

## Durham E-Theses

---

### *The Renewal of Song: Metalepsis and the Christological Revision of Psalmody in Paul*

MATTHEW SCOTT

#### How to cite:

---

SCOTT, MATTHEW (2010) *The Renewal of Song: Metalepsis and the Christological Revision of Psalmody in Paul*. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

#### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/451/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

# The Renewal of Song: Metalepsis and the Christological Revision of Psalmody in Paul

Matthew Anthony Scott

## ABSTRACT

The productive yield of Richard Hays' *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* for the study of Pauline intertextuality has not been matched by adequate reflection on questions of method, particularly on the character of the trope at the heart of the Haysian project: metalepsis, or "echo". Nor has sufficient attention been given to the reception of biblical psalmody in Paul, and to the distinctiveness of psalmic discourse in relation to metaleptic process. This study accordingly attempts a close engagement with biblical psalmody as this appears at selected sites in Romans and 2 Corinthians, focusing on those sites which best demonstrate the distinctive character of psalmody, and so offer to refine an account of metalepsis. In particular, it examines quotations which are attributed or attributable to David or to Christ, and sites in which psalmody serves to modulate Paul's discourse without recourse to quotation. In so doing, this study sets out to enrich the Haysian account of metalepsis by discerning and correcting two biases. In relation to method, Haysian metalepsis is found to license maximalist readings of intertexts on the presumption of narrativity, which cannot be fully sustained in relation to psalmody. In relation to hermeneutics, Haysian metalepsis is shown to privilege dialectical accounts of Pauline intertextuality, in which the voice of scripture is richly and sympathetically invoked in Paul's discourse. By resisting these biases, the present study is able to offer a more nuanced account of metalepsis, one better suited to psalmody, and to discern a more complex picture of Pauline intertextuality. Within it, Christ is richly configured as a psalmist in Paul, rhetorically empowered and tendered for imitation, yet nearly always at the expense of David, subverting the mode of agency he represents, in hermeneutical gestures which are dialectical in form but heuristic in effect.

# The Renewal of Song: Metalepsis and the Christological Revision of Psalmody in Paul

Matthew Anthony Scott

Submitted for the qualification of  
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

Dept of Theology and Religion

Durham University

2010

# Table of Contents

## Chapter One: Metalepsis and the challenge of Christological psalmody

1.1	Introduction.....	12
1.1.1	The literary Paul and the “imaginative craft” of exegesis.....	12
1.1.2	The centrality of metaleptic echo to the Haysian project.....	14
1.1.3	Toward the study of Christological psalmody .....	17
1.2	The dramatic structure of <i>metalepsis</i> .....	20
1.2.1	Echo: “meaning effect” or intentional “act of figuration”?.....	21
1.2.2	The masterful author and the obedient reader.....	24
1.2.3	The benign author and the sympathetic text.....	26
1.2.4	The literary text and the assumption of narrative.....	28
1.3	The distinctive discourse of biblical psalmody.....	31
1.3.1	Domains for metalepsis in biblical psalmody.....	31
1.3.1.1	Parallelism in biblical psalmody: metalepsis and the poetic distich .....	31
1.3.1.2	The rhetoricity of formulaic language: metalepsis and encyclopaedia.....	33
1.3.1.3	Not necessarily the psalm: metalepsis and other domains .....	34
1.3.2	The role of psalmody in character formation .....	36
1.3.2.1	The desirability of suture with a Christological subject.....	36
1.3.2.2	The mechanics of suture: first-person discourse .....	37
1.3.2.3	The urgency of suture, and an invitation to metalepsis .....	38
1.4	In search of Christological psalmody: five chapters and a conclusion .....	40

## Chapter Two: The Davidic psalmist in Romans

2.1	Introduction.....	43
2.1.1	Anonymity resisted: named speakers of the psalms in Paul.....	43
2.1.2	Personal speaking subjects in Romans .....	43

2.1.3	Metalepsis and the agency of rhetorical subjects in quotation.....	44
2.2	The “givenness” of Davidic authorship .....	45
2.2.1	The problem of givenness: the kenosis of David as signifier .....	46
2.2.2	David’s kenosis as a function of psalmic discourse .....	46
2.3	Romans 4:6-8: the subjection of David by metaleptic foreclosure .....	48
2.3.1	The means of metaleptic foreclosure: the voice of David circumscribed....	49
2.3.2	Reasons to silence David: the psalmist’s agency ill-suited to Paul .....	51
2.3.3	Why does Paul bring David to speech at all? .....	53
2.4	Romans 3:10-18: David’s voice mastered by Law, and silenced.....	55
2.4.1	David as a solution to a metaleptic puzzle .....	55
2.4.2.	David’s voice curtailed by the generic defeat of metalepsis.....	56
2.5	Romans 11:9-10: the correction of David by metaleptic censure.....	57
2.5.1	David granted agency, but at the cost of self.....	58
2.5.2	Metalepsis denied, else the transumed voice corrected .....	59
2.5.3	<i>Noch einmal</i> : Why is David invoked? .....	61
2.6	The Davidic psalmist in Romans: preliminary conclusions.....	62

### **Chapter Three: Christological psalmody in the service of formation**

3.1	Introduction.....	64
3.1.1	The Seed of David: inheritor or iconoclast?.....	64
3.1.2	Metalepsis in service of moral and spiritual formation.....	65
3.2	A Christological subject for Ps 68:10b in Rom 15:3 .....	66
3.2.1	Psalm 68 as a Christological psalm in the New Testament.....	66
3.2.2	Installing the Christological subject in Rom 15:3 .....	67
3.3	Audience and agenda for Romans 15:3.....	70
3.3.1	The epistolary context of Romans 15:3 .....	71
3.3.2	“The strong” are primary addressees.....	71
3.3.3	To bear the weaknesses of the powerless .....	73

3.3.4	The strong addressed, but all are subject .....	75
3.4	Romans 15:3: a Christological license for metalepsis .....	76
3.4.1	Predicative challenges open the text to metalepsis from Ps 68 .....	76
3.4.1.1	A warrant from the psalm? .....	76
3.4.1.2	Without metalepsis: the speaker, but not his speech .....	78
3.4.1.3	Unmotivated metalepsis: particular to the psalm, yet arbitrary .....	79
3.4.1.4	Motivated metalepsis: particular, and local to the quoted clause .....	81
3.4.1.5	How it is that zeal pleases: coming to share in divine reproach.....	81
3.4.1.6	God is reproached in the reproach of his “house” .....	83
3.4.2	The sociohistorical relevance of Paul’s quotation .....	85
3.4.2.1	A sociohistorical basis for reproach?.....	85
3.4.2.2	An optional metaleptic extension: Ps 68:11 .....	86
3.5	Romans 15:4: Psalm 68 as a source of hope and instruction .....	87
3.5.1	Written for our instruction – or for our (trans)formation?.....	87
3.5.2	Paul recognises the role of psalmody in formation .....	88
3.5.3	Ps 68 configured for hope by the Christological subject.....	90
3.6	Romans 15:5-6: the outcomes of formation, and its <i>telos</i> in praise.....	92

## **Chapter Four: Christological cinema and the eclipse of the Davidic subject**

4.1	Introduction.....	94
4.1.1	A Christological tracking shot and its Isaianic reverse .....	94
4.1.2	Multiple subjects coordinated by a Christological gaze .....	95
4.2	Romans 15:9: metaleptic subversion: Christ as the <i>telos</i> of David .....	977
4.2.1	Christ installed as the psalmist in Rom 15:9b .....	98
4.2.1.1	Candidates for speaking subject.....	98
4.2.1.2	A renewed call to imitation confirms a Christological subject .....	100
4.2.2	Contrary metalepsis: Christ as nemesis of the Davidic psalmist .....	102

4.2.3	Is Paul metaleptically interested at this point? .....	105
4.3	Romans 15:10: Christological cinema: Gentiles and Jews in praise .....	108
4.3.1	Who speaks is not the issue, but who sees: the Christological gaze .....	109
4.3.2	Metaleptic minimalism: the fragments of Mosaic Song.....	111
4.4	Romans 15:11: cinema and text: the fullness of sight and reference .....	114
4.5	Romans 15:12: the viewing subject revealed.....	117
4.6	Christ revealed, David eclipsed: the testimony of the psalms in Romans.....	120

## **Chapter Five: Christological psalmody in the drama of consolation**

5.1	Introduction: Paul among the psalmists, in Christological voice .....	124
5.1.1	A global psalmic subject engaged in the mode of thanksgiving/lament....	124
5.1.2	A Christological psalmist engaged, the psalmist remade as an agency .....	126
5.1.3	From dramaturgy to drama: an approach to the text.....	127
5.2	2 Corinthians 1:3-7: Christ and the psalmist in alignment.....	128
5.2.1	Blessing and its discursive origins .....	128
5.2.1.1	The subjectivity of blessing.....	128
5.2.1.2	The discursive provenance of blessing: liturgy and psalmody.....	129
5.2.1.3	Blessing's extension (vv. 3-4) drawn from psalmody.....	130
5.2.1.4	A blessing uttered by the global subject of psalmody.....	132
5.2.2	Christology and psalmody in lexical interplay in 2 Cor 1:3-7 .....	133
5.2.2.1	Affiliated: key terms in 1:3-7 and their structural interrelationship .....	133
5.2.2.2	Localised: affliction and consolation domiciled in personal psalmody ..	134
5.2.2.3	Reaccentuated: θλίψις, παράκλησις and the παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ...	136
5.2.3	The alignment of Christological and anthropological agency.....	138
5.2.3.1	The divine agent foregrounded: the <i>salutatio</i> (vv.1-2).....	139
5.2.3.2	Grace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.....	140
5.2.3.3	The Pauline subject in consolation: co-agency in Christ.....	142

5.2.4	The effect of παράκλησις: formation of the psalmist who suffers with Christ .....	144
5.2.4.1	As agency, Christ becomes the psalmist; in Christ, the psalmist becomes agency .....	144
5.2.4.2	Consolation's effects for the suffering psalmist .....	145
5.3	2 Corinthians 1:8-10a: the death of the self as self's agent .....	148
5.3.1	Dramaturgy and drama: 1:3-7 and 1:8-11 .....	148
5.3.1.1	An intimate relationship between two passages .....	148
5.3.1.2	θλιψις here and there, but the sufferer distinct .....	149
5.3.2	Dramatic narration as Aristotelian rhetoric and more: persuasion and transformation in 2 Cor 1:8-10 .....	150
5.3.2.1	With the rhetorical tradition: exaggeration in the service of persuasion? .....	151
5.3.2.2	Transcending the tradition: Paul seeks the transformation of his hearers .....	153
5.3.2.3	Outside the rhetorical tradition: Paul's pursuit of transformation is rooted in psalmody .....	156
5.3.3	Paul among the psalmists in 2 Corinthians 1:8-10a .....	157
5.3.3.1	Paul writes in the mode of psalmic thanksgiving .....	157
5.3.3.2	The signs of psalmic modulation, and their invitation to the reader .....	159
5.3.3.3	A pronominal mode of invitation: the rhetorical work of "we" .....	161
5.3.3.4	Pronominal subjectivity in psalmody, and its modulation of 2 Cor 1 ....	163
5.3.3.5	A psalmist at the limit of canonical experience: despair and a failed appeal .....	165
5.3.3.6	Paul at the limit of psalmic experience: a verdict of death .....	168
5.3.3.7	Death to the agency of the self on its own behalf .....	172
5.3.3.8	A death enjoined upon all via the global subject of psalmody .....	178
5.4	2 Corinthians 1:10b-11: the reconfigured self as co-agency for the other .....	179

5.4.1	Where dramaturgy finds its true drama: 1:10-11 as a narrative embodiment of 1:4-7.....	180
5.4.1.1	Continuity between 1:4-7 and 1:10-11, but not with the subject of 1:8-9.....	180
5.4.1.2	Paul's hope is qualified, but not because he doubts the prospect of rescue.....	181
5.4.2	Restored to a praying community: psalmody and agency in 1:11 .....	183
5.4.2.1	Psalmody engaged: the psalmist rejoins the community of faith in its quintessential act.....	183
5.4.2.2	Psalmody enhanced: the community as co-agency in the economy of rescue .....	185
5.4.2.3	Agency amended: the circumscription of human agency by the divine agent.....	190
5.5	Conclusions .....	192

## **Chapter Six: Christ as the voice of psalmody in 2 Corinthians 4**

6.1	Introduction.....	194
6.1.1	Christ and psalmody co-implicated in the formation of those in Christ: an emerging pattern.....	194
6.1.2	In search of Christological ventriloquism: a metaleptic debate.....	196
6.1.3	Approaching the text: a synopsis .....	199
6.2	A Christological psalmist in 2 Cor 4:13.....	200
6.2.1	Indeterminacy in quotation: ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα .....	200
6.2.2	Evidence from 2 Corinthians 4 for a Christological subject.....	201
6.2.2.1	Hays: symmetry between the careers of Christ and Paul in 2 Cor 4 .....	202
6.2.2.2	Stegman: the “story” of Jesus in 2 Cor 4.....	203
6.2.2.3	Schenck: the faith of Jesus warrants the trust of the believer.....	205
6.2.2.4	Campbell: participation in the faith of Jesus .....	207
6.2.2.5	Arguments from 2 Cor 4 for a Christological subject: reprise .....	209

6.2.3	Christ as believing, speaking subject elsewhere in Paul .....	210
6.2.3.1	False leads to a believing, speaking Christ.....	210
6.2.3.2	The Christological psalmist in Romans: believing and speaking.....	211
6.2.3.3	Christ speaking in Paul and in the believer.....	213
6.2.3.4	Conclusions.....	214
6.3	The written subject of psalmody, which is the spirit of faith.....	215
6.3.1	By way of introduction: a formula for quotation and its entailments.....	216
6.3.1.1	Distinctive features of the “standard formula”: καθὼς γέγραπται .....	216
6.3.1.2	The distinctiveness of the formula κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον .....	218
6.3.2	The representative subject of psalmody and the spirit of faith .....	219
6.4	The quotation in its literary context: Ps 115:1-2 (Ps 116:10-11 MT).....	221
6.4.1	Paul knows the opening distich of Ps 115.....	222
6.4.2	The psalmist’s first words depend upon the remainder of the distich .....	223
6.4.3	A narrative subject for Ps 115:1-2.....	225
6.4.4	A subject ill-suited to mimesis.....	227
6.5	Beyond the distich: metaleptic invocation of Ps 115 .....	228
6.5.1	The logic of metaleptic appeals to Ps 115 .....	228
6.5.2	The literary location of Paul’s quotation.....	230
6.5.3	A quotation from Greek or translation from Hebrew? .....	232
6.5.4	Psalms 115 as Christological psalmody.....	233
6.5.4.1	Fragments of Ps 115 applied to Christ.....	233
6.5.4.2	“The story” of Ps 115 applied to Christ .....	236
6.5.4.3	Reinforcement? Traces of the psalmist in the Christology of 2 Cor 4..	237
6.6	Ps 114 (Ps 116:1-9 MT) and the morally simple subject.....	238
6.7	The Christological psalmist and the limits of metalepsis .....	242
6.7.1	Installing the Christological psalmist.....	242
6.7.1.1	A cumulative case for Christ as the quotation’s subject.....	242
6.7.1.2	A rhetorical strategy for installation .....	244

6.7.2	What does the psalmist believe and therefore speak?.....	246
6.8	Conclusions .....	247

**Chapter Seven: In conclusion: metalepsis and the Christological revision of psalmody in Paul**

7.1	Introduction.....	249
7.2	The Christological subject .....	250
7.2.1	How the Christological subject is installed.....	250
7.2.2	The rhetorical achievements of the Christological subject.....	251
7.3	The Christological psalmist .....	252
7.3.1	Invested in ecclesiology, and to theocentric ends.....	252
7.3.2	Christological psalmody in the formation of character .....	253
7.4	Psalmody and the workings of metalepsis .....	256
7.4.1	Metalepsis is notionally simple, but complex in rhetorical life .....	256
7.4.2	Metaleptic domains in psalmody.....	257
7.4.3	Psalmody, metalepsis, and the flaws of Haysian methodology .....	258
7.5	Paul and the hermeneutics of Christological psalmody .....	259

**Coda: Ps 152 (apocryphal) .....262**

**Bibliography .....263**

## Abbreviations

NET        *The NET Bible 1.0*. Biblical Studies Foundation, 2004

Unless specified, all other abbreviations conform to:

Alexander, P H et al, eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999.

## Primary Texts

The texts used in this study are as follows:

Nestle, E and K Aland, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece* (=NA<sup>27</sup>). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Elliger, K and W Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (=BHS). Fourth Corrected Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.

Classical texts are cited according to the text and translation of the Loeb Classical Library editions.

## Translations

Except where indicated, all translations are my own.

*The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.*

# 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

Throughout the long centuries of his discursive afterlife, Paul has been a magnetic figure, inciting passion in his readers. As the metaphor suggests, Paul’s magnetism has a polarising effect: the apostle attracts some, repels others. But attraction and repulsion are both forms of engagement, and Paul’s readers are never less than engaged.

Always a participant in the construction of meaning, the engaged reader of Paul fashions from his letters an attractive or repulsive figure according to need. It is not surprising, then, to find in the Pauls of current scholarly fashion a more than passing resemblance to contemporary scholars of NT who read him. 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.<sup>1</sup> At least within anglo-american scholarship of the last 20 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 both astute and creative: *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*.<sup>2</sup>

Since that volume was published in 1989 a substantial industry of “intertextual” scholarship has sprung up in Pauline studies.<sup>3</sup> To a large extent, this scholarship has

---

<sup>1</sup> An imagined similarity embodied in Hays’ “common sense” hermeneutics (Hays 1989:27-28).

<sup>2</sup> Hays 1989, henceforth *Echoes*. I am indebted to this work, as are so many, for stimulating my interest in intertextuality in Paul.

<sup>3</sup> 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). Recent treatments that interact with Haysian methodology include Moyise 2008b, and the published work of SBL’s Paul and Scripture Seminar (collected in Porter and Stanley

been detached from the ideological roots of Kristeva's *intertextualité*,<sup>4</sup> serving instead the canonical agendas of historical criticism,<sup>5</sup> 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 allusion's imprecision and indirection (and quotation's also). By methodological sleight-of-hand, the forms of scientific analysis – classification and criteria – can yield the appearance of fixity; however fuzzy an intertextual referent may be, it qualifies as *this kind* of reference in *that place*. But the use of such forms in relation to intertextuality is costly. In part, the cost is aesthetic: itemised lists and labelling are inelegant forms. But they are inelegant because they fail to yield a composite portrait of the desired (elegant) Paul. For where classification and the application of criteria are analytic, discriminating acts, 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. Analytic, piecemeal approaches to his reading of scripture cannot serve.

They will not serve for Hays, at any rate, who has little interest in classifying forms of allusion,<sup>6</sup> and whose criteria for discerning the presence of echoes serve less to define and constrain the productivity of Paul's text so much as to guarantee it (see 1.2.1).<sup>7</sup> 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."<sup>8</sup> As aids to imaginative craft, Hays' seven criteria for "testing" echoes serve to open the field, not narrow it: they nod both to authorial intention and to readerly freedom; they profess an interest in historical

---

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.

<sup>4</sup> 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*.

<sup>5</sup> Hays 2009:xiii.

<sup>6</sup> Hays 1989:29.

<sup>7</sup> In this connection, the failure of attempts to make Haysian methodology more "scientific" are salutary. Thompson, for example, adduces 11 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".

<sup>8</sup> Hays 1989:29.

plausibility but decline to be constrained by it. The criterion he thinks most important, *satisfaction*,<sup>9</sup> is of all the most intuitive, the least scientifically reducible.<sup>10</sup>

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 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”.<sup>11</sup>

This shift we will cover 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 who depends in turn on a cumulative thickness of reference. Even in the subtlest hands, such an approach tends not toward 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, the tool that opens up the text, is *metalepsis*, aka *echo*. Introduced in 1.1.2 below, 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.

---

<sup>9</sup> Hays 1989:31.

<sup>10</sup> On the methodological underpinnings and associated costs, see 1.2.1 below.

<sup>11</sup> Hays 1989:32.

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;<sup>12</sup> more broadly, "as an extended trope with a missing or weakened middle."<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> 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. 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.<sup>15</sup> Invoking Thomas Greene's hermeneutical typology,<sup>16</sup> 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."<sup>17</sup> Hays, by contrast, orients his project, and the category of metalepsis, to a "dialectical" hermeneutic. Hays' response to Green is worth quoting at length:

---

<sup>12</sup> For an early definition of metalepsis, in which the Latin term *transsumptio* is introduced, see Quintilian (*Inst.* 8.6.37-39). Where Quintilian finds the figure rare and unnecessary, Bloom (2003:102) thinks it pervasive. Hollander 1981:133-49 offers an extensive historical review, carefully distinguishing his own account from Bloom's.

<sup>13</sup> Bloom 2003:139.

<sup>14</sup> Hays 1998:219 n.37. Hays' account of metalepsis is grounded firmly in Hollander 1981; cf. Hays 2005:174-75.

<sup>15</sup> Green 1993.

<sup>16</sup> Drawn from Greene 1982; see Hays 1989:173-78.

<sup>17</sup> Hays 2005:175 (reprinting Hays 1993b).

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 continues to be heard rather than suppressed is, in significant measure, a literary judgment about how the text's tropes work.<sup>18</sup>

Hays is quite correct in asserting the hermeneutical significance of literary tropes, specifically in how they "work". 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 judgments, 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<sup>19</sup> – 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 another agent 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.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Hays 2005:176.

<sup>19</sup> 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."

<sup>20</sup> 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, 148-49. Rather, his point is the failure of appeals, whether to intending subjects or to contexts, to master the play of signification.

A close examination of the dynamics of metalepsis is thus in order. Indeed, in its call for context and 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 out its various threads (1.2), a task all too seldom attempted.<sup>21</sup> 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 Toward 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.<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

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.<sup>24</sup> Not infrequently, narrative elements within the Pentateuch – the exodus traditions and patriarchal stories especially – have been brought to the fore;<sup>25</sup> apt, perhaps, to yield a “narrative substructure”<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> At least, little *systematic* attention has been paid to the psalms, such as

---

<sup>21</sup> See 1.1.3 n.33 for attempts to reckon with Haysian methodology.

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> Watson 2004. Watson acknowledges his debt to *Echoes* (2004:xii-xiii).

<sup>24</sup> Here the significant text is Hays 1983, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2002.

<sup>25</sup> Watson 2004; cf. Keesmaat 1999.

<sup>26</sup> The quest for a “narrative substructure” is the declared project of Hays 1983.

<sup>27</sup> 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<sup>27</sup>.

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.<sup>28</sup> Nor can “the psalms” designate a bound literary work in quite the way of other texts in the eventual canon of scripture.<sup>29</sup>

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, many even of these partial studies attempt to read the psalms for narrative, and so demonstrate their debt to Hays.<sup>30</sup>

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; but we will branch out in two closely related directions. The first leads us to 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.<sup>31</sup> But if Christ is indeed a speaking subject in Pauline psalmody, we might expect to discern his influence in Paul’s own “performance” of psalmody; this possibility is tested in a close reading of the opening of 2 Corinthians.

---

<sup>28</sup> 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 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 whether such a “pattern” is best described in narrative terms may be debated (cf. Barclay 2002:154-56; Horrell 2002:166-68). 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.

<sup>29</sup> See 1.3.1.3 n.93 on the fluidity of the psalter in late Second Temple Judaism.

<sup>30</sup> 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 distills 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.

<sup>31</sup> See Evans 1997, 2004; Mays 1986.

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.<sup>32</sup> 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 rather with Hays<sup>33</sup> than with many of his followers, who demonstrate somewhat less reserve (1.2.1).<sup>34</sup>

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

---

<sup>32</sup> 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 2008b. 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 (1973:76-77). 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 (1992:651-662). On the competence of Roman audiences, see Fisk 2008; in response to Stanley, see Abasciano 2007.

<sup>33</sup> 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 1978 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 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.

<sup>34</sup> 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 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.’”

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 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;<sup>35</sup> and the apostle loves to quote from the psalms, indeed to draw attention to the act of quotation through distinctive formulae. Four of the five chapters which follow take as their starting points unambiguous quotations from the psalms. Yet metalepsis might be thought a surer guide than quotation to an author's intertextual activity, signifying not the ambivalent fact of reference but its range and extent. Certainly, it is of critical significance to the question of Christological psalmody in Paul, which is our specific focus. Accordingly, if our investigations begin with quotations, they seldom end there.

---

<sup>35</sup> 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.

Our investigations into psalmody will lead us to a different account of metaleptic process than that offered by Hays. But we will begin with a study of *echo* as it functions in Hays; for it is his model, and the assumptions which inform it, that have guided most recent enquiries into psalmody in Paul.

### 1.2.1 Echo: “meaning effect” or intentional “act of figuration”?

Already in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, Hays had discovered a richly storied substructure beneath the surface of Paul’s thought. In *Echoes*, we learn that this is no Procrustean bed, but a spacious intertextual cavern, into which Paul’s many quotations, allusions and echoes carry the competent reader. Put simply, *echo* is Hays’ name for what happens there.

Viewed this way, *echo* appears as a kind of intertextual meaning effect, independent of authorial intent, anchored more by the competence of readers. But it is also the name Hays gives to an act of figuration. *Echo*, aka metalepsis, aka transumption, is a diachronic trope which is realised at a particular textual site. Thus, at the site of an echo (enacted figure), the competent reader is drawn into a whispered field of correspondences between evoked and evoking texts; the richness of the echo (meaning effect) lies in the material transumed in the process.

Such language sets the notion of *echo* apart in sophistication and breadth from earlier proposals which also allowed that material not quoted could yet be evoked by a quotation. For C H Dodd, for example – an important inspiration for Hays – this material was typically the literary context of the quoted material.<sup>36</sup> Hays’ “whispered correspondences”<sup>37</sup> may in principle carry the reader a good deal further afield.

On the face of the matter, Haysian *echo* offers itself as an apt category to capture psalmic intertextuality. As we will later discover (1.3.1.2), the highly formulaic character of psalmic language is such as to maximise the *echo* effect, “whispering correspondences” across a wide spectrum of poetic texts, within and beyond the borders of the Psalter. The play of psalmic intertexts is disturbingly free, resisting arrest; only a strong referring

---

<sup>36</sup> Dodd 1952.

<sup>37</sup> Hays 1989:20.

author could limit the proliferation of meaning. Does *echo* resist the temptation to provide one?

*Echo* appears at first ambivalent with respect to authors: as an act of figuration it implies (without requiring) an author;<sup>38</sup> yet as an effect it does not. We are not helped by the openly metaphorical character of the term. Yet the categorical haze is increased even more when we understand that the figure works by indirection; unlike other tropes, *echo* depends for its effectiveness on subtle suggestion rather than obvious reference. The conventional marks of intention are suppressed in the interests of the figure, so that the author seems to disappear, only to resurface as the figure is recognised and the reader attempts to complete it (on which, see below).

This ambivalence is reflected in Hays' language. On the one hand, he seems willing to accord some place to historical author, and to audience too: "Claims about intertextual meaning effects are strongest where it can credibly be demonstrated that they occur within the literary structure of the text and that they can plausibly be ascribed to the intention of the author and the competence of the original readers."<sup>39</sup> Yet on the next page, we find John Hollander quoted with approval:<sup>40</sup> "Echo is a metaphor of, and for, alluding, and does not depend on conscious intention."<sup>41</sup>

Hays appears at first to resolve the tension in favour of the text. His chapter on method concludes with a word "against all this hermeneutical hedging"<sup>42</sup> – a reference to his seven criteria. "Texts," he affirms, "can generate readings that transcend both the conscious intention of the author and all the hermeneutical strictures that we promulgate." Accordingly:

To limit our interpretation of Paul's scriptural echoes to what he intended by them is to impose a severe and arbitrary hermeneutical restriction. In the first place, what he intended is a matter of historical speculation; in the second place, his intertextual echoes are acts of figuration. Consequently, later readers will rightly grasp meanings of the figures that may have been veiled from Paul himself.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Certainly, Hays talks freely of "deliberate echoes"; see 1989:41, 43 and *passim*.

<sup>39</sup> Hays 1989:28.

<sup>40</sup> Hollander 1981. *The Figure of Echo* is Hays' most direct theoretical inspiration.

<sup>41</sup> Hays 1989:29.

<sup>42</sup> Hays 1989:32.

<sup>43</sup> Hays 1989:33.

But whether “our interpretation” is to be limited or no,<sup>44</sup> these remain “Paul’s scriptural echoes,” as the quote above makes clear: intentional acts in the first instance, even if their figurative fruit will finally exceed intention.

The ambiguous status of *echo* in Hays’ account is largely a function of his decision not to locate the “hermeneutical event” in which *echo* participates in any one place. Hays surveys five distinguishable possibilities, which look variously to author, to readers historical and present, to interpretive community or to text,<sup>45</sup> then resolves “to hold them all together in creative tension”,<sup>46</sup> insofar as each is inadequate on its own, but indispensable to a story of reading. Accordingly, Hays tells a story of reading in which all five figure,<sup>47</sup> and adduces criteria of similar breadth.<sup>48</sup>

As Culler reminds us,<sup>49</sup> however much a theory of reading may attempt to exclude one or two of the triad author/text/reader, any story of reading generated by such a theory implicates all three, so that Hays’ decision appears entirely defensible: a counsel of wisdom. Yet it comes with a methodological cost. While it can readily demonstrate descriptive adequacy, a maximalist framework cannot easily claim explanatory adequacy. Put differently, it is relatively easy to offer justification for this or that intertextual effect where so many story agents may serve; but it is much more difficult to pinpoint the responsible agent or to qualify the effect with any confidence. In effect, this increases the power of Haysian methodology, but diminishes its accountability, and the transparency of its operation. Harnessed to the “necessarily cumulative” case envisaged by Hays for his treatment of Paul,<sup>50</sup> the risk of unprincipled or thinly motivated but powerful readings is very high.

It is a testament to Hays’ skill and relative modesty that such readings are offered comparatively seldom in his own work. Nevertheless, we will have cause to challenge

---

<sup>44</sup> Intentionalists reject any suggestion that attendance to authorial intention is hermeneutically arbitrary, or that recourse to historical speculation (and therefore uncertainty) undermines the significance of authorial intention for meaning; see Poirier 2000:251-8. For a seminal defence of the place of intentionality in meaning construal, see Gibbs 2000.

<sup>45</sup> Hays 1989:26. Where the event is taken to be located in the text, Hays (rightly) speaks of “intertextual fusion”, rather than “hermeneutical event”.

<sup>46</sup> Hays 1989:27.

<sup>47</sup> Hays 1989:28.

<sup>48</sup> Hays 1989:29-32.

<sup>49</sup> Culler 1983:64-83.

<sup>50</sup> Hays 1989:32; see 1.1.1 above.

his readings in ensuing chapters, and to chasten a number of those whose enthusiasm for his hermeneutical programme has not been matched with equal care.

The story of reading which might be inferred from our own account is not less rich than Hays' own; but it benefits from close reflection on the dynamic of metalepsis at its heart. In the sections which follow, we will attempt to tease out the structure of metalepsis, with the aim of clarifying and refining aspects of Hays' methodological approach, and with it our own. As it turns out, the story of reading he tells is rather more specific than it appears.

### 1.2.2 The masterful author and the obedient reader

As an act of figuration, *echo* constructs a very powerful intending author indeed, and with it a reader in search of intention. We have already pointed to the structure of metalepsis (1.2.1), in which the author is made to disappear only to reappear. We need to explore this in a little more depth.

Hays offers the following definition: "In brief, 'metalepsis' is a rhetorical figure that creates a correspondence between two texts such that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with the precursor text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly cited."<sup>51</sup> As a "rhetorical figure", metalepsis is implicated in the rhetorical work of the text, in which both authors and readers are assigned roles. Moreover, the content of "rhetorical" is supplied in Hays' claim "that text B *should be understood* in light of a broad interplay ..." (emphasis mine). Thus, readers who recognise the figurative act are enjoined to participate in it. Insofar as it is recognised as *metalepsis*, however – as an intentional act of indirection – the scope of participation is not unlimited. Taking what is "explicitly cited" to be part of a whole, the reader is enjoined to *complete* the figure, not merely to *supplement* it. Taken to be initiated by an author, the figure is completed according to intentions ascribed to that author.<sup>52</sup>

Authorial presence is enhanced by the gradual unveiling of the author as the figure is enacted. Indirection calls for traces to be left to cue the reader's perception, but not so

---

<sup>51</sup> Hays 1998:219 n.37.

<sup>52</sup> As an analytic category, *echo* may therefore be formally divorced from an intending author; but in practice, as the discussion suggests, it may not. The empowerment of the author is a by-product of metaleptic structure, though it emerges only in the rhetorical life of the figure. But this is no qualification; any linguistic figure exists precisely in the moment of its realisation in discourse.

many or so clear that the extent of reference is foreclosed. Clues are given, but the reader must constitute the puzzle and complete its solution. The author implied in this process has undergone kenosis: he has become less that the reader may become more. The reader is duly flattered, in much the same way as takes place in allusion, but to greater degree. For the brute didacticism of quotation, as also the swift intentionalism of allusion, is entirely missing: in *echo*, the author depends for his presence and his poetic achievement entirely on the reader.

But this author is strong when he is weak. As the reader identifies the echo and moves to complete the figure, she is required to bring him back to life, and now depends on him for his intentions: how will she complete what she now sees he has begun? Who else will guide her through the “resonant cave of significations”<sup>53</sup> she has entered? When at last the figure is deemed complete, the author has been revealed as a master poet and literary artist, and a wise and gracious guide.<sup>54</sup>

Thus the rhetorical power of metalepsis is revealed, both in its elevation of the author and its flattery of the reader. Enjoined to complete the trope, as we have seen, the reader constructs as partner and guide a sophisticated, masterful author. The figure duly completed, the reader is flattered by success and grateful for guidance received; susceptible, therefore, to the persuasive force of the text.

The author constructed by metalepsis is a flattering representation of Paul and, in many respects, attractive. Nonetheless it carries as corollary a particular vision of the text and of the readerly task, one which bears closer examination. In foregrounding the intentionality of intertextual reference, moreover, it occludes the unintentioned play of signification which, we may learn,<sup>55</sup> constitutes an equal contribution of psalmody to the Pauline text.

---

<sup>53</sup> Hays 1989:21.

<sup>54</sup> Relevance theory offers a somewhat similar account of readerly activity (see Sperber and Wilson 1987, 1995), though vitiated – as our own, multivariate analysis will not be – by the overwhelming explanatory power of its central principle (see esp. Levinson 1989; cf. Levinson 2000).

<sup>55</sup> See Chapter 5. Roy Ciampa’s attempt to survey this territory (Ciampa 2008) is thwarted by a lack of theoretical tools.

### 1.2.3 The benign author and the sympathetic text

Metalepsis, as defined by Hays, constructs a strongly intentional author. Equally, it offers a benign vision of authorial activity, one which invites the reader to complete the figure sympathetically.<sup>56</sup> Polyphonist though he is, the Haysian author prefers the consonance of harmony to the sometime dissonance of fugue.<sup>57</sup> Contrary voices are “suppressed”.<sup>58</sup> Not imagined is a contrarian author, who prefers shouted disputations to whispered correspondences, gleefully summoning voices which strive for mastery, only to be mastered – as all transposed voices must be<sup>59</sup> – by the author’s own.

The entailments of sympathetic reading are worth spelling out. As the willing “research assistant” of an author empowered as master of a wide-ranging textual domain, the reader is both licensed and willing to seek far for “whispered correspondences”: for echoes which “correspond” (i.e. are in sympathy) with the triggering text. This license disconnects the reader from strict obligation to literary context;<sup>60</sup> the salient context is now that which corresponds, its literary location a secondary concern. The effect of all this is to construct for the reader a sense that the text *in general* is in sympathy with the author’s intent.<sup>61</sup>

Even at the fundamental level of terminology, the association Hays forges between metalepsis and the metaphorical term *echo* illustrates the expectation of intertextual sympathy. An echo is materially derivable from its source, however much it may be found to modulate, transpose or even “distort”<sup>62</sup> that source; it thus stands in particular and definable relation to that source; and that relation is finally consonant, euphonic,

---

<sup>56</sup> The rhetoric of “completion” itself imagines a harmony between the said and the unsaid, a sense of sympathetic “fit”, which the language of “supplement” does not.

<sup>57</sup> Moyise (2008b:128) paints a complementary portrait of Paul: “During the course of an argument or exhortation, Paul introduces a number of quotations with formulae that imply intent. He is quoting because he thinks the texts somehow support, strengthen or illustrate what he is trying to say.” No hint of a subversive or contrarian disposition figures here.

<sup>58</sup> See 2.5.2 on David’s suppression in Rom 11:9-10. Claims of suppression are infrequently made, reflecting their cost to a dialectic hermeneutic; cf. Hays 2005:176, quoted earlier *in extenso*.

<sup>59</sup> See Sternberg 1982:107-56. For a particularly forceful (and somewhat overstated) claim of authorial dominance in quotation, see Lane-Mercier 1991:199-214.

<sup>60</sup> Some obligation remains however, on the basis of literary and narrativist assumptions about the text which also figure in the Haysian model; see 1.2.4 below.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Stanley 2008b:128, 130.

<sup>62</sup> Hays quotes Hollander (1981:111) approvingly: “the rebounds of intertextual echo generally ... distort the original voice in order to interpret it” (1989:19). The language of distortion remains the language of relation.

enharmonious. Associated with *echo*, metalepsis is revealed to be the rhetorical instrument of harmony between the Pauline text and its scriptural precursors.<sup>63</sup>

Not coincidentally, Hays detaches *echo* from any role in producing “unforeseeable significations”. As metalepsis, it is rather that which evokes “correspondences”:

This sort of metaleptic figuration [i.e. allusive echo] is the antithesis of the metaphysical conceit, in which the poet’s imagination seizes a metaphor and explicitly wrings out of it all manner of unforeseeable significations. Metalepsis, by contrast, places the reader within a field of whispered or unstated correspondences.<sup>64</sup>

A benign author, then; and a sympathetic text which yields “correspondences”. But must the author of *echo* be so figured? Among the chief virtues of Hays’ account of Paul is to render him a thoroughly “engaged” reader of scripture, alert to the contexts of his intertextual appeals. We may grant, equally, that he is skilled in triggering metalepsis on the part of his readers. But such skill may be turned by the same token to the foreclosure of metalepsis. Indeed, if Paul is deeply engaged with scripture, he will be alert not only to the novelty of his readings but to the tension associated with the new. He will be attuned not only to scriptural voices which promise harmony, but those which threaten argument. Responding to this, he will not always encourage metalepsis. Sometimes he will act to foreclose, boarding up the entrance to the “cave of significations” to which his intertexts might otherwise give entry; not merely “suppressing” an unhelpful voice but silencing all voices not explicitly co-opted to his own. At other times, perhaps, he may act polemically, inviting metalepsis precisely to reinforce the supremacy of his voice, or the hermeneutical novelty imposed by the Christ-event on any reading.

We are faced with a choice between two Pauls, represented in variant authors figurable under metalepsis. In the Haysian paradigm, *echo* is shown to privilege eirenic readings in which the author is not only deeply engaged with his literary precursors, but in fundamental harmony with them: a harmony which can only be enriched and deepened by metaleptic extension. Such an author is capable of novel readings, even of strong misreadings, yet welcomes intertextual reinforcement in almost every case, and co-opts

---

<sup>63</sup> Apart from association with *echo*, metalepsis, which refers minimally to the act of transumption – to “transume” is simply to “take across” – does not characterise the relationship between texts with any such expectation of harmony.

<sup>64</sup> Hays 1989:20.

the reader to the task of discovery. He does not foreclose metalepsis, and he certainly does not engage in “metaleptic warfare”. He is an author, finally, of rich continuity between the old and the new; at the limit, a servant of “salvation history”.<sup>65</sup>

Our critique of the Haysian author discloses another, which might as easily read and be read for discontinuity as for continuity, but with a bias toward neither – a characteristic we might think an asset. Reckoning with this author, the reader will be alert to signals in the text which cue metalepsis, but equally to those which discourage or foreclose it, or which invite metalepsis so as to establish the mastery of the author’s voice over others the text invokes. We will attempt to read in just this way in the study to follow.

But what kind of domain is apt to such varied metaleptic gestures? As we have seen, the author of *echo* is master of a wide domain within which many “whispered correspondences” may be audible. We shall now see how the textual domain of metalepsis is figured under Hays precisely for correspondence (1.2.4). Our own account of domain, derived from an analysis of psalmic discourse, will facilitate correspondence along quite other lines (1.3.1); but it will also privilege certain sub-domains for metaleptic extension, whether this yields correspondence or demurrals. Our revised author may invite either, after all.

#### 1.2.4 The literary text and the assumption of narrative

At first blush, the highly evocative metaphors deployed in *Echoes* carry Hays’ notion of intertextuality some way toward the notion of *encyclopaedia*. This is Umberto Eco’s preferred term for the vast collection of signs that, in the semiotic view, constitutes our knowledge of the world. Eco construes *encyclopaedia* metaphorically in terms of a kind of labyrinth, a vast aggregation of signs among which an infinite variety of connections can be made;<sup>66</sup> compare the Haysian “resonant cave of significations”.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Thus apt to Haysian purpose; not, as Bockmuehl observes (2008:499), in terms of a “seamless *Heilsgeschichte*” in Paul, but of a symbolic incorporation of Paul’s readers into the story of Israel (Hays 2005:9), however “reconfigured by the cross and resurrection” (2005:5).

<sup>66</sup> Specifically, Eco imagines a particular kind of labyrinth (a “net”), distinguishable from the linear labyrinth of the Minotaur, or the maze of later times, with its productive routes and dead ends. Unlike these, Eco’s *net* (or *rhizome*, following Deleuze and Guattari 1976) describes an “unlimited territory”; in a net, “every point can be connected with every other point, and, where the connections are not yet designed, they are, however, conceivable and designable” (1984:81).

<sup>67</sup> Hays adopts the metaphor and phrase from Hollander 1981 (the phrase: p.65; the metaphor: *passim*). By attaching it to “Scripture” (1989:21), Hays has designated a literary domain, potentially bounded, and therefore unlike *encyclopaedia*. The problem of boundedness is notable in psalmody; see 1.3.1.3 n.93.

In practice, Hays is twice removed from Eco: first by his literary sensibilities, which cast the textuality of intertexts in certain structured ways (see below); and second, by his narrativist assumptions, which impose a formally linear structure on textual precursors. To understand the latter is a matter of literary history: *Echoes* follows in the train of *The Faith of Jesus Christ*,<sup>68</sup> and retains the earlier volume's commitment to a narrative sub-structure to Pauline theology. In *Faith*, that sub-structure took its form from the structuralist narratology of 1980s Greimas, the details of which need not concern us.<sup>69</sup>

More troublingly, they no longer concern Hays, who, in the foreword to *Faith*'s second edition, regrets his earlier commitment to Greimas. He observes, "The thing that matters is the message of the text, the story that it tells and interprets. Methodology is a secondary and instrumental concern."<sup>70</sup> For those who do not already share Hays' narrative presuppositions, this may be thought to beg the question; one might equally say that "methodology" is the very thing which constitutes the story of the text, not that which (instrumentally) discloses it. Frei's statement on the matter, which Hays goes on to quote with approval, is therefore telling. In Frei's opinion, "the theoretical devices we use to make our reading more alert, appropriate, and intelligent ought to be designed to leave the story itself as unencumbered as possible."<sup>71</sup> Theory (*qua* methodology) operates upon the reader's perception, not upon the text, whose narrative character is inherent.

Although we cannot pursue a full critique of the narrative project in Paul,<sup>72</sup> we can note here that, in jettisoning Greimas, Hays leaves the narrative substructure he finds in Paul

---

<sup>68</sup> Hays 1983, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2002; henceforth *Faith*.

<sup>69</sup> Indeed, they do not concern Greimas, whose later "meta-theoretic" approach abandoned the earlier schema (see Patte 1990a, 1990b). For a useful survey of narrative approaches to Paul to 2001, see Matlock 2002.

<sup>70</sup> Hays 2001:xxvii.

<sup>71</sup> Frei 1975:xv. One wonders whether Hays' relegation of methodology is in part aesthetic. The elegance of Hays' own writing (*Echoes* not least) betokens a highly developed aesthetic sense, reflected equally in his co-option of the *Echoes* project to "craft" rather than "science" (1989:29), and his weighting of the partly aesthetic criterion "satisfaction" as the most significant in judging readings which invoke *echo* (1989:31). Among methodological choices for the later Hays, how could the stiff formalist machinery of Greimas, elegant in neither form nor content, compete with the "graceful" (Hays 1989:18) option represented by Hollander's *Figure of Echo*?

<sup>72</sup> Our study grants the desirability of narrative to the experiencing subject (cf. Carr 1986:74-75; Turner 1998:134), and is consistently alert to narrative dynamics in the texts on which Paul draws. Accordingly, we take the competent reader as similarly attracted and alert. Nonetheless, this study is agnostic on the question of whether experience is itself *necessarily* narrative in structure (Carr 1986) or necessarily suited to narration (Ricoeur 1984-88, 1992), and has no commitment to claims of narrative inherency in literary

without its most stringent methodological control, and so at risk (in the hands of the undisciplined) of acquiring far too much explanatory power. Not least because it denotes something invisible (i.e. substructural), the category *narrative* may be adduced in relation to non-narrative texts without being required to account for itself in formal terms, and may even (by a category error) come to *confer* the appearance of narrativity on otherwise unsuitable texts.

We might expect to see this twin strategy commonly undertaken in metaleptic claims for psalmody after Hays, where a psalm is invoked not primarily in its particulars, but much more in terms of its “narrative” or “story”, the form of which is minimally specified. On such an account psalms are assumed to have or yield a “narrative”; and in keeping with the relation between substructure and surface in Hays, this overarching (but minimally defined) narrative is taken to ground the metaleptic claim much more fully than surface particulars.

Along these lines, the effect on Haysian accounts of Pauline intertextuality in relation to psalmody is twofold. First, metaleptic claims of great explanatory power are licensed on the basis of appeal to “narrative”, which are not required to ground themselves extensively in textual particulars. Second, though minimally defined (if at all) – indeed, precisely in the absence of definition – three conventional (if inessential)<sup>73</sup> connotations of narrative are brought into play as metaleptic claims are developed. The first is the assumption of *emplottedness*: a psalm will be taken (or made) to exhibit a straightforwardly sequenced plot, given at a high level of abstraction (e.g. the psalmist is afflicted, is rescued, gives thanks). The second, which owes something to a turn to the particular in psalms scholarship,<sup>74</sup> is the assumption of *particularity*: a psalm tells a particular story, distinguishable from that of other psalms or other texts. Even if the plot adduced for a psalm sounds (by virtue of its abstraction) suspiciously generic, we need not imagine it so; for psalms are particular. The last assumption, which owes much to the figured world of the modern scholar among written texts, is that of

---

texts. See Childs 2008:32-39 for a recent challenge, addressed to Hays, as to the adequacy of narrative as an analytic category for scripture.

<sup>73</sup> None of these are “necessary” to narrative. It is because most Pauline scholars have little interest in a detailed specification of narrative form that their assumptions about narrative are simplistic, or often naive. The volume in which Matlock’s essay (cf. 1.2.4 n.69) appears (Longenecker 2002), which is addressed more generally to narrative in Paul, is illustrative. With a few notable exceptions, the collection is striking for its disinterest in questions of methodology, and a consequent lack of sophistication toward basic narrative categories (see Hays 2004 in review of the volume).

<sup>74</sup> See 1.3.1.2.

*writtenness*: a psalm is to be construed as a written object, within which a narrative is somehow enclosed. The effect of *writtenness* is to buttress the first two assumptions. Thus, the impression of a psalm's *emplottedness* and *particularity* is reinforced by the instantiation of psalmody in written form. That which is written is available to the author and his readers for "artful reminiscences" of a literary kind, and metaleptic claims respect the borders of psalms.

All of these assumptions may be challenged, founded as they are on something less than a fully developed theory of narrative, or even a principled narrative methodology. In the case of psalmody, as we shall now learn, all three assumptions are questionable indeed, and metaleptic claims which depend upon them, insecure.

### **1.3 The distinctive discourse of biblical psalmody<sup>75</sup>**

#### **1.3.1 Domains for metalepsis in biblical psalmody**

The contention of this study is that claims for metalepsis involving biblical psalmody are most strongly motivated within either of two domains. The first is a minimal domain configured on the basis of parallelism; the second is an encyclopaedic domain configured associatively from aspects of the quoted text. Allied with these claims is a negative one: the term *psalm* does not denote a privileged domain for metalepsis.

Each of these claims require some justification. But we can begin by observing that they fall afoul of the narrativist expectations set out in 1.2.4, which do indeed privilege the psalm as a domain for metalepsis, but give no recognition to the two domains identified above.

##### **1.3.1.1 Parallelism in biblical psalmody: metalepsis and the poetic distich**

Parallelism is not now thought to be the defining feature of biblical poetic discourse, as for long it was;<sup>76</sup> but it is no longer fashionable to dismiss it.<sup>77</sup> It is nonetheless

---

<sup>75</sup> Throughout this study, references to biblical psalms reflect the numbering of the OG tradition. References to psalms in MT append "MT"; thus Ps 68 = Ps 69 MT. The terminology "OG" for "Old Greek" is used, rather than the term LXX, which is often used to finesse the question of the uniformity or stability of Greek textual traditions in the late Second Temple period; see McLay 2003:5. Just this question is pressing in the case of the Greek psalter; see Pietersma 2000b. More optimistically, see Rösen-Weinhold 2004.

pervasive within Hebrew psalmody,<sup>78</sup> and represented in thoroughgoing, if not always elegant, fashion within the Greek tradition.

In general terms, parallelism is a matter of linguistic equivalences and oppositions between corresponding elements. As Berlin puts it,

Parallelism promotes the perception of a relationship between the elements of which parallelism is composed, and this relationship is one of correspondence. The nature of the correspondence varies, but in general it involves repetition or the substitution of things which are equivalent on one or more linguistic levels.<sup>79</sup>

Correspondence is not identity, of course; in relating the second element of a parallel structure to the first, a reader will construe difference. But especially significant for our purposes is the idea that parallelism is *perceptually* salient, for this bears on the question of metaleptic domain for a competent reader. Berlin proposes several formal principles undergirding the perceptibility of parallelism: proximity; similarity of surface structure; number of linguistic equivalences; and expectation of parallelism.<sup>80</sup> Together, these privilege local, tightly constructed rhetorical units, particularly exemplified in psalmody, as domains for perceptible parallelism.<sup>81</sup> As such, they constitute privileged perceptual domains for metalepsis.

---

<sup>76</sup> Lowth 1753 is the seminal work, inspiring a long tradition of collection and classification in the study of parallelism. Nonetheless, the recognition of parallelism long precedes him; see Kugel 1981:96-286. Such a long history is telling: there is something “intuitive” about the phenomenon that precedes any given mode of analysis. This points to its perceptibility; see below.

<sup>77</sup> Kugel 1981 is the critical work. Discerning parallelism in prose and poetry alike, he dismantles the distinction between the two. But it is not the presence of parallelism in poetry which is decisive, but the “predominance of parallelism, combined with terseness, which marks the poetic expression of the Bible” (Berlin 2008:5). “Terseness” signifies the stripped down character of poetry, which highlights its (parallel) structure as constitutive, particularly in the parataxis of psalmody.

<sup>78</sup> Alter 1985 is an elegant, if under-theorised, treatment of poetic parallelism. Berlin’s monograph on the topic is a good deal more subtle, and remains (in its 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 2008) the standard work. Berlin, in particular, recognises the multidimensional instantiation of parallelism in morphology, phonology, syntax and semantics. Though this allows her to co-opt a variety of phenomena to the category of parallelism (inclusio, for example; see Berlin 2008:132), she recognises that not all of these are perceptually salient; see below.

<sup>79</sup> Berlin 2008:2.

<sup>80</sup> Berlin 2008:130-35.

<sup>81</sup> On proximity: noting “the Bible often goes out of its way to place parallelisms close together”, Berlin claims that “the less intervening material there is between the parts of the parallelism, the more perceptible it will be” (2008:131). Psalmody embodies the principle of proximity especially clearly. As often as not, however, psalmody eschews the exact repetition of syntactic structure within distichs, and prefers varied lexis in pursuit of equivalence. But if psalmody thereby violates Berlin’s second and third principles, it is only so as to exchange “ease of processing” for high “informativity” (see de Beaugrande and Dressler 1981:9, 213); in this way, a potential loss of perceptibility is countered by an increase in interest, as Berlin also notes (2008:135). In this connection, it is Berlin’s fourth principle which confirms above all the perceptual salience of parallelism in psalmody; for “[w]hen parallelism becomes the constructive device of the text as a whole, then all of its parts begin to be viewed as participating in some

In our study we will encounter a range of quotations drawn from tightly constructed units in which various forms of parallelism might be manifest. We will consider these first for metaleptic potential, and question accounts which discount their significance.

### 1.3.1.2 The rhetoricity of formulaic language: metalepsis and encyclopaedia

We are no longer in the heyday of form critical approaches to the psalms,<sup>82</sup> when it was customary to draw attention to the formulaic character of their discourse.<sup>83</sup> Yet despite a contemporary fascination with the particularity of individual psalms, and even of the psalter,<sup>84</sup> it remains true that psalmody is characterised by a preference for the conventional: for phraseology held in common, for narrative trajectories well worn, for willing conformity to generic expectation.<sup>85</sup> This is not to say that psalmody is incapable of innovation,<sup>86</sup> or that generic expectations are rigidly prescriptive.<sup>87</sup> Indeed, too rich is the fund of available metaphor,<sup>88</sup> too broad the range of experience to be captured, for psalmody ever to be entirely bound by convention. But innovation is not invention; and where the act of invention is dissociative, refusing any debt to other texts

---

way in the parallelism” (2008:134). Such is the case, predominantly, in biblical psalmody, though the *reductio* must be avoided by which even the largest rhetorical units may be co-opted to an instance of parallelism, and therefore deemed salient to perception.

<sup>82</sup> Form criticism was the dominant approach to biblical psalmody in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and its legacy remains hugely significant; see esp. Zenger 2000. The classic account is Gunkel 1933 (ET 1998), partially simplified (and sociohistorically enriched) by Mowinckel (ET 2004). Westermann’s later reworking (1981) is also influential. Howard 1999 offers a useful summary of developments late in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, and the proliferation of approaches now in vogue.

<sup>83</sup> Culley 1967 makes the most far-reaching claim, challenged by Watters (1976:6-19). Reflecting on Culley, and on the character of conventional discourse, see Fisch 1988:117-19; Alter 1985:112-13; for discussion in relation to David, see 2.2.2.

<sup>84</sup> Wilson 1985 remains the most influential attempt to argue a broadly narrative sequence to the canonical Hebrew psalter; but there are numerous others (cf. Mitchell 1997; Millard 1994; McCann 1993). Against the subtlety of many of these (somewhat conflicting) proposals must be set the failure of any to find testimony as to their hermeneutical significance in the early historical record. Notwithstanding, as Nasuti’s survey amply shows (Nasuti 2005; cf. Whybray 1996), the logic governing the canonical sequencing of psalms can be argued in so many suggestive ways that the claim of any to be inherent to the text must be cast in doubt. Further, known historical “sequencers” of the psalms were uniformly literary in their orientation to psalmody, and had access to full texts; unlike Paul, all post-date the widespread adoption of the codex.

<sup>85</sup> Alter 1985:112; Fisch 1988:117-18; Mays 1991:88 and many others.

<sup>86</sup> See Bantch 2003.

<sup>87</sup> Rigidly prescriptive notions of genre, eloquently challenged by Derrida (1980), have little place in modern discussion. With Fowler (1982:37) we should take genre to be a matter of “pigeons rather than pigeonholes”, and the relationship between psalmic texts and genre a matter of varied and complex participation rather than simplistic and permanent membership. Such participation is always innovative; every text not only instantiates a genre or genres but modifies the same, however subtly; see Newsom 2003:12.

<sup>88</sup> Though particular metaphorical *topoi* may signify a text’s participation in genre, and so function conservatively, metaphor is in general linguistically and perceptually innovative (see Ricoeur 1975; Soskice 1985). The rich collocation and confluence of metaphorical predicates in psalmody preserves the creative, innovative character of the figure, even in otherwise conventional discourse. Brown 2002 offers a rich account of metaphoricality in the biblical psalms.

by asserting its work as radically new, innovation is self-consciously referential, evocative of texts to which its own stands related: other participants in the play of genre.<sup>89</sup>

It is the rampant referentiality of psalmic discourse with which metalepsis must reckon: the expectation that quoted language will evoke as context not that which is literarily bound to it by shared provenance in a given psalm, but that which derives from other places – indeed, from many places – throughout the discursive range of psalmody. The potential for such evocation will vary, by degree, from instance to instance, but cannot be set aside in principle.<sup>90</sup> This is a non-linear mode of metaleptic extension, which figures the intertextual field of psalmody encyclopaedically.<sup>91</sup> We will be alert to cues in Paul's text which invite metalepsis of this kind, and question accounts which put unwarranted store by the particularity of elements within the quoted psalm.

### 1.3.1.3 Not necessarily the psalm: metalepsis and other domains

Closely delimited units of parallelism, on the one hand; an essentially limitless encyclopaedia, on the other. But what about the psalm? Delimited by superscription; constituted as a unit in ritual performance; enhanced – beyond the terms available to written form – by association with music or chant: surely the psalm is a premier rhetorical domain for metalepsis? Yes, and no.

---

<sup>89</sup> Alter (1985:113) is keen to stress the “nuanced individual character – ‘originality’ in fact may not be the relevant concept – of different poems reflecting the same genre and even many of the same formulaic devices.” He finds plenty of examples in later poetic tradition, “where the power of the individual poem is meant to be felt precisely in such a fine recasting of the conventional.” What Alter is describing is innovation, in contrast to the kind of rhetorical invention characteristic of, say, Job, or the prophets (1985:112). But it is the language of “fine recasting” and of “nuance” that is significant here. A seminal contributor to the literary turn in psalms scholarship, Alter is himself a reader of finely tuned literary sensibilities, a connoisseur of the playfulness of well-crafted texts in their relationship to genre, inclined to find out the distinctiveness of each. We should not be too quick to impute like sensibilities, or like inclinations, to audiences of Paul's period. Nor should we lose sight of the stress in such innovation upon relationship with other texts, rather than distinctiveness from them.

<sup>90</sup> Insofar as “[e]very phrase in the Psalms is a kind of quotation” (Fisch 1988:119), the evocative power of psalmic language is shown to be a function of its rhetoricity. But the richness of metaphorical predication in biblical psalmody is also relevant, particularly in the degree to which such predicates are semantically interrelated. Drawing on the cognitive approach to metaphor of Lakoff and Johnson (1980, 1989), and building on Creach (1996), Brown (2002) explores a range of metaphorical networks which lead to biblical psalmody a thickly described coherence and structure. Granting even a weak claim for the cognitive salience of such networks, we may suggest that instances of metaphor are likely to evoke for the competent reader other instances of the same or related metaphors, across the domain of psalmody, in encyclopaedic fashion. For an (unfortunately unsuccessful) attempt to discover a collection of psalms unified by the metaphor of God as “rock”, see Swancutt 2003.

<sup>91</sup> See discussion of *encyclopaedia* in 1.2.4 above.

The psalms are unlike other biblical texts in the extent to which they combine a formal claim to particularity (as just observed) with a discursive obedience to generic convention (1.3.1.2), in which that claim may be overturned. Put differently, as formally bounded units the psalms present themselves naturally as coherent domains for metalepsis, readily susceptible to recall and appropriately heard as wholes; yet the high degree of formulaic or conventional language they deploy points away from the particularity of individual psalms to their generic kin.<sup>92</sup> These suggest conflicting notions of metaleptic process: the first privileges a local, delimited textual field – the contributing psalm – ahead of any other; the second prefers a trans-local, non-delimited<sup>93</sup> (encyclopaedic) field to which the immediate literary context of the triggering text is of limited relevance.

The balance of these competing claims must be decided in individual cases. But the fact of competition means that the salience of the contributing psalm cannot be taken for granted. Specifically, a psalm cannot be assumed to be emplotted; and such plot as may be adduced for a psalm, if at a high level of abstraction, cannot be assumed to be particular, but may be entirely generic. Nor can the instantiation of psalmody in discrete written forms be taken to underwrite or compensate for a non-particular plot.

Drawing the threads together, we can suggest some basic methodological controls on judging and prosecuting metaleptic claims in relation to psalmody. Any metaleptic claim must take seriously the first domain we described. If this domain “fails” to yield the figure’s necessary complement, the second (encyclopaedic) domain may be considered. Metaleptic claims which bypass the first domain in favour of wider appeal to the contributing psalm, and which do not factor the second domain, run the risk of arbitrariness.

---

<sup>92</sup> Alter 1985:113.

<sup>93</sup> Relevant here is the absence of a fixed and definitive psalter at the time of Paul, such as would set a strictly literary boundary for metalepsis. On the fluidity of the Psalter, the critical evidence is from the Psalms scrolls and fragments at Qumran; Flint 1997 is the reference study, which finds for a variety of psalters, variously organised. Brooke 2004:10-12 argues that the evidence supports an even greater variety of Psalters than Flint allows. It is important not to overstate the flux: variation is much less in the case of Books I to III than in IV and V. Nevertheless, the fact of variation is significant, as also the coexistence and circulation of multiple psalters during the same period and at the same site. It is thus not meaningful to draw a strict net around the psalms represented in canonical MT or LXX as though these constituted “biblical psalmody” for a 1<sup>st</sup> century reader.

### 1.3.2 The role of psalmody in character formation

The quotations we will study are distinctive, insofar as many offer their subjects for imitation. This spare fact urges us to consider the ways in which psalmody “acts upon” the one who performs it, and to reflect on what the advent of a Christological subject might entail.

#### 1.3.2.1 The desirability of suture with a Christological subject

Even where not marked explicitly as first person, the language of psalmody is intended for habitation; it does not constitute literary objects for study, but prayers to be performed. In this it is fundamentally distinct from other forms of biblical discourse which, even in their most richly involving narrative moments, do not afford the reader opportunities for “suture” to their subjects of speech.<sup>94</sup> In turn, the invitation to suture marks psalmic discourse as an instrument unlike any other in the biblical corpus for the entrainment of subjectivity, an insight mined in patristic reflection on the psalms.<sup>95</sup> Psalmic discourse provides a rich and urgent invitation to the reader to identify with its speaking subject, allowing what is predicated of that subject to represent the reader himself. The fruit of doing so repeatedly, as the fathers recognised, is a “training of the soul”, such that the habitual reader of psalmody comes to experience himself in terms of the subjectivity of its discourse, no longer only when reading a psalm. The practice of psalmody is thus a powerful instrument in spiritual formation. We will do well to be alert, therefore, to signs of that formation in Paul’s discourse;<sup>96</sup> for Paul is, on best probability, just such an habitual reader.<sup>97</sup> We may even expect to find Paul cognisant of psalmody’s role, even willing to endorse it (see 3.5.2).

---

<sup>94</sup> The notion of *suture* is borrowed from the semiotics of film, and refers to a speaker’s agreement to be represented by the subject of the cinematic text (the camera); in the case of a psalm, by the psalm’s subject of speech. Specifically, it denotes the “investment that an individual makes in the subject position offered to him or her within a given discourse.” (Newsom 2004:200; cf. Hall 1996:6). See discussion below.

<sup>95</sup> Augustine’s *Enarrationes in Psalmos* offer many instances of this insight and its Christological foundation; but the *Epistula ad Marcellinum* of Athanasius is a sustained invitation to a formation through psalmody, particular in light of Christ. For discussion see Nasuti 1999:111-16; Daley 2003a; Daley 2003b; Linton 1961 (though not on Athanasius).

<sup>96</sup> See Chapter 5.

<sup>97</sup> Paul makes no explicit reference to his personal practice of scriptural reading, or participation in corporate worship, or indeed anything which might bear directly on his exposure to psalmody. Such evidence as we might bring to bear is inferential. To the extent that later patterns of synagogue worship may be read into Paul’s experience (see Burtchaell 1992 on continuities), a rich diet of psalmody in corporate contexts is a strong inference; a current diet, if Luke’s presentation of Paul as synagogue-attender (Acts 13:14; 14:1; 19:8 *et passim*) is sound. In what might be thought confirmation, Paul clearly expects the use of “psalms” (cf. BDAG q.v. πσάλλω, ψαλμός) in corporate worship (1 Cor 14:26; cf. Col 3:16; Eph 5:19). More generally, we can recognise with Carr (2005) a wide range of evidence for the ways

Suture to a psalm's subject of speech is particularly potent in its effects, because biblical psalmody constitutes its subjects within the distinctive terms offered by prayer, in which the discursive *I* is defined precisely by its relation to the divine other.<sup>98</sup> As Carol

Newsom argues:

Although in general one's words and the verbal shape one gives oneself will change depending on whether one addresses someone of higher or lower status, an intimate or a stranger, the language of prayer implies a uniquely definitive relationship. The radically other quality of the addressee of prayer means that the speaker is constituted not as tenant or landlord, daughter-in-law or matriarch, but *as such*, as a person.<sup>99</sup>

It is in this connection that the Christological inhabitation of psalmody is of particular significance, as the fathers also noted.<sup>100</sup> To identify with David as psalmist is one thing; to identify with Christ, or under Christ's aegis (or even: *as* Christ) may be thought quite another. Suture with a Christological subject in his prayer to an omnipotent Father is among all possible routes to subjective formation unexcelled in potency. Might we find this discovery operative in Paul, whether demonstrated in his own disposition,<sup>101</sup> evidenced in Christological practice,<sup>102</sup> or urged in paraenesis?<sup>103</sup>

### 1.3.2.2 The mechanics of suture: first-person discourse

Although biblical psalms do invoke a variety of voices, the predominant voice is the first person voice of the psalmist. The one praying a psalm is obliged, for the most part, to take up that voice as her own, in order to pray it at all. The mechanics of this process are worth spelling out, as they help to disclose the urgency of psalmody's invitation.

---

in which scriptural texts, not least the psalms (2005:154), were deployed in enculturation, particularly of the privileged; cf. Crenshaw 1998. Among these Paul may reasonably be counted, as a Roman citizen with a Pharisaic education (see Acts 22:3, 28; 23:6). Porter (2008b) confirms the picture.

In many respects the best evidence for Paul as an habitual reader or performer of psalmody is in the reception of the psalms in his own work, which our study will explore. To the extent that this reception betrays an extensive engagement with psalmody – for which metalepsis might yield support – we may confidently suppose Paul to have the familiarity with the psalms which is the fruit of a life of worship and prayer. Of particular interest would be instances where psalmody appears not in quotation or allusion as the object of Paul's reflection, but in the modulation of his discourse; that topic will occupy us at length in Chapter 5.

<sup>98</sup> As Newsom puts it (2004:205), "Even though all speech may have dialogical elements, there are obviously different degrees to which the character of the word as addressed may be marked in various genres. Prayer by its very nature is highly explicit in its orientation to an other."

<sup>99</sup> Newsom 2004:205.

<sup>100</sup> 1.3.2.1 n.95.

<sup>101</sup> See Chapter 5 on 2 Cor 1:3-11.

<sup>102</sup> See Chapter 4 on Rom 15:9-13.

<sup>103</sup> See Chapter 3 on Rom 15:3-6 and Chapter 6 on 2 Cor 4:13.

As the French linguist Emile Benveniste has taught us, pronouns play a special role in questions of subjectivity. First and second person pronouns, like certain other linguistic categories, are distinctive in that they refer uniquely and solely in each instance of discourse in which they are uttered. They do not refer to some relatively stable concept in the way that “horse” does; not, in fact, to a concept at all. Instead, “I is ‘the individual who utters the present instance of discourse containing the linguistic instance *I*.’”<sup>104</sup> “You” refers symmetrically to “the individual spoken to in the present instance of discourse containing the linguistic instance *you*.”<sup>105</sup> A range of other “indicators”, such as “this”, “here”, “today” and many others, refer by ostension “concomitant with the instance of discourse containing the indicator of person.”<sup>106</sup>

In ordinary conversational discourse, the subject who utters “I” (the *speaking subject*) is also the one who identifies with that *I* (the *subject of speech*), and with all that is predicated of it; her speech is altogether her own.<sup>107</sup> But the reader of first-person discourse, such as a psalm, is not that psalm’s *speaking subject*, who may instead be thought to be David, or Christ, or another, perhaps anonymous, psalmist. The reader’s identification with such a text’s *subject of speech* – an act we call *suture*<sup>108</sup> – is accordingly of different kind.

These terms, and the conceptuality they embody, will serve us at various points during our study, not least below.

### 1.3.2.3 The urgency of suture, and an invitation to metalepsis

Benveniste stresses that all first-person pronouns and their grammatical kin refer in the *present* instance of discourse, and not otherwise; there is no continuity of reference between discursive moments.<sup>109</sup> Indeed, because each instance of discourse is distinct, each reference is likewise distinct; the *subject of speech* – the linguistic instance *I*, and all that is predicated of it – is ever changing. As a result, the invitation to suture is renewed with each enunciation of the first person; with it, the demand is reissued to fix reference and to secure adequate context for the spoken subject’s point of view.

---

<sup>104</sup> Benveniste 1971:218.

<sup>105</sup> Benveniste 1971:218.

<sup>106</sup> Benveniste 1971:219.

<sup>107</sup> Silverman 1983:197.

<sup>108</sup> Silverman 1983:43-53, 194-201.

<sup>109</sup> Silverman 1983:199.

In this light, it is easy to see how the concentration of first person verbs and pronouns in biblical psalmody guarantees frequent, constantly renewed invitations to suture,<sup>110</sup> and a further impulse to metalepsis in the demand to reinforce the spoken subject's perspective with adequate context, however supplied.<sup>111</sup> Allied with the strong affectivity of psalmic language in lament and thanksgiving, these frequent invitations lend an intensity to the process of suture and its various entailments.

If portrayed in terms of cinematic experience – where the language we have introduced is often applied – the effect is of short takes: rapid cuts from one perspective to the next, foregrounding the camera's changing point of view, rather than wide, static shots in which the subject's dependence on the camera is unmarked, and his identification with its perspective unexamined. By reissuing the invitation to suture, cinema of the former kind imposes a greater demand on the viewer, particularly to configure adequate context to make each brief shot coherent, and so lend narrative coherence to the ongoing experience.<sup>112</sup>

In textual terms, the equivalent demand is metaleptic: each act of identification with the psalmic subject entails a new predication; and this the reader supplies metaleptically, adduced from local and distant contexts. Certainly, *changes* of perspective are more extreme in the cinematic case than in psalmody; parallelistic equivalences (1.3.1.1) ensure a close continuity of perspective, such that the repeated invitation to suture is not posed for conscious reflection. Yet the fact of perspective, and with it a call for adequate context, is renewed at every enunciation of the first person.

Applicable to any instance of suture with a psalmic subject, these features of psalmody are relevant also to the readerly demands imposed by Paul's quotations. As we shall learn, Paul never has Christ articulate a psalm quotation directly; the work of installing Christ as speaking subject falls to the reader, at times with a prior challenge of

---

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Tull 2005:53.

<sup>111</sup> Person is marked morphologically on Greek verbs, so that pronouns are seldom required; nonetheless, it remains true that at every point first person is marked, the challenge of reference is posed anew: the subject of speech is newly constituted.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. Reisz and Miller 1989:283. By way of example, note the subjectivity of the camera in Paul Greengrass' *The Bourne Ultimatum* (2007); contrast Ozu Yasuhiro's *Tokyo Story* (1953). Theorists debate the degree to which extended shots with wide depth-of-field empower the viewing subject – Bazin (2004:5-6) affirms; Mitry (2000:195) denies – but the formal constraints on that subject are undoubtedly fewer than in the “short takes” characteristic of psalmody.

predication.<sup>113</sup> Once installed, however, Christ may be thought subject to the urgency and intensity associated with suture to any psalmic subject; and the reader responsible for Christ's installation must attend to the metaleptic demands of his act.<sup>114</sup>

We have assessed, in general terms, the distinctive qualities of psalmic discourse with respect to metalepsis and to the ability of psalmody to shape the subjectivity of the one who speaks. It is time to chart the course of our study.

## **1.4 In search of Christological psalmody: five chapters and a conclusion**

Our approach to Paul's text, and the texts of biblical psalmody, is made in the guise of a competent reader. The locus of our attention is the text itself in its rhetorical and literary dimensions. In our close reading of selected texts, the categories "author" and "reader" are strictly epiphenomenal, but are understood to perform as reasonable facsimiles<sup>115</sup> of the historical author and audience to which we earlier granted competence (1.1.3), so that claims about Paul's activity and even intentions can and will be coherently made.

Our search for the presence and activity of the Christological psalmist will not carry us into every corner of the modest Pauline corpus. What anchors our study, rather, are quotations of the psalms in which Christ might be installed as speaking subject, whether he is named for them or not. As Christ enters upon a domain already marked for a speaking subject of some prestige – David – we attend also, and first, to quotations for which David is named, or might have been expected.

This narrows our focus to two letters: Romans and 2 Corinthians. David's presence in Paul is formally restricted to Romans, where he serves as named speaker of two quotations (4:6-8; 11:9-10), as presumptive speaker in an extensive catena largely drawn

---

<sup>113</sup> That is, the contents of the quotation must first be found predicable of Christ before Christ can predicate the quotation of himself (as speaking subject). Cf. discussion in 3.2.2, 3.4.1, and 6.7.1 below.

<sup>114</sup> See 3.4.2.2.

<sup>115</sup> Alexander Nehamas insists that the (implied) author must be "a plausible historical variant of the writer" (1986:689), so that issues of competence and wider historical context do influence our account of the author "Paul".

from psalmody (3:10-18), and in two predicative statements about Christ (1:3; 15:12). The latter are strictly beyond the scope of our study, though Rom 15:12 figures briefly in 4.5. David's role as speaking subject is the topic of Chapter 2.

Christ is associated twice with quotations from the psalms in Romans, both in its fifteenth chapter, and these are the focus of Chapters 3 and 4. In the first, we examine Rom 15:3 to learn how Christ comes to be installed as subject of the quotation, and what metaleptic support, if any, might be granted him. Noting Paul's curious reflection in 15:4 on the use he has just made of scripture, we reflect on the role of Christology in the formation of Christian character.

Chapter 4 takes up Rom 15:9, where Christ might be attached to a quotation with striking Davidic provenance. The implications of this, especially in the event of metaleptic extension, occupy us at length. But Rom 15:9 constitutes the beginning of a catena (15:9-12) drawn substantially from psalmody, including Deut 32 (the "Song of Moses") in 15:10. The possibility that Christ is installed not only as subject in 15:9, but as the coordinating subject of the whole catena, is considered under a model drawn from cinematic theory.

In Chapter 5 we pursue a close reading of the opening of 2 Corinthians (1:3-11). While no quotation appears in this passage, the letter's *exordium* associates psalmic and Christological categories in highly suggestive ways, while the *narratio* relates an experience of suffering in terms highly redolent of psalmody. Encouraged by this, we seek to uncover in the former some of the logic of Christological psalmody, and in the latter its significance for those in Christ.

Chapter 6 returns us to quotation, in what is perhaps the most enigmatic of all such, and least straightforwardly predicable of Christ: 2 Cor 4:13. There we engage at length with accounts which discern a deep affiliation between the psalm there quoted and the subject of the quotation. Rejecting these, we explore a more comprehensive affiliation between Christ and psalmody which casts Paul's programme for Christological psalmody in sharpest relief.

Alert to the emerging themes of our study, Chapter 7 synthesises its many and varied conclusions.

## 2. The Davidic psalmist in Romans

---

### 2.1 Introduction

#### 2.1.1 Anonymity resisted: named speakers of the psalms in Paul<sup>1</sup>

Conventional in form, most genres of psalmody invite many possible authors, and none in particular; yet the desire to grant a singular author to each psalm, and to the psalms in general, is richly attested in the history of their transmission. For most of this history, indeed, the authorship of the psalms has been a hermeneutical given, necessary to “authorise” one or another reading in exegetical or theological terms, or to grant existential authority to the speech of psalmody by grounding it in historical life. In the early Hebrew tradition, David’s superscripted claim is already evident, though characterised for the most part in general terms. In the lively interpretive world of Second Temple Judaism, however, the enrichment and propagation of David as authorial signifier ensured a rich and hermeneutically prior claim to the voice of psalmody, whenever brought to speech. Licensed in turn by David – though the matter must be carefully judged – (the) Christ arose early in Christian interpretation to claim some psalms at least for himself.<sup>2</sup> This much is evident in Paul, where both David and (the) Christ are named, or may be clearly adduced, as speakers of quotations drawn from the psalms. These quotations, and the subjectivity they exhibit, are the focus of this chapter and its sequels. The present chapter deals with David in quotation; Chapters 3 and 4 with Christ.

#### 2.1.2 Personal speaking subjects in Romans

David is named in Paul only in Romans: twice as the voice of psalmody (at 4:6 and 11:9); once in the striking Christological formula with which the letter begins (1:3). Unnamed, he is implicated in Isaiah’s rich conclusion to the catena of Rom 15:9-13,

---

<sup>1</sup> For detail on the observations made in this section, see 2.2.

<sup>2</sup> *Speakers*, or, more precisely, *speaking subjects*, are to be distinguished from the *author* of popular literary imagining – who might be thought to have “written” the psalm; though often, the two may coincide. Christ is never claimed for the authorship of the psalms, as David is (see 2.2 below); but both are imagined, as we shall see, to be their speaker.

where Christ is the Davidic shoot of Jesse. And as the “sweet singer of Israel”,<sup>3</sup> David has first “claim” to any instance of psalmody, with which Romans is rife throughout.

Though David appears seldom in Paul, he does figure at significant moments, at the theological opening of Romans (1:3) and at its rhetorical climax (15:12). Impressed with his prime location, some have been tempted to suppose that Pauline Christology invests more in Davidic messianism than is usually thought.<sup>4</sup> As neither Rom 1:3 nor Rom 15:12 draws from psalmody, we are not free to attend in detail to the debates they provoke. Yet our inquiry does impinge on these debates; for if David is important to Paul, we will surely find signs of his presence in the texts attributed to his name. A man of many parts, David is of course not merely the author or subject of psalmody; yet it is precisely in psalmody that he finds his voice. More importantly, if David figures in Pauline Christology, then we might expect to find this reflected in Christ’s voicing of Davidic texts, as this is negotiated in Paul; on which, see Chapters 3 and 4.

Our concern here, however, is with David’s voice in its own right, before ever his discourse is taken up by Christ. For this we turn to Rom 4:6 (see 2.3) and 11:9 (see 2.5), where David is named as speaker; and where Christ – as speaker, at least – is nowhere to be found. And though David is not named for it, we cannot neglect the catena in Rom 3:10-18 (see 2.4): biblical psalmody’s most vivid intrusion into the Pauline text.

### **2.1.3 Metalepsis and the agency of rhetorical subjects in quotation**

Metalepsis plays a special role in the inquiry to follow. As competent reader (1.1.3), we will query Paul’s text at the site of quotation for signs that metaleptic extension might be warranted, construed under the licensing intention of the author. Our account is neutral with respect to the range of authorial intentions that might be construed by a reader. The fashionable image of Paul as an intertextual troglodyte, delighting in the “cave of resonant significations” to which his poetic texts give entry, is granted no prior force in this account. Put differently, the reader will not presume authorial interest – nor, for that matter, disinterest – in the contexts, literary or encyclopaedic, of quoted

---

<sup>3</sup> Menn 2003.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Whitsett 2000; Wagner 2002:319. Reflecting on Isaiah’s conclusion to the catena in Rom 15, Hays (2005:116) thinks “[t]he evocation of Davidic messianic themes here creates an effective *inclusio* with the epistle’s opening confession (1:2-4).”

texts; nor, in construing interest, will our reader take that interest to be *a priori* positive (1.2.3).

Granting our approach to metalepsis, what might we learn about David or Christ as speaking subjects? The terms under which metalepsis is licensed, and the extent and character of its operation, will help us to quantify and qualify the rhetorical agency of the psalm speakers Paul invokes. How else might we see David or Christ empowered in speech if not in an ability to adduce further textual “echoes” sympathetic to the programme of their discursive master?<sup>5</sup> Conversely, the disempowerment of such speakers must lie in metaleptic failure: in the foreclosure of metaleptic reading, or in authorial contradiction of transumed material.

## 2.2 The “givenness” of Davidic authorship

David is named only three times in the accepted Paulines, as we have seen; and only twice in connection with psalms.<sup>6</sup> However modest the tally, these two references are sufficient to find Paul cognisant of Davidic “authorship” of at least the two psalms quoted, both of which claim David through an attributive superscription.<sup>7</sup> This minimal finding is worth noting, since it is by no means universally explicit in literature contemporary with Paul; Luke is virtually the exception to prove the rule.<sup>8</sup> Those wishing to prove the significance of David as a psalmist to authors other than Luke are required to assert the “givenness” of his authorship, such that it needs never to be marked.<sup>9</sup> On this assumption, whenever it *is* marked, as it is twice in Paul, this

---

<sup>5</sup> Whether consonant with the “said” of quotation, or desirably dissonant, the latter in service of intertextual subversion; see 1.2.3.

<sup>6</sup> Rom 4:6; 11:9.

<sup>7</sup> Ps 31:1-2 in Rom 4:6; the psalm is τῷ Δαυὶδ (similarly לְדָוִד in MT Ps 32). Ps 68:23 in Rom 11:9; this psalm is also τῷ Δαυὶδ (לְדָוִד in MT). For further discussion of the superscriptions in relation to Paul, see 2.2.2.

<sup>8</sup> Luke 20:42; see Doble 2006.

<sup>9</sup> “This presupposition was the basis for the use of the psalms in early Christianity” (Daly-Denton 2000:318). Cf. the similar claim of Mays (1986:146): “The psalms were used and were understood as they were, because of their connection through David with Christ.” Yet the instrumental function of David emphasised here betokens a diminished and contingent value for David as a signifier – he is merely the shortest distance between two points – which makes him difficult to recover in the absence of specific mention, and more difficult to recover as a defined and particular figure. Certainly, Daly-Denton’s attempts to argue for a Moses-David dialectic in John, such that “[i]f Jesus was to replace Moses, he would do so as ‘David’ ” (2000:101; cf. pp. 100-1, 142-3, 154-5, 157) appear over-bold; see discussion below.

represents the tip of a hermeneutical iceberg. The assumption is not self-evident, however, and bears some examination.

### 2.2.1 The problem of givenness: the kenosis of David as signifier

Consider, by way of example, Margaret Daly-Denton's spirited attempt to rehabilitate David for the author of the gospel of John,<sup>10</sup> whose references by name are fewer even than in Paul. David appears only in 7:41 (named twice), there to focus the question of messianic descent. That claim is put in the mouth of the confused crowd; John's theological interest in the messianic David is negative.<sup>11</sup> Yet this does not deter Daly-Denton from positioning him near the theological heart of John's programme, albeit under other than messianic terms. Accordingly, her account of David in the Second Temple Period encompasses a broad variety of roles: psalmist, author, liturgist, prophet, temple founder, wise man, lawgiver.<sup>12</sup>

Daly-Denton's approach is instructive. The breadth of David's roles – all of which can be grounded in narrative traditions of one sort or another – is required for her account in order to circumvent the problem of John's apparent lack of interest in, if not hostility toward, David as a messianic signifier. Indeed, breadth of this kind licenses the discovery of Davidic presence almost anywhere. Yet it carries a concomitant risk of diluting its signifying force: David willingly assumes whichever of his many roles suits the receiving text, without necessarily contributing anything substantive to its meaning.<sup>13</sup>

### 2.2.2 David's kenosis as a function of psalmic discourse

The problem is made acute by Daly-Denton's dependence (as also ours) on quotations from the psalms, or allusions to them, rather than on predicative statements in which

---

<sup>10</sup> Daly-Denton 2000.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Dunn 1973:50-51.

<sup>12</sup> Daly-Denton 2000:59-113; see also Nasuti 1999:128-62.

<sup>13</sup> John's citation of Ps 68:10 in John 2:17, correlated below with Paul's own (3.2.2), illustrates the case. Drawn from a psalm which is τῷ Δαυὶδ, this citation may be thought to figure David *qua* builder or founder of the Temple as "prophetic of Jesus" (Daly-Denton 2000:129). But if such an association is *licensed* by narrative backgrounds – in this case, the Temple context (Daly-Denton 2000:128) – and by authorial superscription, it is not thereby made *effective*. In the absence of explicit reference to David (cf. Rom 11:9), nothing in the quoted material itself requires him as speaking subject; and it is hard to see what discursive effect his presence may have. Indeed, the disciples' "remembering" which occasions the citation, and John's amendment of κατέφαγεν to καταφέγγεται, foregrounds a proleptic reference to Jesus' death which owes nothing to the Temple founder. Daly-Denton is closer to the mark when she finds David's prophetic function here, somewhat akin to Luke (2000:121 n.21): he is not speaking of himself at all; cf. John 5:46; 12:41 for Moses and Isaiah in prophetic voice. But in the declarative mode of prophecy, David's particularity as subject is lost; see discussion below.

David features directly. The culprit here is the discourse of psalmody itself, which resists close and permanent association with particular subjects – an association tested sorely in the environment of quotation;<sup>14</sup> and which, therefore, can seldom offer sure or detailed characterisation of any given speaking subject, David included. Through the Second Temple period, David enjoys an increasingly close identification with psalmody in general as author,<sup>15</sup> though this bears only indirectly on his installation as speaker in particular psalms.<sup>16</sup> David’s association with individual psalms is mediated, on the other hand, through historicising superscriptions;<sup>17</sup> he appears only seldom “within” the text.<sup>18</sup> Yet however richly they may signify, biographical references rarely extend into the discursive interior of the psalms;<sup>19</sup> there the particular persona of David is overcome, dissipated within an echo-chamber of formulaic language. As Harold Fisch observes, “It is remarkable how many of the most intimate expressions of feeling in the Psalms are in fact formulaic.”<sup>20</sup> Such language is shaped to offer “reader and writer alike the joy of recognition, the pleasure of meeting an old acquaintance.” But that acquaintance is not David. “No presence is ... evoked by the personal ‘I’: what is evoked is the power of the phrase itself as it resonates with other occurrences.”<sup>21</sup> Here Fisch draws attention to a characteristic feature of all poetic language, but especially of psalms in their preference for the formulaic: the maximal foregrounding of the utterance. “Every

---

<sup>14</sup> Sternberg 1982:107-56.

<sup>15</sup> The most important biographical notes, insofar as they occur within or in close relation to psalms, are found in Psa 151 and 11QPs<sup>a</sup> col. 27. For the Qumranic texts, see Sanders 1965:54-64, 91-93. The Greek of Psalm 151 is found in Rahlfs 1967:339-40. Relevant articles include, inter alia, Talmon 1989; Evans 1997; Smith 1997; Fernández-Marcos 2001. Greek translations of psalms extend the range and specificity of Davidic superscriptions, and over time make David’s authorial function more explicit; see esp. Pietersma 1980. Davidic authorship is quantified in the DSS (11QPs<sup>a</sup> col. 27), and his abilities extended; see de Roo 1999; Evans 1997. David’s star shines ever brighter in early Judaic (Menn 2003) and Christian (Nasuti 1999:128-62) tradition.

<sup>16</sup> Strictly speaking, the author of a work need not coincide with its narrator (or, in the terms we have used, its speaking subject).

<sup>17</sup> Key studies of the superscriptions include Childs 1971; Slomovic 1979; cf. Cooper 1983; Mays 1986.

<sup>18</sup> On David as a narratively significant element within MT Pss 78, 89 and 132, see Knowles 2005. Elsewhere David is mentioned three times: in Pss 17:51; 121:5; and 143:10. As Knowles puts it (2005:237), “The relative absence of David from the body of the texts is notable not only in comparison with his frequency in the superscriptions but also given the frequency and length of other historical motifs such as the exodus, the Red Sea, and the wilderness wanderings.” In a different category are the ingenious historical reconstructions of Michael Goulder, which claim a detailed Davidic provenance for every psalm associated with him; see e.g. Goulder 1990. Few are willing to follow Goulder far in his convictions, though most enjoy the ride.

<sup>19</sup> It is certainly possible, with some creative effort, to find thematic resonances or lexical parallels which make a given superscription seem appropriate; see particularly Slomovic 1979. But as a post hoc procedure, this proves only that David *may* be “inserted” into a psalm by means of a narrative connection, not that such insertion is in any way necessary, or that it may be inferred in the formally atomistic, abstractive act of quotation without added narrative support. Without such support, we are left with the suspicion that the psalms are susceptible of relationship with almost *any* narrative subject.

<sup>20</sup> Fisch 1988:117.

<sup>21</sup> Fisch 1988:117-18.

phrase in the Psalms is a kind of quotation.”<sup>22</sup> In such an environment, particular historical usages of word and phrase are scarcely ever in view; rather, the endless play of signification so beloved of post-structuralist theory is wholeheartedly enacted. David may preside over this play from a lofty prophetic height, as we shall see in Paul; but he is almost nowhere a subject in it.

David is “given” for Paul, then, as the author and nominal subject of psalmody: this much we may grant from historical evidence. But the force of David in either role is anything but given; rather, as we have seen, it seldom if ever arises from the texts of psalmody, especially in quotation. It falls to authors and readers to empower David through the association of superscriptive or other aids to narrativity. In the case of quotation or allusion, metalepsis (where motivated) may in principle play a significant role, in transuming narratively rich material for the interpretation of the formulaic.

Against such a background of givenness, we have cause to ask why Paul chooses to name David at all in connection with the psalms: it is surely not simply to assert the given. Rather, we must conclude, Paul’s nominal assertion of David as the voice of psalmody is an authorial encouragement to hear each quotation precisely as *David’s*, rather than as *someone else’s*. But this is merely to open the enquiry. The effect of Paul’s encouragement, and its motivation, cannot be readily decided: we have just seen how difficult it is for David to secure his presence in psalmody, and for us to quantify it. Yet a close hearing of his psalms in the Roman text will yield some clues to Paul’s intent. As we shall see, his motives are not entirely altruistic.

### **2.3 Romans 4:6-8: the subjection of David by metaleptic foreclosure**

In our first text, Rom 4:6-8, we see signs of David’s fate in Paul which will become all too familiar. Here, as in Rom 3:10-18<sup>23</sup> and Rom 11:9, David’s first-person discourse is voiced without any trace of self-referential language which might secure his presence; nor does Paul encourage a metaleptic retrieval of such language from elsewhere. There

---

<sup>22</sup> Fisch 1988:119; cf. Alter 1985:133.

<sup>23</sup> The catena is in a slightly different category, to be sure; David is not named as speaker for the catena, which culminates in a quotation from Isaiah. See 2.4.

is neither “I” nor “me”; instead, the voice that speaks claims no particularity, and so is made subject to Paul’s discursive will.

### 2.3.1 The means of metaleptic foreclosure: the voice of David circumscribed

David is permitted to speak at some length in Rom 4:7-8, but not until his words have first been glossed; thus Rom 4:6-8, with v.6b (in italics) the Pauline gloss:

<sup>6</sup> καθάπερ καὶ Δαυιδ λέγει τὸν μακαρισμὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων <sup>7</sup> μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· <sup>8</sup> μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὐ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν.

Paul’s quotation is drawn from the opening two verses of Ps 31, represented below; the final clause he has omitted. This, and the psalm’s superscription, which identifies it as Davidic in a general (dative) sense, are italicised.

<sup>1</sup> τῷ Δαυιδ συνέσεως  
μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι  
καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι

<sup>2</sup> μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὐ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν  
οὐδέ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος

These two verses constitute a thematic and structural unity in conventional parallel form, with the second clause developing the first within each verse, and each verse developing the thought of its predecessor within the two verse stanza.<sup>24</sup> The final clause, in particular, exposes the identity of the one who benefits from the makarisms of vv.1-2a. Omitting it, Paul excludes that which characterises the Davidic speaker. Together with his pre-emptive gloss, our early impression is of a dominant authorial voice and of a quoted voice closely circumscribed and shorn of particularity.

The impression is confirmed in the rhetorical strategies of earlier verses in Rom 4. David’s contribution in speech (λέγει, v.6a) is licensed in 4:1, where Paul has issued an apparent invitation to converse. Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν εὐρηκέναι Ἀβραάμ he asks, marking a new

<sup>24</sup> Ps 31:2 negotiates a shift of focus from the actions of the divine agent (who forgives lawlessnesses (ἀνομίαι, 1a); who covers “sins” (ἁμαρτίαι, 1b)) to the character of the subject: no longer reckoned subject to “sin” (ἁμαρτία now singular, 2a); without deceit (δόλος) in his mouth (2b). Within v.1, ἐπικαλύπτω (1b) supplies a figurative extension to ἀφίημι in v.1a; v.2b characterises the subject who has benefited from the blessing of v.2a.

turn through his question, and opening the floor for speech. But this is not an open conversation of the kind Bakhtin observed in Dostoevsky, where all voices – including Paul’s discursive own – participate equally, such that none has the mastery.<sup>25</sup> As we shall see emphatically in 4:6, so throughout this passage, Paul is a strong orchestrator who co-opts every voice to a univocal conclusion, delivered emphatically at 4:9: *λέγομεν γάρ· ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην*. The subject capable of such a strong declaration begins life in 4:1 – *ἐροῦμεν* – taking a variety of voices into itself as the “conversation” progresses. Because *ἡ γραφή* tells us of Abraham’s gain (4:3), “scripture” is included in this new plural subject: “the Writing” speaks. Paul’s voice follows (4:4), and “David” adds his agreement at 4:6 under Paul’s close supervision, as we shall see.

Verbs of speaking predominate throughout the passage: the conversation is joined and pursued in “real-time”. At this point, we may usefully invoke Watson’s distinction between notions of speech and writing in the formulae which introduce quotations in Paul. As Watson observes, the most common Pauline formula, *καθὼς γέγραπται*, “emphasises the written character of the text cited,” and so “presents a citation as a completed utterance that is definitive and permanently valid.”<sup>26</sup> This is in contrast with alternative formulae involving speech – always in present tense, as we find both here and in Paul’s other Davidic formulation at Rom 11:9. “If speech connotes immediacy,” Watson concludes, “writing connotes normativity.”<sup>27</sup> Here, Paul’s insistence on a real-time conversation among speaking voices aids his discursive control, and grounds the possibility of univocal speech at 4:9. Nowhere is this more evident than in vv.6-8. Here, we begin to see how Paul’s formula allows an interpretive gloss to annex the Davidic quotation by downplaying its fixed, normative character: as the present, immediate voice of speech it invites and requires interpretation, offering to cede its subjectivity to the voice of another.<sup>28</sup> The particularities of this process are intriguing.

---

<sup>25</sup> Bakhtin 1984.

<sup>26</sup> Watson 2004:45.

<sup>27</sup> Watson 2004:45. A more detailed discussion of quotation formulae in Paul is offered in Chapter 6.3.1 below.

<sup>28</sup> The case of Rom 11:9 is more complex; see below, 2.5.

Paul's specific aim is to invoke David's unequivocal support<sup>29</sup> for his construal of righteousness without works, of which Abraham is exemplary. To ensure a precise match, Paul acts pre-emptively to decide the question of reference implicit in the quotation, as to the identity of the one blessed. For the David of Ps 31, this identity is revealed in v.2b, unquoted by Paul: the one subject to blessing is the one without deceit in his mouth (οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος), whose true speech consists paradigmatically in the admission of sin (vv.3-5). We noted earlier the close thematic and structural unity of Ps 31:1-2b, broken in Paul's reception. Incomplete, the quoted text exerts pressure toward metalepsis, so as to complete the stanza, and to learn what characterises the one blessed. And indeed, a metaleptic extension to the immediate context of the psalmic quote appears at first apt to Paul's purpose, dovetailing with his earlier declaration that πᾶς ... ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης (Rom 3:4),<sup>30</sup> to which the guileless confession of sin is the only true reply. Yet any such transmuted echo is crushed beneath the weight of Paul's extended gloss, in which the beneficiary of Ps 31:1-2 is defined before David can speak: he is not one "in whose mouth is no deceit", but one "to whom God reckons righteousness without works".<sup>31</sup>

### 2.3.2 Reasons to silence David: the psalmist's agency ill-suited to Paul

Why such foreclosure? Perhaps the psalmist's path diverges from Paul's after all. In the course of confession, as we shall see, the psalmist acquires a degree of agency ill-suited to one "reckoned righteous" altogether χωρὶς ἔργων.

Clearly overwritten, as we observed, is the singular clause which concludes the verses Paul quotes.<sup>32</sup> The makarisms which precede construct a subject of benefaction, the possessor only of ἀνομία and ἁμαρτία, apparently without agency. But to be identified in terms of δόλος in one's mouth, as in v.2b, is to be constructed as a moral agent

<sup>29</sup> The subordinating conjunction καθάπερ καὶ stresses identity among compared elements, and so claims univocity: David's witness in no way diverges from Paul's own. Cf. Godet 1977:172: "an intrinsic and striking agreement". Wilckens (1978:263) thinks that καὶ situates David's text "side by side" with the Genesis quotation as proofs of justification by faith.

<sup>30</sup> The allusion in Rom 3:4 is to Ps 115:2; cf. 6.4.1.

<sup>31</sup> Paul's pre-emptive move makes unlikely the alternative, in which Paul *intends* the reader to adduce the final clause of Ps 31:1-2, so as to make David's man "without deceit in his mouth" an *equivalent* of the one "without works". Substitution, not equivalence, is the discursive effect.

<sup>32</sup> It is this clause which would most likely figure in metalepsis, or figure most strongly, since it completes the structural unit of vv.1-2, and is tightly bound to the preceding clause (via οὐδὲ).

characterised by effective speech, false or true.<sup>33</sup> The true confession which follows, spoken by one in whose mouth is no δόλος, is potent: withheld (vv.3-4), it elicits the heavy hand of YHWH; offered (v.5a),<sup>34</sup> it occasions just that benefaction with which the psalm began (v.5c; cf. v.1); and this at the psalmist's efficacious request (v.5b). Significantly, David *knows* his sin<sup>35</sup> and, confessing it, is reconciled.<sup>36</sup> The agency signaled here is reinforced as the psalmist is revealed, by association, to be godly (ἴσσιος, v.6), numbered among the righteous (δίκαιοι) and upright of heart (εὐθείς τῆ καρδία, v.11): it is such as these – not the ungodly (below) – who confess their sins before YHWH and are answered.<sup>37</sup>

This Davidic trajectory is out of sympathy with Paul's own. As he will shortly assert (5:6), it is for the ungodly (ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν) that Christ died, and that “at the right time” (κατὰ καιρὸν) of God's choosing, not consequent on the confession of a knowing subject. It is while we were sinners, incapable of such efficacious knowledge, that Christ died (5:8) – when indeed we were enemies (5:10).<sup>38</sup> Or, looking backward, it is Abraham's confession not of sin but of promise (4:3; cf. Gen 15:1-6) which leads to righteous

<sup>33</sup> English translations are cued by the MT, in which not the mouth but the “spirit” is in view: אִין בְּרִיחֹוּ רִמְיָהּ. But this should not be taken to imply an interiority distinct from its public manifestation in true action (cf. Di Vito 1999:231-34); in the present psalm, true confession (cf. MT Ps 32:3-5). The OG's rendering with στόμα illustrates the point.

<sup>34</sup> The *diapsalma* immediately preceding heightens the salience of the psalmist's action, which is shown (mirroring form) to usher in a new state of affairs.

<sup>35</sup> Cognition is clearly an important category in Paul's construal of agency, as Engberg-Pedersen (2006:126-34) has recently stressed, though his claim that “divine agency is fundamentally about generating knowledge” (2006:132) is perhaps too neatly made in the service of desired affinities with Epictetus.

<sup>36</sup> David's confession is further empowered in the OG of v.5, where it is offered “against himself” (κατ' ἐμοῦ), an expansion on the MT. Unlike the knowing subject of the Hodayot, whose certainty is frequently and systematically undercut (Newsom 2004:215-16), the confessing subject is here empowered as witness, able to testify truly against himself, as evident in confession's fruit: the forgiveness of v.5c.

<sup>37</sup> If the same subject is speaking in vv.8-9 (i.e. it is not now the speech of YHWH), then its agency is increased: not only does it have the power to instruct and teach (v.8a), but to fix another in its gaze (v.8b) and so define that other, enforcing its definition by the threat of discipline (v.9).

<sup>38</sup> The “knowing subjects” of Rom 1:21a are no true exception. The initial confirmation of agency in the acknowledgement of responsibility is not as strong as often appears in ET. These subjects are without excuse (ἀναπολογήτους) not because they “knew God” (γνόντες τὸν θεόν), but because their knowledge was without moral efficacy. The act of knowing must be read here against a wider context of ever diminishing agency: though nominal subjects of active verbs, their *effective* subjectivity – what they actually come to experience – is increasingly passive (ἐματαιώθησαν, ἐσκοτίσθη, ἐμωράνθησαν, etc.; divine agency is named and so steadily reinforced at vv.24, 26, 28). The portrait of Rom 1 is corroborated in Rom 5:12-21, where the agency of the powers is sketched in programmatically. Here the quasi-narrative sequence of Rom 1:18ff is recast in terms which eliminate the appearance of effective (saving) knowledge altogether within Adamic experience: such agency is ceded already in 5:12 to Sin and Death.

reckoning: a confession which makes Abraham the subject of benefaction (as we find in Ps 31:1-2a), but not the agent of the promise, which comes τῷ ... μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ.<sup>39</sup>

It is therefore unsurprising to find Paul boarding up the “cave of resonant significations” to which his quotation might ordinarily afford entry. Rhetorically, this leaves Paul’s editorial voice in stronger possession of David’s speech than David himself, and denies the agency of David’s voice in evoking a wider textual field than the quoted words; his authorial freedom and presence as named speaking subject is curtailed, and the trajectory he offers denied.<sup>40</sup>

As a means of rhetorical control, Paul’s decision to attach David’s name to the quotation serves him well. Paul requires some distance from the voice of the psalm, for its larger trajectory is at odds with his theological programme, as we have seen. He does not wish its words to be mistaken for his own, as they might be if no subject were named; nor does he wish the psalm to acquire permanent and unrestricted force as ἡ γραφή. If these are David’s words, on the other hand, they are formally historicised; they have limits, therefore, and may be relativised, even played off against the words of another: here, the authorial gloss of Paul himself. In this way, Paul takes out insurance against the possibility of metalepsis.<sup>41</sup>

### 2.3.3 Why does Paul bring David to speech at all?

What is especially interesting about Paul’s rhetorical strategy is that it vitiates so rich an opportunity to constitute a Davidic subject. Although no more than minimally

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Watson 2004:179, who construes Abraham’s act of belief as constituent within the divine speech act of promise, in which his own agency is negligible.

<sup>40</sup> Paul weaves some of David’s words from Ps 31 into his characterisation of the ministry of reconciliation (2 Cor. 5:19b) without marking their source.

<sup>41</sup> This reading is confirmed by the contrasting case of Ps 142:2b (οὐ δικαιοθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν), which Paul cites – albeit loosely (οὐ δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ) – in Rom 3:20. Ps 142 is suggestively Davidic, superscripted ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ ὅτε αὐτὸν ὁ υἱὸς καταδιώκει. Yet Paul has no need to distinguish the cited material from his own speech, much less to attach it to David by name; for it is entirely apt to his purpose. The reader is not cued to adduce further context from the psalm; but neither is Paul concerned at the possibility. Indeed, the citation is sufficiently loose that we may wonder whether Paul has its derivation in mind at all, *pace* Hays (2005:58-59; 1989:51-53), whose attempt to ground divine righteousness in salvific action via Ps 142 would clearly profit – despite demurrals (2005:60 n.34; 1989:51) – from an author who had both the first and last verses of the psalm (and therefore the whole) in mind. The earlier essay (2005:50-60, a reprint of Hays 1980) suggests the way Hays might claim the whole: “the pattern of thought is the same in the psalm and in Rom 3” (2005:60 n.34). In Hays 1989, this vague and abstract assertion of equivalence is not repeated, but is rather implicit in the freedom with which Hays moves from citation to whole, co-opting Ps 143 MT as a sympathetic intertextual agent. Thus, “Paul cites Ps. 143:2” such that an “allusion to Psalm 143” anticipates his argument, such that “Psalm 143 implicitly spans verses 20 and 21 of Romans 3” (all Hays 1989:52). See 1.2.4 on the underlying logic.

associated with David by superscription, and obedient to generic conventions, Psalm 31 begins with a penitentially explicit segment<sup>42</sup> readily associable with narrative episodes in David's life, and close akin to Psalm 51, in which a penitential Davidic subject is prominent.<sup>43</sup> This "penitential David" is, moreover, a significant instantiation of the Davidic everyman to which the superscription tradition, and much other evidence, points.<sup>44</sup> The present segment in particular (vv.3-5) depicts a richly formed subject, disclosed in vivid first-person discourse. Yet Paul declines to include v.2b in his quotation, whose characterisation of the blessed subject cues its metaleptic extension in vv.3-5. Further, Paul's pre-emptive gloss forecloses the possibility of metalepsis, by which this dense first-person text, heard in the voice of David, might be evoked with the quotation itself. Invited to conversation, David finds in Paul not a self-deprecating host but a ventriloquist.

In light of this, we must wonder why Paul brings David to speech at all. Recall that the givenness of Davidic authorship suggests that when he *is* named by Paul, the naming is significant (2.2). We have seen already how it serves a discursive aim, enabling Paul to achieve a necessary distance from the theological trajectory of the psalm. But more positively (for David), we might suppose that his association with Abraham, attested particularly in later exegetical tradition,<sup>45</sup> suggests him to Paul as a witness here. The two converge in the notion of promise, to which the seed of each will be subject; and Abraham's act of belief and the response it elicits (Rom 4:3/Gen 15:6) – to which David is adduced as witness – are complicit, as we have seen, in a divine promise which has Abraham's σπέρμα precisely in view.<sup>46</sup>

Yet to judge by his words, the David which speaks here – even without metaleptic support – is not the messianic progenitor of Rom 1:3 or 15:12, but the penitent of Ps 31. So the question reappears once more: why summon the penitent David only to

---

<sup>42</sup> Though numbered among the so-called "Penitential Psalms", form criticism has classically struggled to qualify this psalm (as MT Ps 32) as a true penitential (e.g. Mowinckel 2004:214 n.47); it is rather a thanksgiving (Weiser 1962:281). Yet there is enough in the local context of the quotation to characterise the psalm's subject as penitential, alert to its transgression (vv.1,5), requiring to confess (v.5).

<sup>43</sup> Paul quotes Ps 50:6 (= MT Ps 51:4) in the previous chapter (Rom 3:4).

<sup>44</sup> See Mays 1986:144-45.

<sup>45</sup> See Jer 33:22, which applies the language of Abrahamic promises to David. The association is nowhere clearer than in the evidentially problematic Targum to Ps 89:34: "I have made a covenant with Abraham my chosen one,/I have sworn to my servant David:/I will establish your seed forever ...".

<sup>46</sup> Gen 15:5, quoted in Rom 4:18. In Gal 3:16 – though nowhere in Romans – the Seed of Abraham's promises is identified as Christ. Dahl (1977:130) believes that Paul makes this identification by analogy with the seed of David in 2 Sam 7, messianically understood.

forbid his attachment to Abraham? We can only conclude by strengthening an earlier claim, that Paul intends not only to distance his programme from that of the psalmist, but actively to signal the failure of penitence – and of its speech acts – as the mode of a salvation which comes τῷ ... μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ: Abraham’s righteousness is of another kind, and David is forced to agree.

## 2.4 Romans 3:10-18: David’s voice mastered by Law, and silenced

Similar effects can be traced earlier in Romans, in the catena of 3:10-18, which is the longest quotation from scriptural texts to be found in Paul.<sup>47</sup> Indeed, the Law undertakes explicitly here what we saw in Rom 4:6-7: the curtailment of Davidic speech, and a denial of agency to the penitent.

### 2.4.1 David as a solution to a metaleptic puzzle

Although David is not mentioned by name, the catena is composed for the most part<sup>48</sup> with quotations from psalms associated with him by superscription,<sup>49</sup> while the rich confluence of psalmic testimony might be thought to invite authorial attribution as a means to establishing a coherent voice. The notable “accuracy” of most of the quoted material strengthens the claim.<sup>50</sup> There is thus a *prima facie* plausibility to the idea that David is their speaking subject here in Romans.

Indeed, the presence of David is sometimes adduced to solve the chief puzzle posed by the catena, which lies in the relation between Paul’s point and the psalms marshaled in support: why choose *these* psalms, in which a distinction between righteous (Jews) and

---

<sup>47</sup> Moo 1996:202.

<sup>48</sup> The exact number and source of some of these quotations is disputed; see Dunn 1988:149-50 and Fitzmyer 1992:334-35 for a claim that the first line is derived from Eccl 7:20. On any accounting, the great majority derive from psalmody.

<sup>49</sup> Ps 13:2b-3, repeated in Ps 52:2b-3, are represented in vv.11-12; Ps 5:10 and Ps 139:4 in vv.13-14; Ps 35:2 in v.18. All are τῷ Δαυιδ (and more) in OG; similarly in MT.

<sup>50</sup> Notwithstanding the continued absence of a reliable critical edition of LXX Psalms, the apparent degree of agreement between Paul and the OG tradition in the catena is striking. Ps 13:2b-3 [= Ps 52:2b-3] is modified only to allow rhetorical reinforcement: “there is no one” (οὐκ ἔστιν) duplicated. Ps 5:10 and Ps 139:4 are exact matches in vv.13-14; so also Ps 35:2 in v.18. Only Ps 9:28 in v.14 is remodeled: where the source emphasises the act of sin (“cursing” (ἄρά)), the catena foregrounds its agent (“mouth” (στόμα)), in keeping with its rhetorical pattern (Byrne 1996:116), and omits “deceit” (δόλος); cf. the omission of Ps 31:2b in Rom 4:6-8, discussed above. The striking precision of the psalmic quotes is at odds with Paul’s (admittedly longer) adaptation of Isaiah 59:7-8a in vv.15-17.

unrighteous (Gentiles) is at minimum implicit, if the point is to implicate the moral failure of all? Thus Francis Watson, unable to find local evidence of a Davidic “Christological voice”,<sup>51</sup> wonders whether a penitent David, paradigm example of the forgiven sinner, might overcome the dualism; David’s words in 4:7-8 are thought to signal “his” reading.<sup>52</sup>

Yet as we have seen, in Paul’s discursive hands the quotation in 4:7-8 is scarcely David’s, with access to the penitential motif discouraged. In Romans 3:10-18, meanwhile, Paul’s tightly woven citations close ranks against David, whose presence – as penitent or in any other role – is no more discernible than Christ’s. In fact, as Watson is aware,<sup>53</sup> the nearest named candidate for speaking subject of the catena is “Law” (3:19), a category which acquires powerful subjectivity in Romans 5 and 7, and whose agency here, provocative and rhetorically strong, threatens to overwhelm any suggestion of Davidic presence. The Law stills all other voices in its pronouncements (3:19), precluding the speech of the penitent and pre-empting the psalmist’s insight into his own condition.<sup>54</sup> As we saw in regard to Rom 4:6-7 (2.3.2), Paul will not license the agency of the psalmist; for salvation will come τῷ ... μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ.

#### **2.4.2. David’s voice curtailed by the generic defeat of metalepsis**

Symbolised in the Law’s action to stop every mouth (Rom 3:19), the curtailment of Davidic speech is substantially a matter of genre. His presence *within* psalmody, especially as the penitent, can only be anchored by a degree of narrative particularity, construed in the hearing of entire psalms, or sequences within, large enough to “narrativise”. Denied by a Pauline gloss in Rom 4, narrative particularity is here defeated by the generic form in which the psalms are brought to speech. Generically distinctive, the catena works by constructing a symphonic, synchronic testimony from isolated elements; in the process, polyphonic, diachronic elements are “lost”, or at least obscured. For all its rich display of psalmic testimony, the catena is no friend to metalepsis. We are to hear *the* voice of psalmody, as defined in the moment, not (at

---

<sup>51</sup> Watson 2004:64-65.

<sup>52</sup> Watson 2004:65.

<sup>53</sup> Watson 2004:64.

<sup>54</sup> “Consciousness of sin” (ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας) is through the Law (3:20b) which, if it is taken as the speaking subject of the catena, may be thought to bring about that consciousness through the pronouncements therein. If so, there is little to commend a Davidic penitent behind the catena with prior knowledge of its culpability.

metaleptic leisure) the nuanced voices of particular psalms, in which the penitential David may perhaps be found. Compare the catena in Romans 15:9-13,<sup>55</sup> in which each voice is at least minimally introduced; here, the phrases run together without pause.

But the catena does not lack a speaking subject. In its discursive strategy, this generic instrument is uniquely able to refashion psalmic testimony to suit the voice of Law (3:19). Itself hypostasised, the Law as speaking subject favours abstracted, transparent evidence in the service of judgment. Pronouncement in the moment, not reflection at length, is its mode of speech.

It is the Law then, and not David, which emerges as speaking subject for the catena.<sup>56</sup> Indeed, where David was required in Rom 4:6-7 to signify Paul's distance from the psalmic voice in its wider trajectory (2.3.2), he is not required here at all, for no wider trajectory is countenanced by the generic cast of the catena and its articulation by Law.<sup>57</sup>

## 2.5 Romans 11:9-10: the correction of David by metaleptic censure

The second instance where Paul names David as speaker might appear more promising. After all, no intervening gloss keeps David from his words, drawn primarily from Ps 68, in Rom 11:9-10.<sup>58</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> See 4.1.2.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. John's presentation of psalmic speech as from the Law (John 10:34; 15:25).

<sup>57</sup> If, despite our discussion, we were to allow the salience of contextual material, we would not need recourse to David (who remains excluded) as Watson suggests. The issue would be better resolved by assessing the quotations and their source contexts in terms of rhetorical effect. Paul begins with dualistic sources only to offer an extended (three line) quotation from Isaiah 59 at 3:15-17, whose context shows that Israel's sin is in view (cf. the prophet's call in Is. 58:1). Those auditors attuned to context find the dualism initially affirmed, but powerfully overturned at this point, so that the final quote (Psalm 35:2 at Rom 3:18) acquires a non-dualistic cast; the voice of Law at 3:19 confirms its defeat. Such a sequence would reflect a cogent rhetorical strategy (assuming Pauline composition; see Koch 1986:99, 179-84). Cf. Gaventa 2008:403 for the similar idea of a "rhetorical feint". To be subject to it, Paul's auditors require only to anticipate the "conventional movement of the Psalms" toward a divine assurance of punishment for the wicked and rescue of the innocent. In fact, the "conventional movement" identified by Gaventa's handwaving is scarcely particular to psalmody. Nevertheless, this solution respects the generic force of the catena, which does not invite metaleptic extension.

<sup>58</sup> Is Isaiah also "present" here? If Wagner is to be believed (2002:262-4) Paul "has in mind" not only Ps 68:23-24 but Isa 8:14, between which he construes an underlying narrative link, signaled by the uncommon word pair of *παγίς* and *σκάνδαλον*. To anchor this claim he must postulate a Greek text of Isa 8:14, known to Paul and reflected in later Greek versions, though not in "the LXX", which renders *מִקְשׁוֹל* as *σκάνδαλον* (rather than *κοιλιάσματι*); see 2002:263 n.143. However, no such subtle reconstruction is

Rom 11:9 καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει· γεννηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς θήραν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδομα αὐτοῖς,<sup>10</sup> σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον.

The primary source is Ps 68:23-24, represented below with Ps 34:8, which collocates παγίς and θήρα.<sup>59</sup>

Ps 68:23 γεννηθήτω ἡ τράπεζα αὐτῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν εἰς παγίδα καὶ εἰς ἀνταπόδοσιν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλον<sup>24</sup> σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν διὰ παντὸς σύγκαμψον

Ps 34:8 ἔλθέτω αὐτοῖς παγίς ἣν οὐ γινώσκουσιν καὶ ἡ θήρα ἣν ἔκρυψαν συλλαβέτω αὐτούς καὶ ἐν τῇ παγίδι πεσοῦνται ἐν αὐτῇ

The question of source need not detain us; it is the resulting text's rhetorical work which is our focus. But we can note that Paul's conflation of Ps 68:23 with Ps 34:8 in Rom 11:9 has increased the imprecatory range of David's speech, adding a further stipulation (θήρα) to those offered by Ps 68:23. Indeed, David's voice appears at first to have acquired powerful agency.

### 2.5.1 David granted agency, but at the cost of self

A potent subject is at work in Rom 11:9-10 as one who declares judgment, in a sequence defined by third person imperatives at the emphatic head of each clause. Such is the performativity of these imprecations that their speaker begs to be named;<sup>60</sup> and so it is that Paul obliges, affirming in so doing the psalmic provenance of the texts.<sup>61</sup> But if

---

required for other texts in which this word pair is found (Josh 23:13; Ps 139:6; Ps 140:9; Wis 14:11; 1 Macc 5:4); and while Paul does not quote any of these texts (so Wagner), Wisdom of Solomon can lay claim to significance earlier in Romans (e.g. as a source for Paul's moral discourse in Rom 1), while the metonymic resonances of the word pair are as likely to carry first to other psalmic texts. It may be worth noting that, like Ps 68 (MT 69), both Ps 139 (MT 140) and 140 (MT 141) are τῷ Δαυὶδ and דָּוִד: nominally Davidic. In sum, Wagner's Isaianic link must remain speculative; one is left suspecting the real "anchor" for this putative link is the "underlying story" itself, not its lexical signifiers. The methodological problem to which this points need not occupy us here.

<sup>59</sup> The addition of εἰς θήραν in Paul's quotation at Rom 11:9 suggests an element incorporated from Ps 34:8, where θήρα is uniquely collocated with παγίς (Wagner 2002:259; Dunn 1988:642). This psalm is also nominally Davidic (τῷ Δαυὶδ; דָּוִד).

<sup>60</sup> In this light, Wagner's claim that Paul's "presentation of David 'in person' as speaker lends considerable rhetorical weight to the dreadful words of malediction that follow" (2002:257) may have the cart before the horse. At any rate, if metalepsis is admitted, David's rhetorical weight evaporates, since the terms of sentence he proclaims will shortly be denied by Paul; see 2.5.2.

<sup>61</sup> Thereby distinguishing these words from that which "is written" in v.8, which represents a conflation of material from Isaiah and Deut 29; cf. Wagner 2002:242-56. Wagner finds in this conflation evidence that Isaiah and Moses "are ultimately significant for Paul as part of the larger voice of scripture," (2002:242). In this light, it is interesting to discover that Paul's Davidic contribution is also a "conflation", drawing (as we have seen) not only from Ps 68:23-24 but also Ps 34:8. David's is the voice

Davidic agency is hereby granted, in no other respect is his subjectivity of significance to the quotation. In contrast with Ps 68:10b, assigned to the voice of Jesus in Rom 15:3, the sufferings of David as “righteous sufferer” are beside the point: David’s persecutors, and their divine judge, alone are in view. Shorn of the context of complaint and distress, as we shall see, the quotation itself offers rather the voice of judgment, announcing sentence. David’s role in this drama is highly circumscribed.

The *dramatis personae* are grammatically arranged. The I-you relationship potently established in imperative mood is displaced in third person, so that David’s agency, signalled in the opening formula,<sup>62</sup> passes immediately to another, and with it the subjectivity conferred by his words. David’s imprecations employ the categories of divine judgment; evoking the discourse of covenant,<sup>63</sup> and with one of its partners already in sight,<sup>64</sup> they bring the divine partner as judge to the stage. The drama is thence in first and second person: the divine subject engaged with those to be judged. David is not on this stage; like the playwright or stagehand, he has served his purpose and may be forgotten. As a signifier he endures, however, co-opted – in the absence of allusion to the suffering out of which he speaks – to a voice judicial in tone: a voice which pronounces sentence. In this he suffers a fate similar to what we have seen already in 3:10-18, where he was co-opted to the voice of Law.

### 2.5.2 Metalepsis denied, else the transumed voice corrected

Might David be enriched as a subject by metalepsis? The quoted speech is followed by a series of strong maledictions (Ps 68:25-29) in which the sufferer’s subjectivity is restored: the divine interlocutor, whose presence constitutes the subject, returns (vv.24,

---

less of individual psalms than of psalmody in general. This does not make it an incoherent voice: the two psalms woven together here share a range of structural and thematic similarities, and are similarly venomous in imprecation. The contribution of Ps 34 to the quotation – the trap (θήρα) which will seize the wicked – is entirely of a piece, compounding the declaration of judgment.

<sup>62</sup> (καὶ) Δαυὶδ λέγει. As earlier suggested in relation to Rom 4:6 (2.3.1), the formula offers David’s voice as spoken in the present, and therefore susceptible of interpretation and constraint. Though we find this also here, we should acknowledge that the formula does further work here. The pronouncements which follow must be enacted in the present, in words of utmost immediacy, for their illocutionary force to be fully felt; David’s agency must be marked at the outset.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. the covenantal curses of Deut 28:28-29, in which those under the curse are like the blind, groping about in the noonday sun: darkness and blindness are conflated. The snare (σκάνδαλον) recalls Isa 8:14-15, where it is correlated with the divinely laid stumbling-stone over which Israel has stumbled; cf. Rom 9:32-33.

<sup>64</sup> Israel is named as recently as v.7; it is thus the natural referent for the “they” of vv.8-9. As such, it distances David’s words further from the personal suffering which occasioned them: corporate Israel is no ready equivalent for the psalmist’s enemies.

26, 27, 29), and the contours of suffering are described anew (vv.26, 29). Yet David's pleas (v.24) and complaints (v.26) issue in imprecations which hold out no prospect of remission (vv.28-29): those who suffer the effects of vv.23-24 can expect no "eschatological reversal".<sup>65</sup> This cannot suit Paul, who declares just the opposite in vv.11-12: "they" have *not* stumbled so as to fall.

Davidic subjectivity is twice circumscribed, then: the agency of his voice is passed to another, while David himself is denied the right to supplement the quoted words with others more distinctively "his". In particular, David is allowed to proclaim judgment, but not to determine, under metalepsis, the scope of sentence. Indeed, even what David says *expressly* is overruled: the suggestive *διὰ παντός* of Rom 11:10/ Ps 68:24, which signals an unceasing judgment,<sup>66</sup> is annulled in Paul's *μὴ γένοιτο* (Rom 11:11).

All this is somewhat troubling for accounts of Paul which value his metaleptic generosity, and imagine him in full sympathy with his intertexts. Of course, those who think Paul ignorant of or uninterested in quotation "context" – or who make small capital of metalepsis in their own account – may simply allow Paul to quote "out of context". But for those who wish to ground Paul's theological labours in a "narrative substructure" richly figured by scriptural intertexts, the problem is more severe. This is because, as we observed in 1.2, a) metalepsis is assumed operative by default in such a model; and b) intertexts retrieved under metalepsis are assumed to be sympathetic, even in situations of misreading (indeed, especially then: metalepsis often serves as a rescue strategy designed to make explicit misreadings sympathetic through contextualisation). Yet here, metalepsis is neither encouraged by Paul's quotation, nor likely to prove sympathetic to it. Accordingly, on the (reasonable) assumption that Paul is alert to the quotation's context in the psalm, we must imagine either a) that he discourages metalepsis, or at least, offers no incentives to his readers to undertake it; and/or b) that he takes steps to limit the contribution of transumed material. In effect, the voice of the psalm must be particularised as David's, then relativised so that its distinctly imprecatory colour does not tarnish Paul's claim for mercy. This is in fact a sound reading of Paul's strategy, as we shall see. Yet neither aspect of this reading sits easily

---

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Ps 68:28-29.

<sup>66</sup> OG v.24: σκοτισθήτωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν καὶ τὸν νῶτον αὐτῶν *διὰ παντός* σύγκαμψιν; cf. MT חֲנִיף. Wagner aligns David's "continually" with a Deuteronomic blindness "which persists "to this day" (ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας)," (2002:262). The temporal force is different, however.

with the assumptions of the Haysian school. To find that Paul denies metalepsis, on the one hand, is a disappointing result; to learn, on the other, that he distances himself from the very voice he invokes, is troubling: for Paul appears able to orchestrate a univocal scriptural witness only at the cost of a prestigious named participant.<sup>67</sup> This we have seen already, of course, in Rom 4:6-7 and Rom 3:10-18.

### **2.5.3 *Noch einmal: Why is David invoked?***

Why is David invoked here, if his contribution is so thoroughly constrained? As the “given” speaker of the psalms, his naming – so rare in Paul – is surely not incidental. But nor is it that Paul deploys him as a fully sympathetic witness to his theological programme. Rather, he serves to delimit a quotation whose force Paul will not fully endorse. As we saw earlier in the case of Rom 4:6-8, although David does not emerge as a particular subject, his is the name which licenses the quoted words, and only these. A generic speaker, such as ἡ γραφή, whether named or grammatically implicit, would assert the permanence and comprehensive reach of the imprecation; an unnamed speaker would effect no distance between the quoted words and Paul’s own. But as seen in Paul’s subsequent qualification, the apostle rejects a permanent judgment, denying the full force of the quotation. He therefore requires a measure of distance: “David speaks, not I.” On this understanding, metalepsis is of no consequence: if undertaken, it falls within the range of Davidic speech which Paul will overturn; if neglected, nothing is lost to the quoted words.

---

<sup>67</sup> Wagner, whose dependence on sympathetic metalepsis is extensive, is willing to find metalepsis suppressed here. Equally, though he values the distinctive contribution of assorted witnesses in Paul, Wagner appears willing to sacrifice it at this point. He prepares the way by relativising David’s voice among a weave of others (Deut. 29; Is. 6; Is. 8; Is. 29), such that the individuality of each is subordinated to “a larger story about God and Israel that provides coherence to Paul’s explicit as well as allusive appeals to scripture throughout Romans 9-11” of which these intertexts offer “a tantalising glimpse” (2002:264). Then, urging the case (“It cannot be insisted too strongly”), he observes: “The divine blinding of Israel is emphatically not God’s last word to “the rest” of his covenant people. Perhaps for this reason Paul reiterates David’s curse only through Psalm 68:24” (2002:264-5). Thus Paul does not encourage a metaleptic retrieval of anything beyond the cited verses; equally, as “David’s curse” the representative claim of his voice – as the voice of “scripture” – is relativised (it is one voice among several) and so diminished; the “sting” of other verses in the Psalm is pulled. The power of Wagner’s strategy of “reading in concert” – and perhaps the cost – is evident.

## 2.6 The Davidic psalmist in Romans: preliminary conclusions

What have we learned about David as a speaking subject in Paul? Precisely where he is named (Rom 4:6; 11:9), or where his words are extensively represented (Rom 3:10-18), the distinctiveness of his voice is overcome. Paul proves a ruthless orchestrator, and David his rhetorical slave. The author asserts control through varied means: a pre-emptive gloss (Rom 4:6-8); generic constraint (Rom 3:10-18); grammatical displacement (Rom 11:9). But though his strategies are varied, the result is consistent: the metalepsis which might have enriched David's presence is foreclosed, and Paul's discourse inoculated against its influence. Though stripped of subjective richness, David is not an empty category; but his varying value as a signifier is specified by discursive agents more powerful than he: Law (Rom 3:10-18; Rom 11:9); or the author himself (Rom 4:6-8). Far from underwriting the poetic productivity of his texts, this David is closer to the modern author so perceptively interrogated by Foucault:<sup>68</sup> a Pauline strategy to limit the proliferation of meaning, so that the language of psalmody may be co-opted to his discursive control.

We have observed, in addition, some preliminary features of metalepsis as occasioned by quotations from the psalms. On the one hand we have seen that contexts local to the site of quotation fail to yield sympathetic "echoes"; on the other, we have discerned in Paul's circumscription of the quoted voice signs of resistance to metaleptic extension within its immediate context in the contributing psalm. Such signs betray Paul's alertness to immediate (local) contexts, though not yet his positive interest in them. Indeed, metaleptic foreclosure denies in practice *all* contexts, not only those local. All this, at least, in relation to quotations in which David figures as subject. The picture will be greatly enriched when Christological quotations are factored in (Chapters 3 and 4).

---

<sup>68</sup> Like that author, David can be seen as "the principle of thrift in the proliferation of meaning" (Foucault 1977:132). As Foucault observes, "We are used to thinking that the author is so different from all other men, and so transcendent with regard to all languages that, as soon as he speaks, meaning begins to proliferate, to proliferate indefinitely. The truth is quite the contrary: the author is not an indefinite source of significations which fill a work; the author does not precede the works; he is a certain functional principle by which, in our culture, one ... impedes the free circulation, the free manipulation, the free composition, decomposition, and recomposition of fiction. In fact, if we are accustomed to presenting the author as a genius, as a perpetual surging of invention, it is because, in reality, we make him function in exactly the opposite fashion" (Foucault 1977:132).

Finally, we can observe that the subjectivity denied to David by means of metaleptic foreclosure has been marked by a particular form of agency ill-suited to Paul's purposes. The rhetorical strategies of Rom 4:6-8 were such as to resist the intrusion of a Davidic penitent whose self-knowledge and confessional speech would qualify the subject as an agent in its own behalf, not one "without works". Nor could that penitent inform the speaking subject of the catena in Rom 3:10-18, co-opted instead to Law; David was excluded equally as a righteous Jew (over against unrighteous Gentiles). Whether as penitent or as righteous, either David would display a form of agency in speech ill-suited to the wholesale consignment of all in their moral culpability to silence (3:19). Where Davidic speech *did* display agency (11:9-10), it was not on the subject's own behalf, but against that of others; even there, as we saw, it was closely circumscribed.

The denial of the psalmist's agency on his own behalf, and the rigorous assertion of divine priority, are features of Paul's discourse we will see also in 2 Cor 1 (Chapter 5). For its part, the Davidic subject which embodies such agency will fail yet more comprehensively than we have seen, just a little later in Romans,<sup>69</sup> supplanted by a Christological subject whose agency is configured for the other. The Davidic psalmist cedes place, finally, not to Paul but to Christ himself.

---

<sup>69</sup> See Ch. 3 on Rom 15:1-6 and Ch. 4 on Rom 15:7-13.

# 3. Christological psalmody in the service of formation: Romans 15:1-6

---

## 3.1 Introduction

### 3.1.1 The Seed of David: inheritor or iconoclast?

In the previous chapter we saw how David's voice was closely circumscribed in quotation, overmastered by Paul's own in a variety of ways. In this chapter and its sequel we examine instances, again in Romans, where Christ is named or may be deduced as speaker of a quotation from a psalm. We will wish to learn how Christ fares in Paul's rhetorical hands: whether his speech, like David's before him, is tightly constrained; or whether instead he is granted a particular and distinctive contribution to Paul's discourse. Might the kenosis of Davidic subjectivity we saw in Chapter 2 reflect – even constitute – the fullness of Christ's own? Or indeed, are the two voices “virtually interchangeable”?<sup>1</sup>

Romans yields two rich sites for this sort of enquiry, in the Christological voicing of two Davidic laments: Ps 68 at Rom 15:3 and Ps 17 at Rom 15:9. The first is a psalm David himself speaks at Rom 11:9; the second is voiced at the start of a catena of psalmic quotes, dominated by a Christological perspective, which Isaiah so strikingly ends.<sup>2</sup> Such texts do not enable us to weigh abstractly the theological significance of predicative statements involving David – those we find in Rom 1:3 and 15:12. Rather, they put a Christological actor on a Davidic stage; and in his lines and gestures, in his metaleptic extemporising, in the rhetorical effect of his speech on his audience, we may see what such predications mean in practice. If the Son is of the seed of David – as Rom 1:3 declares him to be – then does the Son resemble the “father”? Or, when he takes up David's royal speech, does he do so as Oedipus?

---

<sup>1</sup> Hays 2005:108 n.22.

<sup>2</sup> The two quotations identified here are the study of separate chapters: the present chapter assesses Rom 15:3 within 15:1-6; Chapter 4 focusses on Rom 15:9 within 15:7-12. The two texts bear upon many of the same issues; accordingly, conclusions in respect of both are offered in 4.6.

The one possibility would spin for us a Christological thread of continuity, in which the messianic hopes invested in David come to rich and specific fruition in the promised Christ;<sup>3</sup> and those constituted ἐν Χριστῷ might find themselves inscribed thereby within a Jewish narrative of salvation history. The Oedipal possibility weighs against continuity: if Christ be the voice of psalmody, καινή κτίσις!

### 3.1.2 Metalepsis in service of moral and spiritual formation

Here as elsewhere, metalepsis represents both sign and instrument of these subjects' appropriation of psalmic discourse. The Pauline texts in which David came to voice were tightly circumscribed by their author, as we saw in the previous chapter, discouraging the metaleptic extension of David's speech. In the text which is this chapter's focus (Rom 15:3), metalepsis is invited precisely to secure Christ's tenancy, and this in service of a novel aim: the conformation of Paul's auditors to the Christological psalmist.

The context of this metaleptic venture is, as one might expect, paraenetic. Paul offers his Christological exemplar toward the end of the extended exhortation beginning at Rom 14:1, tendered in particular (but not solely) to those he styles "the strong" (15:1). The quoted text is reproduced below, in its psalmic domicile (Ps 68:10) and in its Roman pied-à-terre (15:3); the quotation proper is in italics.

Ps 68:10 ὅτι ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου κατέφαγέν με καὶ οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδίζόντων σε ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ' ἐμέ

Rom 15:3 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδίζόντων σε ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ' ἐμέ.

The structure of the present chapter is cued by this densely woven verse. As an instance of Christological psalmody, Paul's quotation readily justifies the close reading we will offer of its immediate environment (Rom 15:3; see 3.2, 3.4), together with those verses which establish its audience and theme (Rom 15:1-2; see 3.3). But the significance of the Christological exemplar is marked explicitly in the verses which follow (Rom 15:4-6), closing out this section of Paul's paraenesis. In these verses we learn that conformation with the Christological psalmist is for Paul a

---

<sup>3</sup> In Rom 15:3 Christ is granted an article (ὁ Χριστός), which some take to signify a specifically messianic identity (e.g. Dunn 1988:838; Cranfield 1979:732 n.5), following Michel 1978:355. This is rather too much work for the article to do, however.

primary means to the formation of character (Rom 15:4; see 3.5), reflected in unity of thought and of worship (Rom 15:5-6; see 3.6).

## 3.2 A Christological subject for Ps 68:10b in Rom 15:3

### 3.2.1 Psalm 68 as a Christological psalm in the New Testament

Though not as daringly read for Christology as Ps 21,<sup>4</sup> Ps 68 enjoyed popularity in early Christian exegetical attempts to ground the suffering and death of Jesus in scripture, along with certain other of the so-called “Royal Laments”.<sup>5</sup> In the case of this psalm, such attempts take two forms: 1) details from the psalm are woven without notice into the narrative of Jesus’ passion;<sup>6</sup> and 2) words from the psalm (John 2:17), or such as might be spoken by the psalmist (John 15:25; 19:28), are placed in the mouth of Jesus.

In comparison with Ps 21, with which it shares a good deal,<sup>7</sup> there is a certain indirection to the way this psalm is deployed. This reflects its primary reception by John, whose teleological approach to quotation licenses a reworking of the scriptural voice so that it speaks in the mode of its fulfilment.<sup>8</sup> In John 2:17

---

<sup>4</sup> Mark puts the psalmist’s cry of dereliction (Ps 21:2) on Jesus’ lips (Mark 15:34), and reinforces the identification through narrative associations: Mark 15:24/Ps 21:19, Mark 15:30-22/Ps 21:8-9; Mark 15:36/Ps 21:16. See Marcus 1992.

<sup>5</sup> MT Pss 18; 22; 31; 40; 42; 69. Cf. Hays 2005:107; Evans 2004:569. The aptitude of Ps 68 for such usage may be enhanced by its superscription. Aside from its conventional **לְמִנְצֵחַ**, the MT of Ps 69 adds the curious phrase **עַל-שִׁשְׁיָנִים**. This element is a *hapax legomenon* in the OT and defies sure translation. Most ETs have “according to lilies” or similar. The OG translators have rendered **עַל-שִׁשְׁיָנִים** as *εἰς τὸ τέλος*, and **עַל-שִׁשְׁיָנִים** as *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλλοιωθησομένων*, “over those that shall be changed” (NETS): two eschatologically suggestive phrases (cf. Hays 2005:107).

<sup>6</sup> Mark 15:36; Matt 27:34, 48; Luke 23:36.

<sup>7</sup> See Tate (1990:194; numbering as per MT): “Ps 22 has the same literary structure as Pss 69 and 102, much of the same basic context, and is about the same length. It is possible that these three psalms all emerged from the same context, whatever that may have been.” Tate and others (e.g. Allen 2002 *ad loc*; cf. Becker 1966:43-53) affirm the kinship of these three psalms in a variety of ways.

<sup>8</sup> This reworking is variously illustrated in John. The word “written in their law” in John 15:25 – *ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν* – is not in fact “written” anywhere. The language is closest to Pss 34:19, 68:5, which are both aspectually present; but the words become “written” with the change of tense; for the sentiment cf. also Pss 7:4, 108:3. In the case of John 19:28-29, fulfillment consists in the recapitulation of a narrative moment; it is occasioned by a single word – *διψῶ* – called forth by the impending moment. Christ is a psalmic subject in these verses not by virtue of speech but by experience. In John 2:17 even Christ’s experience is detached from that offered by the sponsoring psalm. Among all quotations of Ps 68, that found in John 2:17 is in fact the most verbally “faithful” to its source; yet the aspectual shift effected by John – a change of one word – offers a particularly strong qualification of Christological subjectivity. By setting “consume” (*κατεσθίω*) in the future, John gives the quote a proleptic focus alien to the narrative trajectory of the psalm, as also to the

(below), which quotes from the same verse we find in Rom 15:3, some distance is introduced between the ostensive subject of the quotation and the words he speaks, as these are mediated by the disciples' act of remembering: Jesus is introduced as subject retrospectively.<sup>9</sup>

John 2:17 ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν· ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με.

That the disciples construe Jesus as the true speaker of the quoted words, and this without editorial comment, does suggest an underlying convention,<sup>10</sup> at least for the community (or communities)<sup>11</sup> for which John writes. Yet the indirection of this move is manifest: the zeal of Jesus is not self-predicated; rather, observing Jesus' acts, the disciples recall a text (at John's behest) and attach its predicates to him. Indeed the disciples recall not only the text but that it is written: an act which asserts the quoted text rather as anonymous and representative, than given to a particular speaking subject. The disciples thus "apply" the psalmist's words to Jesus, rather than discover his voice therein. The reader's role is to give assent to the disciples' actions. As we shall now learn, Paul's approach to the same verse bears useful comparison; alike in its strategy of predication, somewhat alike in the effect of writtleness, but distinct in the demand made upon the reader.

### 3.2.2 Installing the Christological subject in Rom 15:3

Paul does not install Christ explicitly as speaker in his quotation, but Christ is the best candidate for the role.<sup>12</sup> Evidence from elsewhere in the NT has been adduced already, and may be summarised: 1) Ps 68 is not infrequently *applied* to Christ elsewhere in the NT, as we have seen; 2) John quotes the other half of Ps 68:10 in John 2:17, and has the disciples predicate it of Christ; and 3) the Johannine case

---

immediate narrative context in John 2. Christ is a subject here, but his subjectivity is detached from the temple incident, and configured instead by his death far hence.

<sup>9</sup> So also Hays 2005:105.

<sup>10</sup> Attridge 2003:105 finds here notice of a specifically "post-Easter" practice of attribution.

<sup>11</sup> See 3.2.2 n.13.

<sup>12</sup> As most in fact agree; cf. Byrne 1996:425; Cranfield 1979:773; Jewett 2007:879; Käsemann 1980:381-82 and many others. Dunn 1988:839 thinks "more natural" a "typological interpretation: the suffering righteous as type of the suffering Jesus"; the quotation would thus be predicated of Christ, but not attributed to him as speaker. See discussion below for the distinction here.

represents an apparent enactment of an underlying convention, which might be argued to have wider currency than a “Johannine community”.<sup>13</sup>

Despite the plausibility of a convention of hearing Christ in the psalms,<sup>14</sup> some caution is required in applying it, not least when it appears widely – even diffusely – attested, but nowhere marked, presumably because it is already well established.<sup>15</sup> The Johannine example is suggestive, however, at least in confirming the Christological aptitude of Ps 68:10, if not necessarily the whole psalm.<sup>16</sup> Local evidence drawn from the Pauline text is required, nevertheless, to justify our reading.

What then of the verse in which Ps 68:10b is heard? Paul prefaces his quotation with a reference to Christ, who is thus the natural (as proximate) candidate for speaker. But his installation in the quotation is neither simple nor direct; the quotation demands significant interpretive labour of its implied reader. The speaking subject is not named; rather, its voice is co-opted by *καθὼς γέγραπται* to a structural correspondence, with “Christ did not please himself” as one term, and the words of the quotation the other. It is as though these words are to be predicated

---

<sup>13</sup> Since the publication of Bauckham 1998 it has become less fashionable to claim a closely definable, localised audience for John’s or any other canonical gospel. If John imagines a geographically diffuse readership for his gospel (whether a local readership is also in view or not), his failure to comment on the convention followed in 2:17 suggests that he takes it – rightly or wrongly – to be widely adopted.

<sup>14</sup> As a development from the well-attested application of lament psalms (cf. Hays 2005:117) to Christ’s passion, the attribution of psalmic speech to Christ is especially plausible. Such laments are couched in first-person discourse; having applied the predicates of that discourse to Jesus, it is a small step to identify the same as speaking subject. Indeed, where such discourse is inserted into a text under quotation, there is considerable rhetorical pressure to identify a speaking subject; see discussion below.

<sup>15</sup> Caveats must be issued nonetheless. For example, we must be alert to anachronism: Paul’s correspondence predates the gospels in their written form, and especially John, so that we cannot be sure how widely adopted the convention was when Paul wrote, or how extensively applied. The problem is compounded by the degree to which Paul may be thought to stand apart from the traditions represented in the gospels: a Synoptic or Johannine convention is not necessarily “given” for Paul, especially in its earliest reception. Equally, we must reckon with the ecclesial distinctiveness of the Pauline congregations; for hermeneutical conventions of the kind we are considering – conventions about psalmody – are embedded in liturgical contexts particular to the communities which embrace them. When Paul writes to congregations not his own (and here, Romans comes to mind), whose liturgical practices are not well-known to him, we need not assume that he thinks the convention known; nor therefore, that he will deploy it himself without comment. Yet he does not comment, save in 15:4 (on which, see 3.5.1).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Hays 2005:105. The matter was of some importance to Dodd (1952:57-60) in his claim for the significance of certain OT passages – including Ps 68 – for the development of Christology in the early church.

of Christ rather than spoken by him, much as the disciples do in John 2:17. Yet there are no disciples here to effect the predication; that task falls to the reader.

The act of predication is distinct from the act of attribution. By the former, the statement “the reproaches of those who reproach you have fallen on me” is predicated of Christ; by the latter, the statement is attributed to Christ as speaking subject. Though distinct, both acts must be undertaken if the subject’s installation is to succeed. There is a logical priority to predication; if it is not possible to predicate the quoted statement of Christ, it will not be coherent for Christ to predicate it of himself, which is what his installation as speaking subject would entail.

It is important to recognise that what is required of the reader, in the first instance, is an act of predication, not of attribution. As we shall learn (3.4), the problem of predication is significant in this verse. Solving it will entail a metaleptic appeal to the quotation’s local context within the psalm, one which will ground the psalmist’s words in coherent action, and so confirm their aptness to be predicated of Christ as a demonstration of how he “did not please himself” (Rom 15:3a).

Successful predication makes logically possible the self-predication of Christ, for which he must be installed as speaker. And indeed, the fullness of predication requires that the reader fix the quotation’s speaking subject; for everything in the quotation itself is constituted in relation to its “I” (its subject of speech):<sup>17</sup> a “you” which refers by ostension, a “they” who reproach the “you”; and reflexively, a “me” on whom reproach falls. Without a fix on the speaking subject, predicative gaps remain and the quotation’s rhetorical force is dissipated.

In attributing the statement to Christ as his own self-predication, the reader creates a potential stimulus to metaleptic extension within the psalm. In part, this is because a psalm nominally is the extended utterance of a coherent subject, so that the installation of such a subject at any point offers that subject to the whole, or to any part within it. But it is also because the attachment of a subject to a narrative

---

<sup>17</sup> See 1.3.2.2 above on first-person discourse.

fragment constitutes an invitation to weave that fragment into a larger narrative;<sup>18</sup> for a coherent subject will narrate. As we shall see (3.4.2.2), a modest narrative extension is offered to the curious reader, though not demanded by Paul's text.

A speaking subject will be named, then, and the reader must discover it; for the psalmist's words come to be spoken by Christ not through his verbal appropriation, nor by the remembering of disciples (John 2:17), but by demanding acts of predication and attribution invited of the reader. Such a reader will have been well prepared before the quotation is heard; thus we turn to Rom 15:1-2, where that preparation is made (3.3).

### 3.3 Audience and agenda for Romans 15:3

We have claimed a Christological subject for Paul's quotation without recourse to the wider context beyond the verse in which it appears. But it is neither possible nor wise to assess the meaning of that subject's speech without a turn to context. On its own reckoning, Rom 15:3 does not introduce a new line of thought, much less stand alone; the *καὶ γάρ* with which it begins ties it closely to the verse immediately preceding, and to the larger unit of paraenesis which began with a call to welcome at Rom 14:1.

As we examine the context of 15:3, we shall set out to determine who exactly will be subject to the admonition of 15:3a and to the example of the Christological psalmist of 15:3b. We will discover a subject both broad and narrow: Paul extends his example to all in Christ, confirming the comprehensive fit of the psalmist's disposition, yet foregrounds a subject strongly specified and compelled in particular to adopt it. This foregrounded subject (the "strong") is prepared by the verses leading to the quotation to respond to metaleptic cues in 15:3.

---

<sup>18</sup> That larger narrative may in theory be coextensive with the donor psalm, though the limits of psalmic narrativity (1.3.1) are such that the psalm as a whole may not be salient. The subject will narrate *in extenso*, then, but not *in toto*.

### 3.3.1 The epistolary context of Romans 15:3

Paul's discourse since 14:1 has been with the "strong" and the "weak", who together constitute his Roman readership. There is little doubt that a real Roman situation is in view: Paul is not addressing hypothetical issues, but substantial topics of material import to his readers. He is, moreover, sufficiently informed as to align himself openly with one of the two groups: the strong (15:1).<sup>19</sup> The identity of weak and strong and the differences among them are not unanimously agreed; but of the various options, it seems best to understand Paul's focus as the Jewish law, specifically dietary regulations (14:2) and Sabbath observance (14:5).<sup>20</sup> The strong do not observe such laws, while the weak do; the one is inclined to condemn, the other to despise (14:3); and both are disposed to judge.<sup>21</sup>

Paul's admonitions have been variously directed at those who observe the law and those who do not (cf. Rom 14:10); or at the larger group which comprehends them both. In terms of the strong, Paul's primary concern is with food laws as these impinge on commensality; while tolerance is urged upon all on both issues (14:1-14; esp. vv.3, 6), it is on the matter of food and not the observance of special days that Paul enjoins the strong to accommodation (14:21). The relevant contexts are not public (cf. 1 Cor 8-10) but private (cf. προσλαμβάνεσθε, Rom 14:1): Paul is concerned particularly with the salience of food laws in shared meals among Christians.<sup>22</sup>

### 3.3.2 "The strong" are primary addressees

When we reach 15:1-2, the strong are foregrounded, and Paul among them:

Ὁφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ δυνατοὶ τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν.<sup>2</sup> ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν·

<sup>19</sup> As Barclay puts it (1996:288-9), "If he can predict his allegiance with one of the two groups in the debate, he must know where they stand: he would hardly donate his authority as a blank cheque cashable by any Pauline group claiming to be 'the strong'."

<sup>20</sup> Most identify the weak as Jewish Christians who keep kosher (so e.g. Barclay 1996; Cranfield 1979:700; Reasoner 1999:6-16; Fitzmyer 1993:687). Nanos (1996:119-44) argues, unpersuasively, for non-Christian Jews.

<sup>21</sup> As described in 14:3 and addressed in 14:10, despising (ἐξουθενέω) is associated particularly with the weak, and judging (κρίνω) with the strong. Nonetheless, the dominant motif throughout is that of judgment. Thus, 14:4 addresses the strong, yet the language of judging (albeit in a different sense) is co-opted to both groups in 14:5; 14:13 is explicit, however: μηκέτι οὖν ἀλλήλους κρίνωμεν. This linguistic interplay, in which terms are now particular to one group, now applicable to all, illustrates a larger dynamic explored in 3.3.4 below.

<sup>22</sup> Barclay 1996:303.

Paul's declared alignment is striking, but should not blind us to other, equally notable features of his appeal. Firstly, we should note that οἱ δυνάτοί are mentioned for the first time here: there has been no opposition of strong and weak before 15:1. Indeed, this is the first time plural designations have been offered at all: Paul's characterisation of τὸν δὲ ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει in 14:1, and ὁ ... ἀσθενῶν in 14:2, is decidedly individual. As such, it established "the weak" as a type of person, and those addressed by it as individual instances of a type. Now constituted as groups, we find οἱ δυνάτοί opposed not to the weak of 14:1-2, now pluralised, but to "the powerless" (οἱ ἀδύνατοι).<sup>23</sup>

The distinction should not be pressed too hard, perhaps; yet ἀσθενής and ἀδύνατος characterise their subjects in different ways. The semantic focus of the latter is squarely on agency or its lack, as reflected in scriptural usage.<sup>24</sup> The former ranges more widely; its implications for agency are guaranteed by its object or by context (if at all), and not by the term itself.

We should not be tempted to read too much into Paul's intentions at this point. It may be that in coining a new term for those who do not observe the law (δυνάτοί), he naturally – and unconsciously – reaches for its lexical complement to name those who do.<sup>25</sup> Yet these new designations are not without effect. Paul's dyadic terms constitute the Roman readers as a whole, for the first time in his discussion; and they do this not with reference to private<sup>26</sup> religious conviction (the focus of Rom 14), but to moral agency; not to defective belief, but to incapacity of action.

<sup>23</sup> As Paul's own usage illustrates, the natural term to oppose to weakness is in fact not power but strength; ἡμεῖς ἀσθενεῖς, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἰσχυροί (1 Cor 4:10); cf. 2 Cor 10:10. The term ἀδύνατος is rare indeed in Paul, appearing only here and in Rom 8:3, where it describes the law. ἀσθενής is much more common; cf. Rom 5:6; 1 Cor 1:25, 27; 4:10; 8:7, 10; 9:22; 11:30; 12:22; 2 Cor 10:10; Gal 4:9; 1 Thess 5:14.

<sup>24</sup> The term is used to denote the impossibility of a task, or the powerlessness of an agent. Linking the two meanings is the notion of agency and its lack; whether implied (predicated of an agent's task), or express (predicated directly of a subject, as here in Rom 15:1). For the former in the NT, cf. Mark 10:27 (Matt 19:26; Luke 18:27); Heb 6:4, 6:18, 10:4, 11:6. For the latter, especially rare in NT, cf. Acts 14:8; Rom 8:3. In biblical literature only Job features the term extensively (Job 20:19; 24:4, 6; 29:16; 30:25; 31:16; 31:20; 36:15; cf. 24:22); there, it almost uniformly denotes not those weak in faith, but who are without agency, subject to the malevolent agency of others.

<sup>25</sup> On stylistic grounds, we might add that Paul is unlikely to speak of "the weaknesses of the weak", though similar biblical locutions appear in Paul in quotation; cf. 1 Cor 1:19.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Rom 14:22: οὐ πίστιν [ἦν] ἔχεις κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχει ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

### 3.3.3 To bear the weaknesses of the powerless

In this light, we must consider afresh the force of Paul’s admonition to the powerful to bear the weaknesses of the powerless (τὰ ἀσθενήματα τῶν ἀδυνάτων βαστάζειν). βαστάζειν has a relatively wide semantic range, focused on either supporting or enduring (BDAG q.v.); its precise force is usually determined by its object. In this case, the negative content of that object appears at first decisive. The δυνατοί are enjoined not to carry the ἀδύνατοι *per se*, but their weaknesses (ἀσθενήματα); and it is the awkwardness of the idea of “supporting” such weaknesses in any positive sense, together with the assumption that ἀσθενήματα refer to the “weakness of faith” of the previous chapter, that leads some ETs and commentators to dismiss it in favour of “bearing with” or “putting up with”.<sup>27</sup>

Thus understood, Paul is recapitulating an earlier demand for tolerance. But to read this way is to resolve one awkwardness only to impose another: for “putting up with” another’s weaknesses is a curious – though not unintelligible – form for “not pleasing oneself” to take;<sup>28</sup> and the plural ἀσθενήματα cannot be straightforwardly conflated with the ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει of 14:1.<sup>29</sup> More seriously, this reading underrepresents what Paul has just asked of the strong,<sup>30</sup> who are not only to “put up with” weakness but to emulate its requirements (Rom 14:21) for the sake of the other.<sup>31</sup> To anticipate a later conclusion (3.4.2.1), the effects of this accommodation

---

<sup>27</sup> So e.g. NIV, NJB “bear with”; NRSV “put up with”. Among commentators, see Fitzmyer 1993:701-2; Ziesler 1989:337; Barrett 1991:269.

<sup>28</sup> We strong are to “bear the weaknesses ... and not to please ourselves” (μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν). The question of what is pleasing, and to whom, is of apparent importance to the psalm quotation ahead; it is prefigured here and in 15:2. Paul’s statement here counterposes the two phrases as two sides of one coin. Thus, the bearing of weaknesses is implicitly figured as something which pleases the other, whether that other is divine or, proximately, the ἀδύνατοι. See 3.4.1.5, 3.4.2.4 below.

<sup>29</sup> At best, the identification is uncertain. “Weaknesses” *could* be construed as a collective reference to the varied observance of special days or dietary laws; the term ἀσθενήματα would then be elliptical for “weaknesses of faith”, in line with the “weak of faith” of 14:1. But if “weaknesses of faith” is in view, then a closer and less demanding correlation could be made with the διακρινόμενος of 14:23: their eating is not “from faith”, and so may betoken a “weakness of faith”. Inasmuch as such faithless eating is sin (ἁμαρτία), such a reading aligns 15:1 somewhat closely with Gal 6:1-2 (see below), where the burden bearing of 6:2 finds illustration in the response to παράπτωμα urged in 6:1. If pressed, the association would argue against a call for toleration: are the strong to “put up with” what is sin? Yet it is better to suggest that ἀσθενήματα cannot find a secure referent in any of the particular forms of weakness in Rom 14; and hence, that the term may acquire a different kind of reference in 15:1ff.

<sup>30</sup> Similarly Dunn 1988:837; Byrne 1996:426: “Paul is asking for positive help not mere toleration.”

<sup>31</sup> At least in respect of diet, if not Sabbath observance.

are identification: the strong become socially weak, constructed as Jews in the eyes of the Roman other, and so sharers in the experience of reproach.<sup>32</sup>

In this light, to “bear” the weaknesses of the powerless is ultimately to share in their reproach, as might be confirmed by Christ in 15:3; the strong are to dispose their strength in solidarity with the weak. This alternative reading gains support from the use of βασιτάζειν in Gal 6:2.<sup>33</sup> There, as in Rom 15:1, the verb has an other-regarding quality, takes an object with negative connotations, and correlates its action in some way with Christ. The Galatians are to “carry” the burden (τὰ βάρη βασιτάζετε) of the other, and thus famously fulfill the law of Christ. The Roman strong, similarly, are to “bear” the weaknesses of the other, and so – they shall discover – follow the example of Christ (Rom 15:3). Encouraged by these ostensive parallels, we might ask whether ἀσθενήματα and βάρη can be related; for then a positive sense for βασιτάζειν in Rom 15:1 gains a sure precedent. Although the two are scarcely equivalent, the association of βάρη (Gal 6:2) with the παράπτωμα of Gal 6:1 forces a metonymic construal of burden bearing which supports our reading of Rom 15:1: just as the Galatians are to support the burdened, the Roman strong are to support the weak.<sup>34</sup>

Read in this way, 15:1 is no mere recapitulation of an earlier demand for tolerance; instead, it represents a more demanding call to sustain the powerless in their weakness. Ineluctably, these terms carry Paul’s discourse beyond the intramural debate with which he began; to what end, we will shortly discover. The question of agency, meantime, will continue to prove important in the verses to follow.

---

<sup>32</sup> Granting to the category of “the weak” in 1 Cor 9:22 a sociohistorical situation of diminished agency (Thiselton 2000:705; cf. Theissen 1982:121-43), Paul’s testimony to accommodation in this verse offers a notable parallel.

<sup>33</sup> Other usages illustrate the range of βασιτάζειν without shedding light on 15:1. In Rom 11:18, it carries the positive sense of sustaining, nourishing: the root “supports” you. In Gal 5:10, negatively, the troubler will “suffer” the judgment (κρίμα). In Gal 6:5 φορτίον gives a neutral sense: each shall “bear” his own load.

<sup>34</sup> The generalising injunction of v.2 includes, but is not limited to, the narrower precept of v.1 (Bruce 1982:260), identifying the one caught in transgression (παράπτωμα) as one burdened (Martyr 1997:547). The effect is to distance βάρη from ἀσθενήματα, since no sense of transgression attaches to the latter in Rom 15:1. But in the Galatian context, the bearing of such a burden becomes metonymic: the burden bearer surely does not support the sin of the other (much less “put up with” it; either would be incomprehensible), but supports the other in their transgressive burden. Might we not find similarly in Rom 15:1, such that the strong do not – in an opaque phrase – “support the weaknesses of the weak” (Byrne 1996:426), but “support the powerless in their weaknesses”? If the force of the parallel is granted, we have laid the groundwork for our exposition of the nature of that support: the disposition of agency at the service of those without, effected in identification, and so in shared reproach. Cf. Cranfield 1979:730 n.2.

### 3.3.4 The strong addressed, but all are subject

The first person plural pronoun so clearly refers to “the strong” in 15:1 that we might imagine ἕκαστος ἡμῶν in 15:2 encompasses only them. The strength of the strong is subtly suggested here in the terms with which pleasing the neighbour is qualified: it is to be done εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν. οἰκοδομή, a word which will prove suggestive for the interpretation of 15:3, looks back – no great distance – to 14:19. There Paul enjoined the pursuit of τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης ... καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους, clarifying what this might mean by its opposite: the destruction of the other (14:20a).<sup>35</sup> To read 14:19-20 alongside 15:1-2 is to discover what it will mean if the call of 15:1 is neglected: the powerless other – the ἀδύνατοι – will be destroyed. As we saw in the labels of 15:1, so also in the notion of οἰκοδομή in 15:2: Paul stresses the effective agency of the strong as against the agency of the weak.

But pronominal reference is notoriously indeterminate when plural; and if the strong lay first claim to be the subjects of ἕκαστος ἡμῶν in 15:2, there is reason to find the weak included also.<sup>36</sup> The same associated verse (14:19) is key: for while non-observant Christians are to the fore in preceding verses (14:15-16), Paul makes the mutuality of οἰκοδομή explicit in 14:19 – it is εἰς ἀλλήλους – so that strong and weak both are co-opted to its pursuit. οἰκοδομή thus carries a sense of mutuality into its appearance at 15:2. There we find that Paul has made room for the weak among ἕκαστος ἡμῶν, insofar as the antithesis of strong and weak has been suspended: “each of us” is opposed not to the ἀδύνατοι of 15:1, but to the referentially broader πλησίον, which may encompass strong and weak alike.

The dual subject figured variously here – the “strong” on the one hand; “strong” and “weak” together on the other – reflects the presence of two key motifs throughout the text: the assertion of agency as for the other rather than for the self, and the fundamental reciprocity of communal life in Christ. In less particular contexts, such as in 2 Cor 8 and 9, the play of agency, now with one party, now with another, always oriented to the weaker other, is demonstrably reciprocal;<sup>37</sup> but where one party in particular possesses agency, and another does not – as we find

---

<sup>35</sup> μὴ ... κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 14:20; cf. ἀπόλλυμι in 14:15b). In one of many theocentric identifications, the other is designated as “the work of God”.

<sup>36</sup> So also Jewett 2007:878; *contra* Reasoner 1999:191-93.

<sup>37</sup> On the disposition of agents in 2 Cor 8, see 5.2.3.2 and 5.2.3.3.

here – the universal subject of reciprocity (“strong” and “weak”) is rhetorically obscured behind the narrower empowered subject (“strong”) whose agency is to be redirected, and who must therefore be addressed.

All are subject, then, to the example of Rom 15:3, confirming (we shall see) the universal “fit” of a psalmic subject Christologically defined; but the strong are addressed as those possessed of agency. What will they anticipate from Christ’s example? A clear paradigm for “pleasing the other”, marked by the exercise of agency with potent effect: how Christ, as one of the powerful, sustained the powerless in their weaknesses. It remains to be seen whether and how these expectations will be met.

### **3.4 Romans 15:3: a Christological license for metalepsis**

καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται· οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδίζόντων σε ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ’ ἐμέ.

In 3.2.2 we found a Christological subject installed in the quotation in Rom 15:3 by the agency of Paul’s readers, well motivated for the task (3.3). It is time to examine the predicative challenges involved, which motivate a metaleptic search for informing context.

#### **3.4.1 Predicative challenges open the text to metalepsis from Ps 68**

##### **3.4.1.1 A warrant from the psalm?**

The work of predication is made demanding for the reader because the voice of the psalm has a disjunctive quality when transposed to Rom 15:3. Two disjunctions are easily pinpointed. The first is within 15:3 itself: how does Paul’s claim that “Christ did not please himself” secure a precise warrant – “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται) – from the quotation? Conversely, how does the psalmist’s claim that “the reproaches of those who reproach you have fallen on me” demonstrate that Christ did not please himself? In particular, how does the grammatically passive experience of reproach, as figured in the quotation, demonstrate the agency implied by “not pleasing oneself”; an agency which might serve as example to the strong?

The second disjunction is between 15:3 and what precedes. Reading καὶ γάρ, which ties this verse to v.2, we expect the quotation to tell us how Christ pleased “others”; the identity of σε is thus critical here. For the psalmist of Ps 68, the “you” who is reproached is the possessor of “your house” (Ps 68:10a): the divine subject. A straightforward substitution of Christ for the psalmist retains God as referent for σε.<sup>38</sup> Thus Christ did not please himself, but (ἀλλά) the divine other, and he did this by being reproached with reproaches directed against that other. If focussed upon the event of the cross, this is intelligible in itself, but its relevance to the situation of the strong is not at all transparent.

Recognising this, some interpreters see fit to complicate Christ’s occupation of the psalm by suggesting a human referent for the reproached other.<sup>39</sup> Thus Christ did not please himself, but accommodated to<sup>40</sup> the (human) other, and he did this by being reproached with reproaches directed against them. While this “recontextualisation” would solve the disjunction between 15:3 and 15:2 by demonstrating the relevance of Christ’s actions, it entails a decidedly unsatisfying Christological narrative, not least if combined (as it usually is) with a focus on the cross.<sup>41</sup> In what sense is Christ reproached or insulted with reproaches or insults directed against human others?<sup>42</sup> Perhaps only if Paul declares him so. Sensing the hermeneutical violence involved, scholars who take Paul to have substituted a human referent for σε claim the *Lehrsatz* of Rom 15:4 as Paul’s justification.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>38</sup> So e.g. Cranfield 1979:733; Kasemann 1980:382; Dunn 1988:839; Fitzmyer 1993:703.

<sup>39</sup> So e.g. Jewett 2007:879-80, following an older tradition of interpretation in Meyer 1876:2:332; Lagrange 1931:342.

<sup>40</sup> BDAG ἀρέσκω q.v.

<sup>41</sup> For which, see Kleinknecht 1984:359-60; Wilckens 1982:101-2.

<sup>42</sup> Not easily can Jesus’ experience of reproach be correlated with an anthropocentric reading in Paul. *Contra* Jewett (2007:880), Christ did not die “the most shameful of deaths in behalf of the shamed” as recipients of ὀνειδισμοί. The “weak” (ἀσθενής; Rom 5:6) for whom he died were ungodly (ἀσεβής; Rom 5:6); sinful (ἁμαρτωλός; Rom 5:8); enemies (ἐχθροί; Rom 5:9). Nor would Isa 53:4-5, not quoted here but thought supportive (Thompson 1991:223-34, quoting Chrysostom), be of use; for the wounded there are likewise transgressors. Such were they who insulted Jesus on the cross (cf. ὀνειδίζω in Mark 15:32; Matt 27:44); far from the recipients of reproach, they were those who levied it. In any event, the substitutionary force of reproach-bearing – if read in light of the cross – is neither native to this verse in the psalm (see 3.4.1.3 n.46) nor appropriate to the *sharing* of reproach envisaged by Rom 15:1-2.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Jewett 2007:881: “To shift from an address to God, clearly intended by the “you” in the psalm, was a gigantic, virtually heretical step for Paul as well as his audience, requiring an explicit statement of his hermeneutic.” In fact, it is unclear why such a substitution would be considered “gigantic” or “virtually heretical”. In any event, would this be any more scandalous than Paul’s other misprisions in Romans, which are offered unremarked? Cf. the substitution of subjects in Paul’s appeal to Hosea in Rom 9:25-26.

It falls to the reader to retain or substitute referents in the quotation, as also to predicate it of Christ; ultimately, to attribute it to him. If understood as a readerly challenge, the way is opened to a readerly solution through metalepsis; indeed, metaleptic exploration is cued precisely by the quotation's failure to resolve the challenges it poses. In the first instance, a competent reader will assume a divine referent for  $\sigma\epsilon$ , as that which is native to the psalm. Accordingly, that reader must discover – through metaleptic extension, not least – how the sharing of reproach directed against God, which constitutes the unity of the psalmist with the divine other, pleases that other, and how this corresponds with the pleasing required of  $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  (Rom 15:2).

#### **3.4.1.2 Without metalepsis: the speaker, but not his speech**

Failing to discern the relevance of the quotation construed as Christ's address to God, but unwilling to substitute a human referent, most step back from the particular claim made by the psalmist to that subject's general circumstances or selfless disposition, wherein the relevance of the quotation may be found.<sup>44</sup> In effect, this entails the quotation's complete capitulation to its complement: it means straightforwardly that "Christ did not please himself".

Could this be established as best reading, it would in fact represent a significant finding for the reception of psalmody in Paul: that, here at least, the apostle is more concerned to evoke a generalised psalmic subject – the "righteous sufferer", perhaps – than its particular speech. The speaker of the psalms, then, and not his speech, is material in Paul. But this conclusion is bought at real cost; for while it has the benefit of securing a clear if general warrant, it does so by emptying the quotation of its particular force. The cost to Paul as hermeneut is high: his reading of the psalm fragment is neither close nor subtle. Indeed, as an observation about intertextuality in Paul, the abandonment of the particular for the generic constitutes a blow against the sort of richly metaleptic account now in vogue, in which the particularities of literary texts are thought to be operative in the making of meaning. Notably, the

---

<sup>44</sup> So for example Fitzmyer (1993:703): "As applied to Christ, the words mean that he willingly accepted his sufferings and bore the reproaches uttered against God by the enemies of God." Dunn (1988:843-43) offers a typical application: "The model is Christ: if he was willing to suffer misunderstanding and abuse to the extent of giving his own life, how could those who both gloried in their own strength and called Jesus Lord refuse the much less [*sic*] self-limitation of curbing the liberty of their conduct when it was causing their fellow Christians to fall?"

integrity of the psalm as a domain for metalepsis, elsewhere fashionable, is abandoned. On such a reading, Paul's quotation is at most a place-holder: it signifies a certain subjective disposition, already read in Paul's "Christ did not please himself"; but itself contributes nothing material, nor anything which is particular to the psalm.

The cost is equally high for a Christological reading of the quotation. It requires relatively little to predicate a broadly other-regarding disposition of Christ, which the quoted words signify in general but do not specify in detail. We read the quotation and think of Christ, particularly in the event of the cross; for the quotation is "about" him. But there is then no reason to take these words as the particular *speech* of Christ, since their particularity is irrelevant; he is the psalm's subject only in the most schematic terms, but not its speaking subject. His affiliation with psalmody, stripped of the particularity of speech, is diminished in potency.

#### **3.4.1.3 Unmotivated metalepsis: particular to the psalm, yet arbitrary**

Richard Hays attempts to enrich the sort of generic reading just identified through the "transumption" of material from elsewhere in the psalm. Hays acknowledges the imprecision of the warrant as it stands, and isolates the vicarious quality of Christ's suffering as the key point for Paul.<sup>45</sup> In itself, this does not take us far: the warrant for the claim that Christ did not please himself (but pleased others) is now found, none too transparently, in his willingness to suffer vicariously. Nor does it exhaust the meaning of the quoted words, which signify *identity* between the psalmist and the (divine) other – in the sharing of common reproach – more clearly than a vicarious (substitutionary) suffering.<sup>46</sup> Yet it does point up the possibility of a

---

<sup>45</sup> Hays 2005:112.

<sup>46</sup> The *vicarious* quality of suffering is figured not in Ps 68:10 OG but – if anywhere – in v.8 (see 3.4.1.4). It is not illegitimate to read the two "in concert", but the strategy should be made explicit. Yet even on this reading, it is unclear how the psalmist's bearing of reproach relieves the  $\sigma\epsilon$  of v.10 of its own. In other words, a strong (substitutionary) form of vicarious suffering can only be sustained at the sacrifice of the divine  $\sigma\epsilon$  for an alternative "relievable" subject. Perhaps for this reason, commentators are reluctant to claim the psalmist as more than "[c]lose to the boundary of vicarious suffering" (Kraus 1993:61); a weaker account is in fact tantamount to shared suffering, and so speaks to identity rather than substitution. Cf. the way in which the language of reproach is figured in Ps 88:51-52, verses which stand at the heart of Don Juell's thesis (Juell 1988, esp. p.109) as to the place of messianic exegesis of the psalms in the development of early Christology. There, the Messiah speaks in first person to call divine attention to his suffering of reproach at the hands of God's enemies, the nations. There is nothing vicarious in this, the only explicit instance of messianic

specific ethical lesson to be drawn by the readers, in which they might take up some – yet to be identified – suffering in community with the weak. To this possibility we will return.

Hays does not take this route; instead, discerning the operation of metalepsis, he adds a measure of Christological reinforcement to Paul’s general counsel of other-regard. “The aptness of the quotation would be enhanced,” he writes, “for readers who remembered its immediate context in Ps 69:6ff.”<sup>47</sup> As Hays shows, v.7 (OG)<sup>48</sup> features language and sentiments represented elsewhere in Romans; read as a prayer of Christ, Hays suggests, the petitions offered at this point in the psalm reinforce Paul’s appeal. “Paul wants the Roman Christians to echo the prayer of the Messiah by saying, in effect, ‘Do not let one for whom Christ died be put to shame because of me’ (cf. Rom 14:15).”<sup>49</sup>

Suggestive though this is, it shares with other readings a failure to account for the specific contribution of the quoted words; Paul’s καθὼς γέγραπται seems quite unwarranted. Nor does it show why the quotation is offered particularly to the *strong*. And it is a selective metalepsis which, though referring to “immediate context in Ps 69:6ff.”, in fact brings nothing more “immediate” than Ps 68:7 to view.<sup>50</sup> But if we must reject Hays’ analysis, we need not discount the possibility of metalepsis altogether. Indeed, the predicative challenges posed by the quotation encourage just the sort of reader activity demanded in metalepsis: the transumption of unquoted material in the service of interpretation.

---

ownership of reproach in lament. Despite its suggestive character the parallel is of limited use to us (and, unfortunately, to Juell), since Ethan’s psalm is nowhere cited in the NT.

<sup>47</sup> Hays 2005:112. Psalm references in Hays’ article are to MT.

<sup>48</sup> Hays 2005:112. Thus Ps 68:7: μὴ αἰσχυθῆσαν ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ οἱ ὑπομένοντές σε κύριε κύριε τῶν δυνάμεων μὴ ἐντραπήσαν ἐπ’ ἐμοὶ οἱ ζητοῦντές σε ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ.

<sup>49</sup> Hays 2005:112.

<sup>50</sup> Nor would it suit Hays to delve any further back in the psalm. Verse 6 offers an explicit admission of personal folly (ἀφροσύνη) and errors (πλημμέλειαι) as the grounds for the petition of v.7, whose Christological aptitude is somewhat lessened thereby. Nor would such metalepsis suit the context of Paul’s appeal, to which the moral failings of strong and weak are immaterial. We may grant with commentators (e.g. Tate 1990:196) that the psalmist’s early confession should not be taken to govern the whole psalm (though it is scarcely “a brief form of the speaker’s protestation of innocence” (ibid.)); nonetheless, it surely *does* govern the following petition. Equally, we may argue that Hays’ atomistic metalepsis allows a similarly atomistic appeal to the verse “next door”.

#### 3.4.1.4 Motivated metalepsis: particular, and local to the quoted clause

A more plausible metaleptic proposal would account for material closer in position and theme to the words of the quote. Verse 8, for example, shares with v.10 the crucial lexeme *ὀνειδισμὸν*; if evoked on this association, *ὑπήνεγκα* suggests the active agency of the reproach-bearer of v.9, while the claimed experience of *ἐντροπή* hints at the social consequences of reproach-bearing. These become explicit and profound in v.9, and are confirmed by *ὅτι* (v.10) as directly contingent on the psalmist's zeal.

Yet the strongest candidate for metalepsis is the half-verse which completes Paul's quotation: Ps 68:10a. In its favour are its structural intimacy with the quotation,<sup>51</sup> and its salience elsewhere in the NT.<sup>52</sup> But its immediate significance lies in the resource it offers to solve a central problem of predication posed by Rom 15:3: the absence of agency in the psalmic subject.

#### 3.4.1.5 How it is that zeal pleases: coming to share in divine reproach

Throughout Paul's discourse in Rom 14:1-15:6, the agency of the Roman readers, and particularly of the strong, is both presupposed and required; and the agency of Christ the exemplar is acknowledged in 15:3a. In 15:1-3a, in particular, the conceptuality of pleasing not oneself but another is paramount; and whether this is exhorted (15:1-2) or exemplified (15:3a), it imagines a capable moral agent. But there is no sense in the quoted half-verse that the psalmist – whether Christ or any other subject – *chose* to bear the reproaches of another, or acted so as to bring this about; they simply “fell on” (*ἐπέπεσαν*) him. It is this oddness which compels a metaleptic search for an agent to counterpose with the strong of 15:1-2. This will make the warrant secure, by showing what Christ *did* to not please himself; by the same stroke, it will make the quotation apt to be predicated of Christ, and perhaps attributed to him. By enriching the narrative available to the subject, it may equally shed light on the relationship between the divine *σε* whom the Christological psalmist pleased and the “weak”, whom the strong must please (15:2).

---

<sup>51</sup> The verse as a whole is a well-formed parallel structure; on the salience of such structures, see 1.3.1.1.

<sup>52</sup> See 3.2.2 above on John 2:17. Taken together, the Johannine ascription of Ps 68:10a to Jesus and the Pauline ascription of Ps 68:10b to Christ claim high Christological salience for the verse as a whole.

The necessary agent is close at hand, in the same psalmic verse: it is the one who exercises “zeal for your house” (οἶκος, 68:10a). Christ did not please himself, says Paul; rather, consumed by his zeal for God’s house, he came to share in reproach directed against God. The action of zeal, metaleptically adduced, confers the desired agency to the experience of reproach, and makes the psalmist a coherent candidate for imitation. Like Christ, the strong are to act with consuming zeal; so they will come to share in reproach directed against God.

But it is not simply zeal which is in view, but zeal “for your house”. In what sense was Christ consumed by zeal for God’s house? What object might “your house” represent for the zeal of the strong? The psalmist of Ps 68 is of course a temple enthusiast; but zeal for the temple (as the original referent for οἶκος in the psalm) is not straightforwardly predicable of Christ in Paul,<sup>53</sup> and nowhere urged for those in Christ.

Yet the local Roman context of Paul’s quotation may shed light on the matter. The strong in particular have just learned that pleasing the neighbour is πρὸς οἰκοδομήν (Rom 15:2); all were recently made aware that those who pursue οἰκοδομή (14:19) are well-pleasing (εὐάρεστος)<sup>54</sup> to God (14:18).<sup>55</sup> When “zeal for your οἶκος” is evoked by metalepsis, οἶκος is inflected by these associations toward the corporate subject of οἰκοδομή.<sup>56</sup> On this reading, the psalmist – as co-opted into Paul’s discourse by the reader – is consumed not by zeal for the temple, but for the church.<sup>57</sup> Equally,

---

<sup>53</sup> Though it is, of course, in the Synoptic tradition (Matt 21:12-13; Mark 11:15-17; Luke 19:45-46). *Temple* has a different kind of discursive life in John; and if 2:17 appears to offer alignment with the Synoptists, 2:18-21 points elsewhere (but cf. Mark 14:58; Matt 26:61, 27:40). The Pauline case is to David’s loss, whose zeal for the temple is well documented in biblical narrative, and whose afterlife as temple founder in Second Temple Judaism should have guaranteed his subjective claim on this verse.

<sup>54</sup> The term is particularly Pauline; cf. Rom 12:1, 2; 2 Cor 5:9; Phil 4:18.

<sup>55</sup> While the somewhat open ἐν τούτῳ in 14:18 may be taken to refer in either direction, ἄρα οὖν (14:19) certifies the tight link between the pursuit of οἰκοδομή and the well-pleasing service of Christ.

<sup>56</sup> The two terms share more than an etymological root and a degree of homophony. In Paul and elsewhere, οἰκοδομή encompasses both the act of building and its result (BDAG q.v.); οἶκος comes close to the latter where it refers materially to a “house” (as often in Paul; cf. Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; Phlm 1:2). In this, it is a species of οἰκοδομή, but one whose discursive life includes “temple” via OT usage. Elsewhere, οἶκος in Paul is a household (1 Cor 1:16) and, by extension, the church that gathers in a home; cf. Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:19; for more explicit figural usage of the term outside Paul, cf. 1 Tim 3:15; 1 Pet 2:5; 4:17. Notably, οἰκοδομή and οἶκος share in Paul a corporate reference; the tendency of ETs to take Rom 15:2 as imagining the building up of “one’s neighbour” (sg.) is mistaken (so also Hays 2005:102).

<sup>57</sup> Put so starkly, this seems to imply a substitution of one concept for another, which is of course too bold. Why should local categories in the text of Romans “trump” those transumed from the psalm (where “your house” is clearly the temple)? In part this reflects a hermeneutical priority

zeal for *this* house is revealed, by the same intratextual associations, to be that which pleases the neighbour (15:2), and which constitutes one as well-pleasing to God (14:18-19).<sup>58</sup>

By the interplay of Paul's discourse in Romans with the verse from which he quotes, Paul's readers have learned: 1) that Christ pleased God by his consuming zeal for God's house, understood as his people, which led him into sharing reproach; and 2) that pleasing the other, if in imitation of Christ, entails an equivalent zeal for God's house, understood as his people, which will lead likewise into shared reproach.

But however οἶκος may be read in terms of the church, we must still ask how God – the default referent for σε in the quotation – is reproached, that Christ or his imitators should share in his experience. To this we turn next.

#### 3.4.1.6 God is reproached in the reproach of his “house”

In fact, the category of God's οἶκος, which the action of metalepsis has brought to view, supplies an insight into the nature of divine reproach. In the reproach of his people (who constitute his house), God is himself reproached;<sup>59</sup> for this house is the

---

grounded in the observed experience of readers (Sternberg 1982:140-44), who are not ostensibly bound to construe the meaning of the psalm, but of Paul's discourse. Nonetheless, as transplanted to the Roman text, the οἶκος of the psalm is “double-voiced” (cf. Bakhtin 1981:324-25) by the psalmist and the author who invokes him. The psalmist's temple is the locus of the presence and glory of God: the dwelling place of his name, and symbol of his reputation; such associations are lent to Paul's discourse. Yet the psalmist defers at last to Paul; for when an alternative term is available to designate the temple more narrowly (ναός), the psalm's use of οἶκος is seen to open up a wider field of reference which Paul's own discourse offers to fill as the reader interprets. In any event, those who hear ναός for οἶκος in the psalm find that this too is co-opted to Paul's ecclesiology (though not in Romans): Οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστε (1 Cor 3:16); and that the same term is aligned with οἰκοδομή (1 Cor 3:9-15) in referring to the church as a corporate entity.

<sup>58</sup> The passage shortly to follow (Rom 15:7-9a) offers confirmation of this reading, especially given the installation of Christ as the quotation's subject. As 15:1-6 brings Paul's discourse to the strong and weak to a close, we learn in respect of the “welcoming the weak” (προσλαμβάνω) of 14:1 just how far and deep its entailments run: all this from the agency and experience of the Christological psalmist of 15:3. In 15:7, Paul renews the call on the Romans to “welcome one another” (προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους), in a lexical recapitulation of 14:1; and in doing so, he sets up a structural correspondence: the Christ of 15:3 is to the welcome of 14:1 what the Christ of 15:7b-9a is to the welcome of 15:7a. Paul's renewed call is of course predicated on the example of the welcoming Christ, whose “backstory” is declared in 15:8-9a. And there we find Christ taking the role of servant (διάκονος) in his zeal for the οἶκος of God – for Gentile and Jew constituted together, finally (15:10-11), in praise. Chapter 4 examines this passage in depth. For the extensive structural parallels between 15:1-6 and 15:7-13 see Byrne 1996:428.

<sup>59</sup> Insofar as the metaphor of the house suggests (more clearly than ναός, for example) the place of God's dwelling, the idea that an offence against God's house constitutes the reproach of God himself is easily seen. Jer 7:11 (cf. 7:14) makes the connection explicit: the profaned temple is designated ὁ οἶκος μου οὐ ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου. In Ps 73:7 the sanctuary (ἁγιαστήριον) is designated τὸ σκήνωμα τοῦ ὀνόματός σου.

locus of his glory and reputation.<sup>60</sup> This is a common enough *topos* within communal laments;<sup>61</sup> but appears less frequently, and with greater indirection, in individual laments:<sup>62</sup> save here.<sup>63</sup>

It is this theological inference, made possible by metalepsis, which resolves the difficulty of discerning how Christ might have shared the reproach of human others, having construed a divine referent for  $\sigma\epsilon$  in the quotation. In the category of the  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ , reproaches directed against God or against those of his household coinhere. Seeking to ground this inference in their own experience, Paul's readers require only to recognise themselves as together God's  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ , and to discern reproach in the material experience of some of its members: this reproach is then understood as God's in which the readers share. The form of that reproach will occupy us in 3.4.2 below.

In light of this it would be pedantic, if not theologically ill-advised, to parse out the multiple senses of Christ's suffering in respect of either God or his house; for these are closely imbricated in Paul's account. But this is not to consign ourselves to the puzzlement faced by other interpreters. Rather, Paul's "fuzzy logic" in Rom 15:3 has been shown coherent by a well-motivated gesture of metalepsis – a specific gesture to a particular context – by which the reader has figured Christ as an imitable agent in the agency of zeal, and one invested in the  $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  of God, where the divine and human objects of reproach coinhere.

The theological yield of Paul's intertextual activity is high. The Roman church is identified in uncompromisingly theocentric terms, for it is God's house, such that the church's experience of reproach is to be understood in terms of reproach against God himself. Equally, the church is figured as the object of Christological

---

<sup>60</sup> The association of God's house, understood as the people of God, with God's name, is made by Paul himself in Rom 2:24, where Isaiah's words are commandeered: τὸ γὰρ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ δι' ὑμᾶς βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Isa 52:5). In the context of Rom 2, as of Isaiah, it is Israel's moral failure which elicits reproach (strictly, blaspheming; βλασφημέω), and not a reproach directed *against* Israel; the connection is not symmetrical with that drawn by the psalmist in Rom 15:3, but confirms it in negative terms.

<sup>61</sup> Gunkel 1998:91 illustrates the various ways in which the identification is made.

<sup>62</sup> For example, the psalmist's enemies may be represented as God's enemies (Ps 5:8, 10; more common in communal lament); the psalmist's suffering deprives God of the praise due to him (Ps 6:5; 29:10).

<sup>63</sup> Gunkel 1998:170 n.579. Gunkel also lists Ps 5:11 as "equating the request of the one praying ... with the concern of YHWH."

zeal. The agency of Christ himself is thus ecclesiocentrically invested; yet insofar as the church is the locus of God's reputation, that agency has its *telos* in the glory of God (cf. Rom 15:7).

A final question remains as to how this figuration might be realised in the imitation of the strong in their sociohistorical context; this is the topic of 3.4.2.

### 3.4.2 The sociohistorical relevance of Paul's quotation

In resolving the problem of predication, the reader has made of Paul's quotation a coherent statement in its particularity, apt to a Christological speaking subject; one which figures the psalmist as imitable in his zeal. Can we discern the likely form of imitation in the Roman context?

#### 3.4.2.1 A sociohistorical basis for reproach?

In particular, can we find in the social context of Roman life some referent for reproach – of God or of his “house” (as we have come to understand this) – that would give the quotation a particular force? We may wonder whether Paul's earlier admonition to “give place to wrath” (δοτε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ; 12:19) does not imagine some real offence in the Roman context construed both by Paul and his readers as against God.<sup>64</sup>

A suggestion offered by John Barclay may help at this point. Drawing on evidence from Philo and a variety of Roman sources, he finds a) that dietary laws were faithfully observed by Roman Jews of all social classes; b) that Jewish non-observance “would constitute a serious affront to the Jewish community”;<sup>65</sup> and c) that Gentile observance would constitute identification with Jews in Roman eyes. Most significantly, Barclay is able to trace signs of the stigma attached by Romans to Jewish particularity in the matter of food.<sup>66</sup> This allows him to argue that Paul's call to accommodation may entail for the strong a real social cost, and that this may account for the specific contribution of the quotation. As he puts it, “Perhaps Paul

---

<sup>64</sup> At a minimum, in reserving ἐκδίκησις to divine prerogative, Paul co-opts the matter of injury to divine interest; and by naming the speaker as κύριος, he asserts the prophetic provenance of his language, in which the injury of God's people and of God's name are closely bound; cf. Amos 2:7; Isa 48:11; 52:5.

<sup>65</sup> Barclay 1996:295.

<sup>66</sup> Barclay 1996:294-5.

intended to indicate a quite specific application to the case in point: the slanders and reproaches levelled at Jews in Rome would be shared by the strong to the extent that they were willing to adopt Jewish eating habits in their common Christian meals.”<sup>67</sup>

Barclay deploys a visual metaphor: “The psalm would ... be refracted through a double lens: it applies in the first instance to Christ absorbing the blasphemies directed against God, and by transference to the strong in Rome sharing the anti-Jewish sentiment which was suffered by Torah-observers.”<sup>68</sup> The rhetorical effect may be granted, though the logic of “transference” is not explicated. On our account, the “refraction” Barclay describes, and a mandate for “transference”, are underwritten by the coinherence of reproach directed against God and against his οἶκος (here, the “weak”; see 3.4.1.6).

Supported by our metaleptic argument, Barclay’s reading has the virtue of offering to explain why *just these words* were quoted by Paul in the expectation (signalled in 15:4) that they would be found relevant by the strong. To the structural coherence of Christ’s speech may now be added their clear material contribution to Paul’s argument.

### 3.4.2.2 An optional metaleptic extension: Ps 68:11

Having satisfied the predicative demands posed by the quotation through the transumption of Ps 68:10a, no further metaleptic impulse is generated by Paul’s text. Successfully predicated of Christ, however, the quotation may now be attributed to him by the reader as self-predication, such that Christ is installed as subject (cf. 3.2.2). Duly installed, Christ may be expected to say more about his experience of reproach, or about his zeal. It is highly suggestive, therefore, that in v.11 of the psalm, “zeal for your house” is shown to issue first in abstention from eating: in fasting (νηστεία) on behalf of the οἶκος, by which the psalmist’s soul is humbled,<sup>69</sup> and which occasions reproach (ὀνειδισμός). Insofar as Ps 68:11 is not only adjacent to v.10, but lends it specification (cf. καί, which links the two verses), it is a plausible

---

<sup>67</sup> Barclay 1996:294-5; 304-5; here, p.305.

<sup>68</sup> Barclay 1996:305 n.38.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Kraus 1993:62.

candidate for metalepsis; at least, for the curious reader who reflects on Christ's installation within the psalm.<sup>70</sup>

It is important, however, to distinguish the closely motivated metalepsis required to resolve the initial problem of predication from the extension just outlined to the following verse. The first is, we have argued, a *necessary* metalepsis, arising from the problematics of reading; the second, an *optional* extension, however well motivated. The first *enables* interpretation with a complement which completes the rhetorical figure, construed according to authorial intention by the implied reader; the second *enhances* interpretation with a supplement which extends the figure. The first is one which *establishes* a Christological subject; the second is *motivated by* the subject so established.

### 3.5 Romans 15:4: Psalm 68 as a source of hope and instruction

ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν.

#### 3.5.1 Written for our instruction – or for our (trans)formation?

Paul's rich evocation of the Christological psalmist will shortly issue in doxology, in a sequence rich with liturgical language (15:5-6). Prior to this, the apostle departs from personal custom to comment on the use just made of scripture (15:4): a move which has left many puzzled.<sup>71</sup> Earlier we cautioned against assuming the universal "givenness" of a Christological hermeneutic for psalmody so early in the development of tradition.<sup>72</sup> In light of this we might imagine that, in writing to congregations not formerly touched by his own teaching (as in Romans), Paul might think to comment on his Christological reading, uncertain of its familiarity to his

---

<sup>70</sup> Sufficiently curious readers may, like Hays, read elsewhere in the psalm, though as we have seen (3.4.1.3), this is a matter of picking and choosing, avoiding Christologically questionable setups (Ps 68:6) to promising verses (Ps 68:7); it is not a question of closely motivated metalepsis.

<sup>71</sup> Keck (1991:129) is sufficiently puzzled to argue for Rom 15:4 as an interpolation. Others are content to view the verse as digressive (e.g. Moo 1996:869; Thompson 1991:225).

<sup>72</sup> See 3.2.2 n.15.

recipients.<sup>73</sup> Yet there may be a more specific call for comment. It may be that Paul offers here a *hermeneutischer Lehrsatz* whose point is to warrant the hortatory use of the psalm, Christologically read. As Hays has observed, early messianic exegesis of the psalms was typically in the service of apologetic argument or soteriological reflection; Paul's use in paraenesis is novel, and so calls for justification.<sup>74</sup> This is what 15:4 supplies, in which we find that what was written beforehand – and here, the psalm just quoted is in view<sup>75</sup> – was written for our διδασκαλία.

Yet what kind of “instruction” is offered by 15:3? Does it consist simply in the provision of an example, which the reader is enjoined to understand and apply? Our analysis has shown otherwise, at least in practice. In the reading of 15:3, what begins with interpretation – with the desire to understand how Christ is exemplary of one who does not please himself – issues in the reader's metaleptic recovery of a disposition of zeal for God's house; it continues, for the reader who installs Christ as that zealous subject, in a trajectory of abstention, and the promise of reproach (3.4.2.2). It is the reader who calls the psalmic context to life, whose speech it is before it is given to Christ; thus to the reader the offer of suture is made.

### 3.5.2 Paul recognises the role of psalmody in formation

Such a journey is offered in interpretation; but is Paul alert to the dynamic? It may be that in affirming that what was written beforehand was “for our instruction”, Paul intends by διδασκαλία something broader than a modern intellectual formation,<sup>76</sup> encompassing such a formation of character as the psalmist

---

<sup>73</sup> On the other hand, insofar as Christ has been offered formally for predication, rather than required to be installed as speaking subject (3.2.2) – a Pauline indirection replicated in other quotations, as we shall see (cf. Chapters 4 and 6) – it may be that a convention of hearing Christ *as speaker* is not being presumed at all.

<sup>74</sup> Hays 2005:112-3; cf. Käsemann 1980:382. By the same token, Paul's *Lehrsatz* is *not* required to justify a substitution of referents in the quotation itself (*contra* Jewett 2007:881); for no such substitution has taken place (see 3.4.1.1).

<sup>75</sup> Clearly, 15:4 looks beyond the quotation in 15:3 to “whatever was written beforehand” (ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη): scriptural texts in general; psalmody in particular, as scripture's local instantiation in 15:3. But insofar as the occasion for 15:4 is Paul's *specific* use of scripture in 15:3, as we have just suggested, the immediate referent for γραφή is surely the quoted psalm, or that portion of it called metaleptically to view, and attributed to Christ. Indeed, the point should be stressed: for the quotation does not “encourage” save in Christological voice; nor may encouragement be readily taken from the quotation *in se*, so much as its metaleptic extension. In these respects, Paul's claim for παράκλησις confirms the reading we have offered of 15:3.

<sup>76</sup> In classical usage, διδασκαλία was no less at home in dramaturgy than in more “academic” contexts (LSJM q.v.). More importantly, the pedagogy of the classroom was clearly formative in its aims (Carr

undergoes.<sup>77</sup> The impression is strengthened when we see that the “encouragement of the scriptures” (ἡ παράκλησις τῶν γραφῶν) – presumably associated with its role as instructor – is co-ordinated with endurance (ὑπομονή), and issues with endurance in hope (ἐλπίς).<sup>78</sup> While endurance and hope are elsewhere bound together directly,<sup>79</sup> a middle term between the two is supplied earlier in Romans (5:3-4), where we learn that ὑπομονή serves to achieve (κατεργάζομαι) proven character (δοκιμή), which in turn grounds ἐλπίς.<sup>80</sup> Allied with ὑπομονή in Rom 15:4, the things that are written – here, elements of Ps 68 – instruct, we discover, by “bringing about” our proven character. Hinted here is Pauline recognition of the role of psalmody in such formation.<sup>81</sup>

In the same language we find figured the specific experience of formation we have traced for the quotation: for endurance is itself produced in suffering (Rom 5:3) and

---

2005:178-81), with imitation a core value. More generally on the structure and aims of classical education; cf. Bonner 1977; Marrou 1964, 1981; Morgan 1998.

<sup>77</sup> In a not dissimilar vein, compare Paul’s formulation in 1 Cor 10:11, where the things which happened to “our fathers” (1 Cor 10:1) were written down (ἐγράφη) for our instruction (νουθεσία). As in Rom 15, Christ is somehow key to the capacity of what is written to instruct: though he is nowhere a speaker within Paul’s intertextual account, his subjectivity is forcefully figured in the Christological πέτρα (1 Cor 10:4), which accompanies and nourishes the community then and now. 1 Cor 10 shares with Rom 15 an interest in psalmody; for the “writing” to which it refers consists not only in the narratives of Exodus and Numbers, but particularly in so-called “historical psalms”, together with the Song of Moses (Deut 32); these, at any rate, manifest strikingly in Paul’s midrashic exposition. Texts of this poetic kind offer to admonish or warn (allowing for the distinctive flavour of νουθεσία) through the formation of the one who prays or reads them, sutured to the subjectivity of the exodus experience encoded there. And indeed, Paul begins by “folding” space-time so as to inscribe the Corinthians – both Gentile and Jew – within the exodus story, and the wanderers within their own: nominally remote, the wanderers are “our fathers” (1 Cor 10:1); nominally pre-Christ, they follow him nonetheless, inscribed within the story as the moving rock (1 Cor 10:4).

<sup>78</sup> παράκλησις, ὑπομονή and ἐλπίς, here bound with scripture – and psalmody in particular – are richly collocated in 2 Cor 1:3-7. Of particular interest are the symmetries between the παράκλησις τῶν γραφῶν of the present verse, in its relation with ὑπομονή, and the παράκλησις of 2 Cor 1, in a discursive context which owes much to psalmody; see Chapter 5 for discussion of this passage.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος in 1 Thess 1:3. The genitive may be taken to generate endurance from hope (NIV), or to qualify hope as “steadfast” (NRSV).

<sup>80</sup> Only one verb (κατεργάζομαι) is explicit in Paul’s developing climax, linking suffering (θλιψις) and endurance (ὑπομονή); this verb must be supplied elliptically for other pairs. To serve throughout the climax, κατεργάζομαι must be taken in its most general sense: to achieve (BDAG; LSJM). But as the first pair illustrates, the links effected by the verb are elliptical. Suffering cannot be said to “achieve” endurance, except “when it is met by faith in God which receives it as God’s fatherly discipline. Where God sustains faith, tribulation produces ὑπομονή” (Cranfield 1975:261). Equally, we may ask, how does ὑπομονή “produce” δοκιμή, “the quality of provedness which is possessed by faith when it has stood up to testing, like the precious metal which is left when the base metals have been refined away” (Cranfield 1975:261)? In keeping with the elliptical demands of the logic here, we may reasonably infer the idea of formation: that endurance in suffering effects a process of character formation which results in provedness (and so “brings it about”); and this is the ground of hope (Rom 5:4). If understood similarly in Rom 15:4, endurance and the παράκλησις τῶν γραφῶν are implicated together in a process of formation which leads ultimately to hope.

<sup>81</sup> These hints are confirmed in 2 Cor 1, where identification with a Christological psalmist in suffering engenders a consolation whose outcome is patient endurance (ὑπομονή); cf. 5.2.4.2.

practised there (Rom 12:12); and it is the suffering of reproach and its entailments which the psalm enacts. In sum, Paul does not merely pause to justify his hortatory use of the psalm, but to acknowledge the way in which the psalm acts upon its readers. As we will shortly discover, this acknowledgement continues in the liturgical conclusion of 15:5-6.

It is worth pausing to note the significance of this discovery. Our analysis of Rom 15:3 has shown that the psalm is invoked in quotation in such a way as to invite suture; and that this entails the potential transformation of the subject. Put differently, to appropriate the example of Christ is to speak the psalm with him, or a fragment at least thereof, and to allow oneself to be shaped by its subjectivity. Paul's hortatory use of the psalm, Christologically voiced, thus offers in its effects a "discipleship of the soul" akin to that commended by the fathers.<sup>82</sup> It is perhaps no surprise to find psalmody working this way several centuries earlier than the fathers. The power of psalmody to shape subjectivity is not contingent on recognition of either its effects or its mode of operation, but is a matter of immanent discursive properties as these come to life in performance. Yet in Paul's hermeneutical comment in 15:4 we have found evidence that he was himself alert to the dynamic, and eager to endorse it.

### **3.5.3 Ps 68 configured for hope by the Christological subject**

But if the psalm exercises a constructive, and not merely instructive, power, we have still to ask how it issues particularly in "hope"; and it is here that the Christological subject plays a significant role. Generically, Ps 68 is an individual lament; and though the discourse of lament is dominated by suffering and protest, in biblical psalmody it issues almost invariably in hope. Thus, the psalmist enters a trajectory which leads eventually to the hope of a reconstituted self (68:30-34), and ultimately of a restored Zion (68:35-36).

Yet this psalm is not easily characterised as a psalm of hope, particularly when set alongside other so-called "royal laments".<sup>83</sup> The hoped-for redemption is not realised – even proleptically – in the psalm, but remains in an unspecified future. It

---

<sup>82</sup> See 1.3.2.1 n.95.

<sup>83</sup> Pss 17; 21; 30; 39; 41; 68. Of these, only in Ps 41 is hope similarly attenuated. The lexeme ἐλπίς does not occur in Ps 68.

is the installation of Christ as the quotation's speaker which certifies the psalm as a source of hope.<sup>84</sup> This it does by offering to superimpose a Christological narrative on the spare framework of lament: a narrative which embodies the patient endurance whose *telos* is hope (Rom 5:3-4), but which we know from Romans,<sup>85</sup> as elsewhere in Paul,<sup>86</sup> concludes and climaxes in resurrection: the very ground of hope,<sup>87</sup> and its most material sign.

If this analysis is correct, it offers to shed light on the question of hermeneutical priority: not, to be sure, on the diachronic question of the way in which the psalm and Christ came to be associated in the tradition; but rather, in synchronic terms, of the relative priority of two narratives, or two distinguishable sources of narrative, in the moment of reading, where the grounds for hope must be construed.<sup>88</sup> In such a moment, elements of Christological narrative – whose coordinates are drawn primarily from outside the psalm – have been shown to “lead” the supply of hope in 15:3-4, thereby qualifying Ps 68 to serve as an instance of scripture, written for the formation of the believer. Paul's comment in Rom 15:4 on the hermeneutical event of 15:3 reveals not that a story about Christ has been interpreted in light of the psalm, Christologically read, but that the psalm has been read in light of a Christological story which – in the critical aspect of hope – it imperfectly reflects. As we shall see in Chapter 4, this finding is consistent with the intertextuality of Ps 17 in 15:9, and in conflict with Hays, who claims the hermeneutical priority of the psalm at that point.

---

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Rom 15:12, in which the root of Jesse is designated the hope of the nations. In Rom 5:2, the hope in which we boast is of “the glory of God”; a hope sketched programmatically in 2 Cor 3:18, and given Christological focus in 2 Cor 4:6, where “the light of the knowledge of the glory of God” is precisely ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>85</sup> Rom 6:5; 8:11.

<sup>86</sup> 1 Cor 15:3-4; cf. Phil 2:5-11.

<sup>87</sup> 1 Cor 15:17-20.

<sup>88</sup> The notion of priority must not be taken too strictly or too abstractly, as though two monolithic and fully specified narratives – one psalmic, one Christological – were jostling for hermeneutical precedence. In our story of reading, the hermeneutical event takes place as the reader encounters the text, adding narrative elements from the psalm and from the reader's storied perception of the Christ event, and negotiating their interanimation. The reader does this construing the intention of a prior reader, the author “Paul”; see 1.2. Within such a story of reading, it is appropriate to speak of the relative priority of narrative sources in the act of reading, particularly where a reader construes conflict between the narrative elements they offer.

### 3.6 Romans 15:5-6: the outcomes of formation, and its *telos* in praise

<sup>15:5</sup> ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δώη ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν,<sup>6</sup> ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Through his invitation to take up the subjectivity of the psalm ἐν Χριστῷ, Paul has constituted strong and weak together as a people of imitation. This is confirmed in the divine predicates of 15:5a; for in characterising God precisely as the God of ὑπομονή and παράκλησις (cf. 15:4), Paul affirms that the formative role of scripture remains in view, now understood in terms of its divine provenance. Imitation's formative result is then declared: a common mind among the community (15:5b), which issues in univocal praise (15:6). Yet again we find Paul signalling the role of scripture; for the common mind is given “in conformity with Christ” (κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν):<sup>89</sup> a gift made proximately (15:3-4), in the conformation of strong and weak to the Christological subject of the psalm.<sup>90</sup>

Continuity within these verses is secured through Paul's entry into the mode of liturgy – occasioned, not least, by his earlier engagement with psalmody, its

---

<sup>89</sup> Taking *κατὰ* in a marked but legitimate sense; most read “according to [the example of] Christ Jesus” (BDAG q.v.). Käsemann takes the phrase, against the majority, to express accordance with “the will of the Kyrios”. As he puts it, “The most important criterion of the way taught in Scripture is that it runs under Christ's lordship. This is also the only guarantee of authentic unity. This expresses itself in worship in common and single-minded praise” (1980:383). But this is to underestimate Paul's confidence in the power of scripture – here, psalmody, since it was in taking up the psalm that Christ became exemplary – to form those who submit to the subjectivity it offers them. The guarantee of authentic unity consists in corporate conformity with the Christ of the psalm, not in some extrinsic factor. That said, Käsemann's criterion is not finally falsified, insofar as Christ vocalises the psalm precisely as its discursive κύριος, conscripting it to hope; cf. Ps 17:50, where the Christological κύριος speaks (4.2.1.2).

<sup>90</sup> The phrase τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν might be construed any of three ways, each of which reinforces the logic of formation for which we have argued. 1) Without an extrinsic referent, the phrase emphasises commonality: “to think the same (among one another)”. Commonality of mind in turn is what is produced as diverse readers enter individually and repeatedly into a shared psalmic text, particularly in shared performance contexts; each comes to be similarly shaped by its subjectivity. 2) If the phrase is taken with κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, it emphasises the character of the common mind as Christological (cf. Phil 2:6). In this it points to Rom 15:3, where we found the Christological mind subjectively rendered (taking φρονέω to refer to disposition; BDAG q.v.). Only in 15:3, moreover, is the categorical distinction between strong and weak overcome (as each takes up the disposition of the Christological psalmist), and the Romans constituted “in common”, so as to receive ἐν ἀλλήλοις the gift of a common mind. 3) If the phrase is taken with κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, and the latter phrase denotes not the mind of Christ but the will of the Christological κύριος (Käsemann 1980:383; but cf. previous note), then the content of φρονεῖν is still determined in 15:3, for the will of the κύριος is invested precisely in his zeal for the church, metaleptically figured there.

discursive instrument.<sup>91</sup> Marked formally by divine predication<sup>92</sup> and the optative δῶη,<sup>93</sup> Paul's heightened discourse issues finally in liturgy's defining moment: corporate worship, in united voice, of a high and lofty God. For this reason, worship is not so much expressive of unity<sup>94</sup> as immanent to the process which produces it: for all to pray the psalm κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν is, finally, to worship ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι.

In these verses Paul accomplishes the repristination of human speech, overturning the silence effected by the Law (2.4.1), and symbolically enacted in David's rhetorical censure (Chapter 2 *passim*).<sup>95</sup> It is in the imitation of the Christological psalmist that speech is renewed, now in the praise of God. Indeed, Christ himself will be found amid the worshippers just three verses later, in the striking opening to a catena of psalm quotations rich in Christological perspective, and in which David's displacement is complete. That catena is the focus of our next chapter.

---

<sup>91</sup> Cf. 15:13 on the heels of 15:9-12, considered below in Chapter 4 below. Of course, the affinities of liturgy with psalmody may work both ways here: the heightened language of 15:5-6 may hint that more than just the quoted words were in Paul's mind as he wrote 15:3: a point suggestive for our metaleptic analysis.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. the "solemn divine predicates" (Käsemann 1980:383) which have a particular home in psalmody (Harder 1936:65).

<sup>93</sup> The form is a *hapax legomenon* in Paul (BDAG q.v.; BDF 95.2).

<sup>94</sup> Käsemann 1980:383.

<sup>95</sup> On the toxicity of human speech in Romans, and the role of doxology in its purification, cf. Gaventa 2008.

# 4. Christological cinema and the eclipse of the Davidic subject: Romans 15:9-12

---

## 4.1 Introduction

### 4.1.1 A Christological tracking shot and its Isaianic reverse

In Rom 15:3 we found a Christological subject installed in psalmody, there to provide not a vague example to Paul's readers, but a metaleptically enriched subject to which they might closely conform, as a means to the formation of character (15:4). The fruit of that conformation we saw in a unity of mind and voice in praise: conformed to the psalmist, the Romans become themselves a chorus of psalmists, engaged in the praise of their God (15:5-6).

Three verses later we find Christ himself in their midst. The consummation of individual psalmody, and particularly lament, is in the repristination of its voice in the community of faith;<sup>1</sup> so, in Rom 15:9, the Christological psalmist – earlier engaged in lament<sup>2</sup> – enters at last into corporate worship.

Rom 15:9 τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν,  
καθὼς γέγραπται·  
διὰ τοῦτο ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν  
καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ.  
10 καὶ πάλιν λέγει·  
εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.  
11 καὶ πάλιν·  
αἰνεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, τὸν κύριον  
καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί.  
12 καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει·  
ἔσται ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν,  
ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν.

The catena which opens in 15:9, dominated by psalm quotations, is a richly visual sequence which finds Paul in the director's chair. This chapter deploys a cinematic

---

<sup>1</sup> See 5.3.3.4.

<sup>2</sup> Ps 68 (quoted in Rom 15:3) conforms clearly to the generic requirements of individual lament (Tate 1990:192; Gunkel 1998:121).

model to discover the way in which his images are constructed, and whose gaze they represent. Of course, the materials of Paul's cinema are scriptural, so we will play close attention to the function of his intertexts throughout. How do they nourish the director's vision?

The nature and extent of metaleptic activity prompted by the text will occupy us here, as it has before. The psalm voiced at Rom 15:9 is closely associated with David, so that Christ's installation as speaking subject invites us to return to the focus of Chapter 2, to learn what becomes of Davidic subjectivity in Paul, now under the aegis of Christ. We will learn in respect of 15:9 that metalepsis, if motivated at all, brings about either the downfall of David (if local context is transumed) or of Christological particularity (if such context is excluded). Subsequent intertextual sites in the catena confirm this picture, inviting us to consider whether Paul is engaged in metaleptic subversion, asserting Christ's subjectivity in psalmody as a novel, even contrary thing.

#### **4.1.2 Multiple subjects coordinated by a Christological gaze**

Paul's last catena in Romans, drawn largely from psalmody, finds Christ and David both in attendance; or so it seems. Indeed, they appear to enter and leave the intertextual stage together. Christ is attached, after lengthy introduction (15:8-9a) to the quintessentially Davidic Ps 17; both are figured by Isaiah in the "root of Jesse" (15:12). Yet they are not alone.

Unlike the catena in Rom 3:10-18 (cf. 2.4.2), the present sequence of quotations preserves the possibility of distinct and particular subjects; Isaiah is of course named (15:12). Preceded by Paul's emphatic authorial λέγω (15:8a), all quotations save one are granted a verb of writing (15:9) or of speech (15:10,12); indeed, the change of domain between written and spoken in a single sequence may itself suggest a change of subject. At the very least, the repeated καὶ πάλιν declares the cumulative, supplemental character of the whole;<sup>3</sup> it encourages the reader to identify the speaker anew, though it does not promise a change of speaker.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> BDAG q.v. 3.

<sup>4</sup> καὶ πάλιν λέγει, or equally καὶ πάλιν, is, however, neutral with respect to *who* is identified: the same speaker may emerge in each case. In a sense, this is just what happens; see below.

In the event, the task of identifying speakers in 15:10 and 15:11 will prove curiously difficult, and ultimately ill-conceived; and the force of καὶ πάλιν (λέγει) may be otherwise construed. Such is the potency of Christ's subjectivity in the first quotation, so great the illocutionary force of his words, as we shall see, that it is finally better to take the quotations which follow *sub specie Christi*. Indeed, the uncertainty of speaker identification in these two verses paves the way for the subjective influence of Christ throughout.

A cinematic metaphor may help to describe the rhetorical effect of this highly visual sequence. In its subjectivity the catena resembles an extended tracking shot in cinema, with a concluding reverse shot. Even more than static long shots, extended tracking shots are designed to intensify and prolong the experience of suture with the cinematic subject. Unlike static shots, which labour to conceal the subjectivity of the camera,<sup>5</sup> long tracking shots frequently celebrate it.<sup>6</sup> Reverse shots, on the other hand, satisfy the desire to know whose gaze is shared, a desire which grows until the reverse shot is made. As applied to the catena, the model suggests a seamless sharing of the gaze of the dominant subject, and a growing desire to learn who that subject is; the reverse shot which reveals him satisfies<sup>7</sup> and, as we shall see (4.5.2), provokes review. A study of that gaze in its choice of subjects and horizon will yield further insight into the Christological psalmist, offered again – as we saw in 15:3 – for imitation.

Though the backstory is supplied in 15:7-8, the immediate set-up for the shot is in 15:9a, where Christ is designated a servant of the Gentiles, on behalf of mercy, for the glory of God.<sup>8</sup> The set-up is necessarily oblique: the initial gaze is one in which the viewer's willing participation is sought, and if the Christological subject is installed too

---

<sup>5</sup> See 1.3.2.3.

<sup>6</sup> Both for their effectiveness in offering a rich and prolonged experience of suture, and in celebrating the power of cinematic artifice, extended tracking shots commonly open movies; cf. Altman's *The Player* (1992); Welles' *Touch of Evil* (1958). Among the more celebrated shots of this kind is one found in Scorsese's *Goodfellas* (1990), in which the protagonist, played by Ray Liotta, walks through the Copacabana club with his wife, played by Lorraine Bracco. This is her first experience of the gangster lifestyle, and a seductive one; the camera invites the viewer to share the latter's viewpoint and undergo her seduction. Such a proposal entails a strong and persistent invitation to suture, which the long shot facilitates by deferring the point at which the camera's point of view is revealed, conventionally by reverse shot.

<sup>7</sup> The reverse shot is of course a deceit (Silverman 1983:201-2); whichever subject is revealed, it is never the camera. In the same vein, Christ will be revealed as the viewing subject; yet it is Paul's directorial vision which has been enacted. See further 4.5.1 below.

<sup>8</sup> This designation is made elliptically, and depends on a disputed reading of the syntax; for its justification, see 4.2.3 n.43.

directly as the quotation's subject, this participation, or suture, will be deferred.<sup>9</sup> We observed a somewhat similar dynamic in the case of Rom 15:3. There, a challenge of predication enabled the reader to bring coherence to Christ's speech, and so to desire more of it, inviting him further into the psalm (4.2.1.2). The obliqueness of the identification in 15:9a likewise engages the reader's energies in confirming Christ as the quotation's subject. Having made this investment, she desires more, and so is sutured to the gaze of the Christological subject which presides over the catena, seeing what and as he sees. The logic of imitation underwrites participation at both sites.<sup>10</sup>

The tracking shot itself begins in 15:9b, where Christ assumes (indirectly) the voice of the psalm. The camera's POV (point-of-view) is thereby suggested as his; and its gaze is on the Gentiles, among whom he will stand in worship. Paul's Christological camera carries the reader through two further scenes (15:10, 11). The sign of repetition and supplement – καὶ πάλιν – ensures the continuity of the shot throughout, until the reverse shot of 15:12 identifies the subject whose gaze we have shared. There, Christ himself comes into view, while the camera pans back to take in the sweep of his rule.

We will review this shot in some detail, as it promises extensive insight into the agency and perspective of the Christological subject through the language of psalmody. As a mode of analysis, it invites us to focus less on the various speakers of each quotation than on the images their words construct. Of course, the validity of such an undertaking depends on finding Christ in 15:9b, and in learning what way he comes to be associated with the psalm from which his words are drawn. To that task we now turn.

## 4.2 Romans 15:9: metaleptic subversion: Christ as the *telos* of David

Rom 15:9 τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν, καθὼς γέγραπται· διὰ τοῦτο ἔξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ.

Ps 17:50 διὰ τοῦτο ἔξομολογήσομαί σοι ἐν ἔθνεσιν κύριε καὶ τῷ ὀνόματί σου ψαλῶ

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Silverman 1983:202-3.

<sup>10</sup> See 4.2.1.2 below on Rom 15:9.

## 4.2.1 Christ installed as the psalmist in Rom 15:9b

In the first of Paul's quotations (Rom 15:9b), a remarkable declaration is made, drawn from Ps 17:50: "Therefore I will confess you among the nations, and sing praises to your name." The declaration is remarkable because, as I shall shortly argue, it comes from the mouth of Christ; but once this is granted, it becomes more intriguing by virtue of the image it creates. If Paul's intention was to signal the advent of mercy among the Gentiles by the agency of Christ, he required only the first clause of the quotation. But Christ resolves not only to confess: he will also sing (ψάλλω);<sup>11</sup> and both of these acts he will do "among" (ἐν) the Gentiles.<sup>12</sup> The *telos* of such singing is of course the glory of God, signalled already in this verse (15:9a), but linked explicitly with praise in 15:5-6. There we found Roman corporate praise conditioned by formation κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν; put differently, the Romans were called and enabled to praise ἐν χριστῷ. Here we find this logic confirmed through its obverse: Christ enters into corporate praise ἐν ἔθνεσιν.<sup>13</sup>

### 4.2.1.1 Candidates for speaking subject

As the first element in an extended shot, this quotation – in both its parts – works powerfully, if indirectly, to name its perspective as Christ's own. It is the most extensive quotation, Isaiah's excepted. It is also the most intimate: though the Gentiles are evoked, they are not summoned; and Christ's action is to come among them, ostensibly – and strikingly<sup>14</sup> – as an equal in the familiarity of song. His speech is his own. By such means the camera eschews a high vantage point; positioned low, it constructs a scene of surprising intimacy.

Yet for all this, Christ is never directly installed as viewer; and if the virtue of such indirection is the possibility of suture, its cost is debate. Thus, the image of Christ

---

<sup>11</sup> "Sing, sing praise, make melody" (BDAG 891).

<sup>12</sup> The Gentiles are supplied elliptically for the second clause, under the conventional terms of parallelism.

<sup>13</sup> Of course, Christ sings among *the Gentiles*, not the congregation of strong and weak; but the apparent partiality is amended as the catena continues; see 4.3.1 and 4.4 below.

<sup>14</sup> In the figured world of psalmody, praise and confession – as addressed to God – are acts notably constitutive of the humanity of their subjects. To confess God, in particular, is to forgo the self-representation normally afforded by speech in order to represent the divine Other; the one who confesses assumes a position of deepest contingency. To praise, equally, is to consecrate one's voice to the exaltation of the Other. In the quotation of Rom 15:9b, as equally in the psalm, these kenotic acts are promised directly to God in second person; the "I" constituted thereby is precisely not-God: not God, but human. Little in Paul's discourse from 14:1 to this point prepares the reader for such a "low" Christological voice; hence, the effect is striking, and will become more so when this voice is shown to be that of the κύριος (4.2.1.2).

praising God among the Gentiles is by no means universally accepted. Thinking that any other subject would have to have been named, Käsemann takes Paul to be declaring his own ministry among the Gentiles: the quotation is thus governed by λέγω (15:8a).<sup>15</sup> But the first accomplishment of Paul's λέγω is to establish Christ at the centre of what follows; and this precisely by name.<sup>16</sup> Jewett reaches a similar conclusion to that of Käsemann, thinking Christ's apparent segue from third to first person unlikely.<sup>17</sup> Further, he finds the idea of Christ praising God *among the Gentiles* to be at odds with the known career of Jesus. But the eschatological orientation of the passage, as equally of the psalm under interpretation, is not to be constrained by the earthly career of Jesus.<sup>18</sup>

Others look to the psalm or its attributed psalmist to help identify its voice in Paul. Dunn, attracted to the idea of structure in the catena (David (15:9); the Gentiles (15:10-11); both together (15:12) engaged in the praise of God),<sup>19</sup> settles on David as “the devout Jew ... foreshadowing the situation of the diaspora Jew, and now particularly of the Jewish Christian.” In doing so he is no doubt alert to the Davidic character of the psalm; and implicit in the identification he offers is a claim about author and readers: both take the psalm to be Davidic.

<sup>15</sup> Käsemann 1980:386-87.

<sup>16</sup> Wilk (2009:282 n.64) can find no support “in the Pauline surroundings” for the claim that Christ is presented as speaker of the psalm; against which, cf. 4.2.1.2 below. Further, he suggests that such a thesis “stands in tension with the context of the citation”, which he gives as Ps 17:51: μεγαλύνων τὰς σωτηρίας τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιῶν ἔλεος τῷ χριστῷ αὐτοῦ τῷ Δαυιδ καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος. Wilk proposes an instrumental dative (claiming ἐλέεω + instr. dat. in Rom 11:30), enforces a reading of σωτηρία as consistently “salvation in Christ” in Paul, and invokes Rom 1:3 to distinguish David from his Christological seed. On these grounds, he argues, “[Paul] has probably understood the Psalm verse as follows: “(The LORD) increases the saving deeds of his king and brings about mercy through his Christ, David and his seed unto the distant future.” The argument is specious, however, predicated on an imagined Pauline rereading of unquoted material, which must be regarded as speculative. But it is far from clear that the exercise of divine mercy characterises the acts of the warrior-king to this point (see 4.2.2), as portrayed in the verses leading up to the quotation. Proximately, the Davidic subject alone is the beneficiary of divine mercy (17:49), so that continued mercy *to* (not *through*) the anointed king and his seed is the likeliest prospect in 17:51. But these earlier verses do not figure in “the context” adduced by Wilk. On the import of potential context from the psalm, see 4.2.2 below.

<sup>17</sup> Jewett 2007:894.

<sup>18</sup> Indeed, as Rom 15:18 makes clear, Paul understands his own mission among the Gentiles to be Christ's. It is by no means unnatural, therefore, to find Christ confessing God among the nations.

<sup>19</sup> Dunn 1988:849, following Michel (1978). There is a certain appeal to the idea of logical sequence in this catena since, as we have noted, καὶ πάλιν suggests a supplemental progression: something new is added by each quotation, which nonetheless fits with what precedes it. Yet there are various ways to construe logical progression, not all of which require a devout Jew (whether David or, with Käsemann, Paul) as subject in 15:9b. With Christ as first subject, for example, 15:9b declares an eschatological intent, whose fulfillment Moses (15:10) and David (15:11) demand; Isaiah supplies the warrant in 15:12. Paul thus adduces Law, Writings and Prophets in support of a Christological declaration (Dunn 1988:845); though whether the Writings constituted a canonical division for Paul is moot. Differently, by taking ἐν ἔθνεσιν as including Jew and Gentile together, Schlier (1977 *ad loc*) finds in the first quotation an *Überschrift* for the catena as a whole; but this is to stretch the referential range of the term. Rather, Jew and Gentile are drawn together later in the catena, in 15:11; see below.

Given the slipperiness of David as a signifier, much more in adjectival form,<sup>20</sup> the content of such a claim must be carefully specified. The claim gains in interest when we consider the psalm in question; for Ps 17 may be thought “Davidic” in a variety of ways, depending on what one takes as a discursive starting point. In order to find the devout Jew, Dunn must look some distance back in the psalm from the quoted verse, which occurs near its end. Ps 17:20-28 configures the psalmist as blameless and devout (vv.21-24), paradigmatic of a humble (ταπεινός v.28) people. But this David is quickly submerged beneath the avenging warrior king of later verses; and it is from this latter subject that the pledge to praise is heard.<sup>21</sup>

Richard Hays finds a somewhat different David in the psalm, figured particularly near its end (Ps 17:51): a messianic king, or a king with messianic seed, with or as whom Christ may be readily positioned as subject not only of the quotation in Rom 15:9b, but of the psalm from which it is drawn. In taking Christ as the speaking subject in 15:9b, Hays aligns himself with the majority; however, the “kind” of Christ he finds figured in the quotation as subject of speech owes much to the messianic David, as we have just suggested, and this is a less fashionable claim.

#### 4.2.1.2 A renewed call to imitation confirms a Christological subject

We will shortly question the influence of David on the subjectivity of the quotation; but in the meantime, we can affirm with Hays that Christ is indeed the best candidate for speaker. Key to this, as Hays correctly discerns,<sup>22</sup> is the renewed presentation of Christ as one to be imitated. Richly exhibited in 15:1-4, and confirmed in the κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν of 15:5 as we have seen, the call to imitation is issued equally in 15:7, represented below; nor is the model dissimilar.

Rom 15:7 Διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

---

<sup>20</sup> As a qualifier, “Davidic” may qualify in any degree. The nominal “David”, by contrast, claims to be binary: it refers, or fails to refer.

<sup>21</sup> The two are not incompatible, of course: a Davidic warrior-king may surely be humble and devout. But the exalted account of kingly exploits (17:38ff.), which promise to constitute him “head of the nations” (17:44, set in the future) is not easily assimilable to the earlier image, especially in the moment of later interpretation.

<sup>22</sup> Hays 2005:103.

The Christ of 15:3 took up reproach out of zeal for God’s house – for strong and weak united; the Christ of 15:8-9a became a servant out of a similar zeal, now for Jew and Gentile, united in fellowship (15:7) and praise (15:10-11). Equally, where reproach against God’s people is figured in 15:3 as reproach against God, as we have seen, then here we find a further correlation: their unity is for God’s glory (15:7) and his praise (15:10-11).<sup>23</sup> Most pertinently, the sharing of reproach is accomplished in Christ (15:3); so also, the sharing of praise (15:8-12). It is not difficult to hear the voice of Christ, therefore, in the quotation of 15:9b; indeed, the reader who has felt the impress of the Christological psalmist in 15:3 will be predisposed to do so.

Additionally, as noted even by some of those who eschew a Christological subject here (such as Dunn),<sup>24</sup> this reading offers to account for the omission of the address (κύριε) from the quotation: “It is the κύριος who speaks.”<sup>25</sup> Given the prevalence of κύριος language in the psalm (on which, see below), the omission should be judged significant for Paul. Not only does it confirm a Christological voice for the quotation, but it offers a hint of the high Christology which will emerge over the catena’s course, and definitively in the rule of 15:12.<sup>26</sup>

But this elegant solution is highly problematic for Christ’s alignment with David as the psalm’s speaker since, in rhetorical terms, David is constructed precisely *opposite* the κύριος. To be the κύριος in *this* psalm is, emphatically, to be *not-David*;<sup>27</sup> indeed, it is to

---

<sup>23</sup> More exactly, the correlation of unity and glory in these verses is the obverse of Paul’s reading of Isa 52:5 in Rom 2:24.

<sup>24</sup> Dunn 1988:849; similarly, Hays 2005:103. Käsemann, for his part, acknowledges that his own proposal for subject – Paul – fails to explain the omission, but claims that “no other interpretation can offer any cogent grounds for this either” (1980:386).

<sup>25</sup> Hays 2005:103. Silva (2001:285) judges the omission of κύριε to be textually insignificant. Koch (1986:87) thinks the omission “offenbar um ein mögliches Mißverständnis von κύριος im Sinne von Χριστός von vornherein auszuschließen.” Such a sensibility bespeaks the significance of making this identification.

<sup>26</sup> In fact, the “reverse shot” of 15:12, which confirms Christ as the one whose gaze we have followed throughout 15:9-12, encourages the reader to discover earlier traces of the high Christology figured in Isaiah’s “ruler”. Recalling the designation of Jesus Christ as Lord as recently as 15:6, the subject of 15:9b is recognised as κύριος, and the impact of that first quotation’s extraordinary image is enhanced: the ruler of the Gentiles is he who worships among them, figured in humility.

<sup>27</sup> Indeed, the opposition of David and κύριος is what constitutes the psalm as prayer, and the psalmist as a viable subject; cf. Fisch (1988:109), cued by reflection on MT Ps 63: “[W]e do not have here an autonomous ego at all: the ‘I’ of the poem is in a real sense constituted by the dialogue with the ‘Thou’. There is no ‘person’ behind the ‘I’ whose existence can be separated from that relationship.” In the present case, the opposition of psalmist and κύριος is established strikingly as the psalm begins. Declaring his intention to love (ἀγαπήσω), David lavishes attention on the object of love, so that verse 3 becomes an encomium of the κύριος in his many-splendored might, invoking some of the strongest and most pervasive metaphors within the psalmic lexicon (for which cf. Creach 1996 and Brown 2002). κύριος is itself widely attested in the psalm (in 17 of 51 verses; three times in v. 1): in absolute terms, only Pss 117

be God in the most exalted terms. By installing Christ as κύριος in the quotation, the reader establishes an irreducible distance between the Christological and Davidic subjects, and waits to learn just how far from David – messianic, royal or “everyman” – Christ may prove to be in his speech.

#### 4.2.2 Contrary metalepsis: Christ as nemesis of the Davidic psalmist

Christ it is, then, who speaks in the quotation; though as the κύριος, and therefore not, it seems, in the person of David. But what if Christ’s voice were enriched metaleptically by the Davidic psalm whose words it utters? Recall the situation we described in Rom 15:3, where a quotation from Ps 68 required metalepsis for its intelligibility as Christological speech. Is the same dynamic at work here?

Hays wishes to argue that the *whole* psalm, or more specifically its *narrative*, forms an allusive backdrop to Paul’s quotation. On his reckoning:

[T]he image of Christ praising God among the Gentiles must be interpreted not as an isolated proof text about Gentiles but as an allusion to the narrative of the psalm as a whole: ‘David’ praises God for delivering him from death and Sheol (vv. 4-6) and from his enemies.<sup>28</sup>

But the first part of this claim is extraordinary: for while the psalmist’s deliverance from the grip of Sheol may be aptly associated with Christ, it is a generic motif widely attested in the psalms;<sup>29</sup> in no sense need we imagine a metaleptic appeal to Psalm 18 MT (vv. 4-6) *in particular*, where this motif is encoded in the psalm’s narrative, at some textual and thematic remove.<sup>30</sup> Sensing this, perhaps, Hays extends his narrative summary to include David’s deliverance “from his enemies”; but such an extension is generic in the extreme, encompassing almost any and every notice of thanksgiving in psalmody.

---

and 118 feature more instances of the lemma (though the present psalm is, admittedly, somewhat longer); while the vocative κύριε occurs four times – again, well beyond the statistical average in canonical psalms.<sup>28</sup> Hays 2005:114.

<sup>29</sup> For Hades and deliverance cf. Pss 29:4; 48:16; 85:13; esp. 114:3, which looks to Ps 17 in correlating death and Sheol in deliverance; cf. also 15:10; 87:4; 88:49. For death and deliverance (without Sheol), see also 9:14; 54:5; 55:14; cf. also 12:4; 32:19; 67:21; 88:49; MT 88:15.

<sup>30</sup> The thematic distance is the more significant. In claiming Paul’s allusion to the *narrative* of the psalm, Hays limits the force of an argument from the linear text: it does not greatly matter that deliverance from Sheol occurs early in the *text* of the psalm, if it can be closely correlated with the praising voice of 17:50 at some “sub-structural” level. At this level of cognition (= *dianoia*?), metaleptic distances are short for a competent reader. But the formulaic, familiar quality of deliverance from Sheol argues against such a metaleptic leap; and in the event, a more salient, particular, and textually proximate narrative of deliverance is available at the site of quotation (see below). This needs no supplement. On the underlying logic of claims of this kind, see 1.2.4 above; on the difficulties presented by psalmic discourse, see 1.3.1.

In Hays' defence we might adduce the narrative superscription to Ps 17, in which a *particular* "deliverance from enemies"<sup>31</sup> is made the occasion for David's speech. There, as in 2 Sam 22:1, we find that David addressed the psalm to the Lord "on the day the Lord rescued him from the hand of all his enemies and from the hand of Saul." Yet this superscription is of less help than it appears. For all its specific connection with the text of 2 Samuel, it is unable to secure David's subjectivity against any particular account of deliverance found there;<sup>32</sup> the psalm's generic cast is unqualified. Nor, therefore, does it bring the Gentiles specifically to view, as the reader of Paul's quotation might hope.<sup>33</sup>

Not an allusion to "the narrative of the psalm as a whole", then. A narrative of deliverance from enemies is, however, proximate to the quoted verse, in which the Gentiles clearly figure,<sup>34</sup> and these verses Hays finds "particularly provocative" when read within a Christological framework.<sup>35</sup> But the psalmist is delivered from his enemies by destroying them (vv.38, 39, 41, 43); while the Gentile conquered, denied God's mercy (Ps 17:42), come cringing (אֲשַׁקְּטָא MT 18:44), bereft even of integrity,<sup>36</sup> before a proud and fearsome lord. This portrait is not easily matched with Paul's exposition. The Gentiles proclaimed by Paul as grateful recipients of God's mercy are in the psalm expressly denied it; nor does it come to them in the action of the king, whose (doubtless

<sup>31</sup> εἰς τὸ τέλος τῷ παιδί κυρίου τῷ Δαυιδ ἃ ἐλάλησεν τῷ κυρίῳ τοὺς λόγους τῆς ᾠδῆς ταύτης ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ἐρρύσατο αὐτὸν κύριος ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς Σαουλ (Ps 17:1).

<sup>32</sup> The attempt is certainly made: ἐλάλησεν and ἐρρύσατο set up the expectation of singular address and singular rescue, and these on a particular day – ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἣ ... (Ps 17:1). But David ultimately resists association with a narrative moment – a singular rescue – in favour of a genre of such moments. The betrayal is intertextual: Psalm 17's parallel in 2 Sam 22, recalled immediately in the title, arises from a summary account of military campaigns, preceded by an account of the death of Saul (2 Sam 21:15-22). As Craigie points out (1983:173), this narrative context "does not permit the identification of the psalm with a particular event or military victory." More generally on the Davidic subject in 2 Sam 22 see Noll 1997:118-51.

<sup>33</sup> Indeed, the Gentiles are altogether lost to view, subsumed within the generic ἐχθροί. If the narrative of the psalm as a whole is encoded in its superscription, the Gentiles so important to Paul are effectively marginalised. If anything, the superscription's juxtaposition of "the hand of his enemies" and "the hand of Saul" connotes opposition from within Israel, not without.

<sup>34</sup> Ps 17:38-49; cf. 17:18, though ῥύσεται is future, against MT.

<sup>35</sup> Hays 2005:114.

<sup>36</sup> The effects of Davidic agency on the conquered Gentiles are particularly striking in the OG. In 17:44 the Gentiles respond immediately to David's command (εἰς ἀκοὴν ὧτι οὐκ ὑπήκουσέν), yet deceptively (υἱὸς ἀλλότριος ἐψεύσασάντό μοι); the translators have followed the typical sense of the verb כָּחַשׁ in MT, especially in pi'el (as here in the psalm); cf. HALOT q.v. In 17:45 David's command is felt in their bodies: the withered (נָבַל) foreigners of MT 18:44 have become old (ἐπαλαιώθησαν), the trembling (רָחַח) now limp (ἐχώλαναν). Even more than in MT, this characterisation of the conquered Gentiles distances them from the praising subjects of the catena: before their new overlord they are without integrity of either body or speech.

hyperbolic) account of their destruction would not readily emanate from the Christological ruler in whom Isaiah's Gentiles hope (Rom 15:12).

If, as Hays appears to suggest, Paul is cognisant of David's conquest in the psalm and of his ruined subjects, then he has become a very strong misreader indeed; this is at least plausible, and not without (lesser) precedent, even in Romans.<sup>37</sup> Perhaps Hays means just this in suggesting the "provocative" effect of reading the psalm Christologically. If so, however, Paul can only mean through his wilful misprision to achieve the end of Davidic messianism as a substantive source for Christological reflection; acknowledging a messianic connection through a metaleptic echo of the psalm's final verse, he nonetheless strips it of any but the most schematic, depicularised relevance.

For Hays, nonetheless, Christ's occupation of the psalm signifies "a typological hermeneutic of continuity", in contrast to the prediction-fulfilment model he finds in Matthew and, differently, in Luke-Acts.<sup>38</sup> In the latter, David speaks *about* the Messiah; in Paul and the early tradition, "the Messiah embodies Israel's destiny in such a way that David's songs can be read retrospectively as a prefiguration of the Messiah's sufferings and glorification."<sup>39</sup> Not only this; but "as shown in the psalm's concluding words of praise", this prefiguration extends via Paul's reading to the purpose for which the seed of David was delivered: "welcoming? Israel and Gentiles together."<sup>40</sup> But against these conclusions, we have seen that – in Rom 15:9 at least – David's song "prefigures" in only the most general or selective terms, unless restricted to the abstracted quote; and that the psalm can only yield the rationale for Gentile praise by suppressing or rewriting its own narrative of Davidic victory and the subjects associated with it.

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. the substitution of subjects in Paul's appeal to Hosea in Rom 9:25-26. But mere substitution does not overturn the dynamics of God's act in Hos 2:23: whether Israel is (re)constituted as a people (Hosea) or the Gentiles (Paul; unless the newly constituted people consists of both groups in 9:24), God remains one who constitutes a people *ex nihilo* on the ground of elective mercy (9:23). David's agency and those subject to it, by contrast, are quite changed in Paul's account in Rom 15:9 from their disposition in the psalm. Somewhat closer to the present case is Paul's "hostile takeover" (if such it is: the matter is contested) of Deut 30:11-14 in Rom 10:6-8. Paul substitutes there an apparently antithetical subject (the Righteousness from Faith) for the Law. Nevertheless, what is predicated of the new subject in subsequent verses is in relative sympathy with the Deuteronomistic original. The changes are subtle but not revolutionary; and Paul honours his textual precursors through an extended, quasi-midrashic treatment. In Rom 15:9, however, the psalmic logic of David's praise "among" the Gentiles is entirely overwritten; nor can metalepsis prove otherwise.

<sup>38</sup> Specifically in Peter's speech in Acts 2:25-36, where "[t]he logic of Peter's speech does not posit a typological interpretation of David; rather, it drives an argumentative wedge between David and the Messiah predicted by David's words" (Hays 2005:115 n.41).

<sup>39</sup> Hays 2005:115.

<sup>40</sup> Hays 2005:116.

Yet Hays is sufficiently impressed by the psalm’s contribution, when read messianically, to accord privilege to the hermeneutical framework it embodies. Against Keck, for example, who suggests that in Rom 15:7-13 “the Christ-event is interpreted by incorporating its messianic/Davidic dimensions into a wider context based on the meaning of the resurrection,”<sup>41</sup> Hays argues the converse: “the resurrection is interpreted by incorporating it into a hermeneutical framework provided by the messianic/Davidic tradition, which had long envisioned as its *telos* the universal scope of God’s rule and – according to Paul’s reading of the tradition – the uniting of all nations in praise of Israel’s God.”<sup>42</sup> Again, we must demur in respect of 15:9b: here, the tradition does not provide a framework for interpretation, but a site for exploitation. As the messianic signifier at its heart, David is permitted to offer no narrative subject to shape Christ’s own; his subjectivity is secured – if at all – precisely by the advent of Christ. Any narrative trajectory which ends in the eschatological unity of Gentile and Jew in praise comes not from Ps 17, at least; whether it may be drawn from elsewhere in Paul’s catena, we have yet to see.

Thus far, then, we may suggest that the “hermeneutic of continuity” Hays wishes to find here is, in practice, ambiguous at best, hollow at worst. To borrow from Rom 10:4 – let the reader understand – “Christ is the τέλος of David.”

### 4.2.3 Is Paul metaleptically interested at this point?

In contrast with Rom 15:3, there is no real sign, at least at this point, that Paul is reading metaleptically from Ps 17, or that he requires his readers to do so. Christ’s installation as speaking subject in 15:9b does not require recourse to the psalm, but only to the renewed call to imitation in the Pauline text, two verses earlier (15:7), glossed in the verses which follow (15:8-9a), where the welcome of Christ is represented in a double servanthood. There, Christ is designated a servant (διάκονος) first to the Jews (περιτομή); then – by ellipsis – to the Gentiles.<sup>43</sup> To the former he has become a servant

---

<sup>41</sup> Keck 1990:93.

<sup>42</sup> Hays 2005:103.

<sup>43</sup> The syntax of these verses is notoriously difficult to untangle. The chief difficulty lies in relating the subordinate clause of 15:9a, τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἑλέους δοξάζει τὸν θεόν, to the clauses which precede (15:8). Most alternatives entail either grammatical violence or severe ellipsis. Cranfield offers a careful summary of the options (1979:742-44), but selects one which commits Paul to a double ellipsis, in which most of what the apostle “says” is invisible. Ross Wagner (1997) has ventured an elegant solution that requires but one plausible ellipsis (διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι, associated with τὰ ἔθνη taken as an accusative of respect),

on behalf of God's truth, so as to confirm the promises given to the fathers (τῶν πατέρων); to the latter<sup>44</sup> on behalf of (God's) mercy, so as to glorify God. Here we find a further encouragement to hear Christ in the quotation of 15:9b: since his service toward the Gentiles is for God's glory, it is natural to find him glorifying God with the Gentiles.

There is nothing in this prelude to quotation to cast readerly attention toward the conquered Gentiles among whom the psalmist now extols God, unless that reader is a sophisticate with a thirst for irony. Nor, equally, in the quotation itself. διὰ τοῦτο, with which the quotation begins, might be thought to encourage metalepsis: the psalmist's intention to confess is offered in consequence of something which might be sought in the psalm itself. Yet the quotation appears structurally as the apodosis of Paul's pronouncement (15:8-9a), as just described.<sup>45</sup> As such, it prompts an initial search for a fitting protasis among the preceding clauses in Paul, not (unless that search should fail) in the narrative of the psalm. The basis for, and character of, Christ's praise is to be sought in the Pauline λέγω of Rom 15:8-9a, or in the exhortation for which it provides warrant and example (15:7); not in the career of the psalmist.

All this does not mean that Christ may not be read *into* the psalm by an interested reader, however. Indeed, as we saw in Rom 15:3, the act of installing Christ as subject of the quoted psalm fragment, which entailed metalepsis from the local context of the quotation (3.4.1), occasioned a sympathetic extension of Christ's voice in the verse beyond (3.4.2.2). Undertaken here, however, such a gesture is subversive in its results. If Christ is made to occupy not just the quoted verse but those before it, he enters not as inheritor but – ironically – as conqueror, building not on the foundation of Davidic subjectivity, but upon its ruins. And so it is a Pyrrhic victory for David when, in the

---

and permits Paul an otherwise largely well-formed sentence in which no violent change of subject takes place. This reading is by no means perfect, since it entails an imbalanced parallel between the genitive περιτομῆς and the accusative τὰ ἔθνη; but if this is granted (as the least of various grammatical evils), Wagner's solution commends itself as the best available.

<sup>44</sup> It is often objected that Paul would not figure Christ as a servant toward the Gentiles, a claim sometimes bolstered with an appeal to Matt 15:24 (e.g. Fitzmyer 1993:706; Thomson 1991:233; cf. Jewett 2007:894). But the Matthean Jesus is scarcely evidential for Paul at this point; and that the eschatological ministry of Christ should be thought constrained in Paul by the earthly career of Jesus is surely unwarranted: is not Paul's apostolic ministry to the Gentiles equally Christ's (cf. Rom 15:18)?

<sup>45</sup> Instrumental in this is the introductory formula, καθὼς γέγραπται, which asserts a correspondence between the quotation and the preceding clause (v.9a), itself closely woven with v.8. On this and other Pauline formulae see 6.3.1.

final verses of the psalm, he is associated, or even identified, with the messianic Christ: the cost of his identification is the loss of his narrative self.

Is Paul engaged in such a subversive enterprise? Perhaps; for though it is only with the Isaianic close of the catena (15:12) that we discover David, the “reveal” effected in that reverse shot may indeed betray Paul’s subversive rhetorical aims; see 4.6 below. But if Paul is not so engaged, if he is not in fact mindful of the particular trajectory of the warrior-king in the psalm, then his interest in David is no longer negative, but merely negligible. Either case represents a serious problem for accounts which wish to make something substantial of Rom 1:3 and 15:12, where David and Christ are linked.<sup>46</sup>

Put in terms of metalepsis, such a conclusion is at first troubling; a blow struck, it might be thought, against the sort of metaleptically interested Paul currently in vogue, and a counterexample to what we observed in Rom 15:3. But we should not draw the curtain down too soon. Although the text does not invoke the wider context of Ps 17 at Rom 15:9, the ensuing catena itself has the form of a record, post hoc, of metaleptic extension on the part of Paul. In this respect it is quite unlike the catena we encountered in Rom 3:10-18 (2.4), whose texts were knit together without pause, later co-opted to the discourse of Law. In Rom 15:9-12 the language of supplement (καὶ πάλιν) asserts each quotation as additional, not integral, to the previous; these are not thought together but one after another, each inspiring the next. Significant also is Paul’s (formally gratuitous) decision to introduce three of the four quotations with verbs of speaking or writing. καθὼς γέγραπται, which introduces the first (v.9b), asserts what follows as normative: an authoritative voice speaks. But thereafter (vv.10, 12, not 11) these quotations are marked as spoken, lending an immediacy to each: the sense that each comes to voice in and for the present moment.<sup>47</sup> One text leading to the next, each in the moment: such is the experienced form of metaleptic process.

Metalepsis is enjoined, therefore, upon the reader, not within Ps 17, but beyond it, in imitation of Paul. Gripped at first by the image of Christ among the gentiles in worship, the apostle’s mind ventures elsewhere in psalmody for related images, which

---

<sup>46</sup> On Rom 15:12, see 4.5 below. Here we can do no more than flag the debate prompted by Rom 1:3.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Watson (2004:45): “If speech connotes immediacy, writing connotes normativity.” See further 6.3.1.1.

he finds in the Song of Moses and in Ps 116. It is this visually rich train of thought, carefully recorded, which the reader is invited to follow.

In this first quotation, Paul’s camera has constructed a somewhat intimate picture of Christ – as κύριος – in confession and song among the gentiles. Christ is at the outset the object of the camera’s attention; but we have adduced a variety of ways in which the reader is motivated to hear Christ in the quotation, and so the shot tracks in to where Christ stands. Hearing his words, the viewer (reader), now positioned with Christ, takes up his view, which will dominate the scenes to follow. It is as rich an experience of suture with the Christological psalmist as that offered in Rom 15:3, where Christ led the reader a little deeper into a single psalm. Here he leads the viewer across multiple psalms, before Isaiah concludes the scene.

### 4.3 Romans 15:10: Christological cinema: Gentiles and Jews in praise

καὶ πάλιν λέγει· εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ.

The Song of Moses, as Deut 32:1-43 is conventionally known, is a rich psalm with wide generic affinities.<sup>48</sup> Though found only in Deuteronomy, where it has been carefully integrated into its literary setting,<sup>49</sup> its discursive and thematic kinship with biblical psalmody, and its collocation with canonical psalms here in Romans and in the “midrashic” context of 1 Cor 10 (where it is deployed amid pentateuchal narrative and other “historical psalms”), evince an alternative identity which owes little to its final-

---

<sup>48</sup> Our business is with “psalmody” as this functions in Paul; here, in the voicing of named or nameable subjects. An exploration of Deut 32 may accordingly seem out of place. Behind this perception, however, lies an inappropriate judgment about poetic texts, embedded within the “canonical approach” to which students of Pauline intertextuality are often (if unwittingly) indebted. Taking canon as an essentially literary construct (cf. the alternative label: “final-*form* approach”), reading of this kind tends to obscure the possibility that a text with a stable literary situation, reflected in final form, might have maintained an independent discursive life, perhaps long after its textual infixation. Even within final form, the example of 2 Sam 22/Ps 18 is surely indicative: to what canonical “division” does this psalm “belong”? Similar questions are posed by the phenomenon of *relecture* in which materials from the psalms are redeployed, notably by the Chronicler; cf. Pss 105, 96 and 106 in 1 Chron 16 (“historical psalms” with a notable kinship to the Song of Moses); Pss 132 and 136 in Solomon’s prayer and the people’s refrain (2 Chron. 6 and 7). More generally, we may point to the continued fluidity of the literary borders of the psalter in the time of Paul (1.3.1.3 n.93), in light of which a given psalm not formally included in a psalter may yet be associated with other psalms that are, and so acquire their associated subjects. This might be thought especially likely in liturgical performance, where literary setting is not decisive.

<sup>49</sup> See Watts 1992:63-81; cf. Mathys 1994; Watts 2005.

form *Sitz-im-Text*.<sup>50</sup> Indeed, the Song was doubtless married to the text of Deuteronomy on account of its popular reach; we need not imagine it was always bound to it in performance.<sup>51</sup> Generically, it belongs primarily, but not exclusively, with biblical psalmody.<sup>52</sup>

### 4.3.1 Who speaks is not the issue, but who sees: the Christological gaze

καὶ πάλιν λέγει, then (15:10); but who or what is speaking? A finite verb of speaking requires a speaker, after all; and four candidates are available to answer. A final form reading of the psalm offers us Moses, either as “himself” or as a metonym for the Book of the Law: a pentateuchal witness either way, should Paul require one at this point. Moses was named in Paul’s earlier appeal to verse 21 of the Song (Rom 10:19), there “in concert with” Isaiah – also named (10:20; cf. 15:12). But while this confirms his candidacy in 15:10, it argues against his significance; for here he is *not* named.<sup>53</sup> A generic assessment of the psalm alert to its sociohistorical life might suggest David: for on evidence of form and use, as we have just seen,<sup>54</sup> the Song belongs with biblical psalmody. David takes up such a voice, if at all, in the guise of prophet, as reflected in its co-option by Moses: the psalm is spoken over against Israel, not by it (Deut 31:28-30; 32:46).

Christ has just spoken, and might be thought to speak again (πάλιν); indeed, having supplanted David as the voice of psalmody in Romans, as we have seen, his claim is perhaps the stronger. Few commentators attend to the question of subject here; those that do, and many ETs, favour an impersonal subject – ἡ γραφή – on analogy with 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; and 11:2.<sup>55</sup> Yet the analogy is questionable: scripture is not named directly

---

<sup>50</sup> The possibility that someone other than Moses speaks from the Song in Rom 15:10 – whether as “himself” or, metonymically, as the Book of the Law – is accordingly strengthened.

<sup>51</sup> Josephus comments on the Song’s preservation, among other psalms, at the Temple (*Ant.* 4303; cf. 3.38; 5.61). Rabbinic usage is suggestive; see *Roš Haš* 31a; *y. Meg.* 3:7, 74b, end. 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>, a scroll featuring the Song alone, suggests independent use at Qumran; see Skehan 1954. In general on the literary deployment of the Song, see Bell 1994:209-69. For an attempt to discover a genre of “Rock psalms” in Paul, with the Song of Moses prominent among them, see Swancutt 2003.

<sup>52</sup> Texts are rarely monogamous in respect of genre, however; and the vitality of the Song reflects its participation in a wide variety of poetic and other genres; cf. Tigay 1996:509-13.

<sup>53</sup> Nor is he named in Rom 12:19, where Paul introduces a quotation from Deut 32:35 with *γέγραπται γάρ*.

<sup>54</sup> See 4.3 n.51.

<sup>55</sup> For example, Dunn 1988:849, expressly; cf. Moo 1996:873; Jewett 2007:886; implicit in NIV, NJB.

here; while καθὼς γέγραπται (15:9b) does not signify the voice of scripture so much as its univocity, irrespective of speaker.<sup>56</sup>

Such uncertainties undermine the quest for a singular speaking subject, and encourage us to focus elsewhere. Psalmody is capable of taking a variety of named speakers in Paul, in any event: David and Christ are both attached to quotations from the same psalm (Ps 68): David at Rom 11:9; Christ at Rom 15:3. This alone should remind us of the distinctive character of psalmic discourse: no speaker may gain permanent rights to language whose first-person subjectivity is declared only in the event of speech; yet insofar as “every phrase in the Psalms is a kind of quotation”,<sup>57</sup> the discursive echoes of all prior speakers are evoked (if only to be suppressed) with every fresh performance. In this sense, the quotation of such a text as Deut 32:43 is awash with speakers.

But our approach to this text is made from Rom 15:9, where the long tracking shot began. The camera – whose perspective is offered to us – is Christ’s; not that of Moses, or of David, or of “scripture”. The image of Christ singing amid a Gentile congregation, attached to the gaze of Christ by his appropriation of the quoted speech, gives way to a larger view; the camera zooms out as Christ gazes on a worship in which Jew and Gentile both are figured, with hints of cosmic participation just out of frame.<sup>58</sup>

The Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη) are the unequivocal focus of Paul’s quotation in Rom 15:10: summoned to join with the people of God (λαός) in praise. Indeed, addressed by the command of scripture, the Gentiles are made actors, capable of right movement and true speech.<sup>59</sup> The Jews are not absent from the frame: they are named; yet they are passive, if prior, participants in a common praise.<sup>60</sup> Nothing in the quotation undoes the distinction between Jew and Gentile, however, so that it becomes constitutive of the

---

<sup>56</sup> In Paul “scripture” (ἡ γραφή) is never named as a speaker of psalmody. The closest instance is 2 Cor 4:13, where κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον offers a quality of “writtleness” to its quotation; see 6.3.1.2. It is tempting to imagine that the rigorously personal character of the psalms, in which a subject is always – if momentarily – particularised in the moment of speech, resists a generalised, impersonal speaking subject. The same cannot be said for most of the Pentateuch, often voiced by ἡ γραφή: Rom 4:3; 9:17; 10:11 (Isaiah); Gal 3:8; 4:30; nor even (in discursive terms) Isaiah (cf. Rom 10:11). Cf. also Rom 11:2, where scripture speaks from 1 Kgs 19.

<sup>57</sup> Fisch 1988:119.

<sup>58</sup> As found in the verse from which the quotation is drawn; see below.

<sup>59</sup> Contrast David’s gentiles of Ps 17 (4.2.2 n.36).

<sup>60</sup> Jewish priority is in fact observed, if minimally, in the preposition (μετά) – the Gentiles must act to join with the Jews; not the other way around. Yet this priority is equally undercut; it is the Gentiles, after all – and not the Jews – who are singled out for Christ’s attention.

camera’s view: two groups converge in praise, but do not coalesce.<sup>61</sup> The view will change dramatically in the next verse, as we shall see.

### 4.3.2 Metaleptic minimalism: the fragments of Mosaic Song

What may we learn from how the Song is woven into Paul’s discourse? The text of the quotation in 15:10 is drawn verbatim from Deut 32:43, reproduced below; the quotation is in boldface, Paul’s addition italicised.

Deut 32:43 εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ  
**εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ** καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι  
 θεοῦ  
 ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται καὶ ἐκδικήσει καὶ  
 ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἀνταποδώσει καὶ  
 ἐκκαθαριεῖ κύριος τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

In this tradition, the MT’s demand for praise of his people (עַבְדֵי יְהוָה) has become a call to the nations (ἔθνη) to join them in praise (εὐφράνθητε ... μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ). The hostility of the verse toward the Gentiles is widely acknowledged in the case of the MT;<sup>62</sup> the OG μετά, which may in fact attest to a scribal error in transmission of a Hebrew *Vorlage*, later rationalised in translation,<sup>63</sup> offers a marginally more congenial welcome to Paul’s Gentiles. But if in Greek the nations are invoked as partners with Israel in praise, they are not thereby made co-beneficiaries in the redemption which prompts it. On the contrary, the translator’s amendments leave the dualistic force of the Hebrew substantially unmitigated, raising the question as to why the Gentiles would wish to respond to the call.<sup>64</sup>

<sup>61</sup> In contrast to the copula καί, the prepositional key to the quotation, μετά, associates but resists conflation, as reflected in its grammatical behaviour. Cf. *with* in English, which associates other actors with the principal subject but does not force a change of grammatical number (e.g. “John, with his colleagues, is engaged in important research”).

<sup>62</sup> For example, Dunn 1988:849; Byrne 1996:432. Of course, the Song does not deploy τὰ ἔθνη to designate God’s enemies directly, preferring terms at home in the generic discourse of psalmody (οἱ μισοῦντές με; οἱ ἐχθροί; οἱ ὑπεναντίοι; cf. Deut 32:27, 41-43), adaptable as such to different referents as needed. But *contra* Wagner (2002:317 n.38), this observation (an argument from silence) does not remove τὰ ἔθνη as objects of vengeance; it simply obliges the reader to identify them as such from the narrative logic of the text: an option not frequently available in the canonical psalms, but more certainly in the Song. If taken contextually in the Song, reference to the nations may be naturally concluded, as suggested below. Abstracted from the Song in quotation, however, reference is left open; and τὰ ἔθνη may be repositioned.

<sup>63</sup> See discussion in Watson 2004:450-452; Wagner 2002:316.

<sup>64</sup> Telling here is the OG’s retention of the *reason* for rejoicing: God will repay in judgment those who have spilled the blood of his sons; he will cleanse the land of his people. Who could have spilled the blood save those not his sons – the nations (cf. Deut 32:28 (*contra* Wagner 2002:317 n.38, the use of ἔθνος here is strongly suggestive for τὰ ἔθνη); 32:40-42)? And how will the land *of his people* be swept clean, if not by emptying the land of those not his people – again, the nations? Of course, τὰ ἔθνη might be

In selecting the tradition represented in OG, Paul has taken advantage not of a genuinely sympathetic alternative to the MT, but of the singular addition of *μετά*. This modification has made the clause, but not the verse, and much less the Song, apt to Paul's use in Rom 15:10. Nonetheless, Paul's own reading is doubtless forged less by Deut 32:43 itself than by verse 21 of the Song, of which he makes substantive use in Rom 10:19. The earlier verse constitutes τὰ ἔθνη negatively and indirectly: they are the "not-nation/senseless nation", figured purely as the means to provoke Israel to jealousy. Just *how* the not-nation performs its instrumental function the verse does not say; yet this very gap invites Paul's inference, drawn from Isaiah in 10:20: God is found by them (εὐρέθην), revealed to them (ἐμφανῆς ἐγενόμην). The not-nation is thereby constituted directly in relation to God, and therefore *as* a nation, subject to divine blessing (cf. 15:7-9). This nation will respond willingly to the summons of Deut 32:43 – provided they ignore the rationale for praise offered by that verse.

Taking Rom 15:10 on its own, then, we may think Paul a misreader: subverting the dualistic thrust of the verse, even in its Greek form, the apostle misreads the Song. Yet when read with Rom 10:19, the picture is different: an interpretive aporia in Deut 32:21 has provoked a chain of reasoning within which the Gentiles are plausibly figured as co-beneficiaries with Israel. But this still requires the quoted phrase to be sealed from its immediate surrounds, answerable only to Paul's interpretation of the earlier verse, and ignorant of other points between and beyond at which τὰ ἔθνη are less happily positioned.<sup>65</sup>

---

willing to rejoice if they stood *among* Israel as God-fearers; but *μετά* does not carry this force within the verse. In extending the call to rejoice beyond those summoned in the MT, the translator seems concerned to assure a univocal result from a diverse chorus: just as the nations are to *rejoice with* (εὐφράνθητε ... *μετά*) his people, the heavens are to *rejoice with* (εὐφράνθητε ... ἡμεῖς) God. All heaven and earth, then, are to rejoice with one voice in the coming vengeance; but they are not constituted together as its beneficiaries: that role belongs only to "his people".

<sup>65</sup> Paul's inference is entirely reasonable (if not demanded): how else will the not-nation provoke Israel to jealousy except as the undeserved object of divine blessing? Yet it is far from clear in the remainder of the Song in what such blessing might consist. Certainly, the not-nation is empowered to chastise Israel; but military success is somewhat less than the discourse of election usually specifies for the chosen, the terms of which are applied to Israel's history in Deut 32:10-14. In particular, YHWH's empowerment of the not-nation cannot be said to overturn the arrangements declared in 32:8-9, in which the boundaries of the nations (ὄρια ἐθνῶν) are apportioned κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ; and the Lord's people (λαὸς αὐτοῦ) – not τὰ ἔθνη – are named the inheritance of the Lord. This division is borne out later in the Song, where the victorious nations become at last the Lord's enemies, targeted for destruction (τοῖς ἐχθροῖς καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσίν με ἀνταποδώσω 32:41): that which is not his inheritance may finally be dispensed with.

Metalepsis is ill-suited to such a carefully circumscribed voice: those drawn to the immediate literary context of the quotation will find the hostile dualism of the Hebrew largely intact; while those whose cognitive associations are made encyclopedically find the key lexical terms in the quoted clause – τὰ ἔθνη and (ὁ) λαὸς αὐτοῦ – juxtaposed in contrastive, ultimately agonistic terms.<sup>66</sup> Only those sophisticated readers who figure the connection Paul himself has made between verses 21 and 43 of the Song will be able to construe the rejoicing Gentiles of the latter verse as beneficiaries in the Song’s own terms.<sup>67</sup> Yet if sophisticated, they may also know that Paul campaigns on a Greek tradition unsupported by any Hebrew text. No reader for whom the primary or prestige text of this psalm is in Hebrew will imagine Paul to be reading “the Song of Moses” at all.

On balance, Wagner may be thought bold to claim that “The use Paul makes of Deuteronomy 32:43 in Romans 15:10 ... provides a striking confirmation of my argument that Paul reads the Song as a whole as a narrative of God’s faithfulness to redeem Israel and, through Israel, the entire world.”<sup>68</sup> The problem lies with the idea that Rom 15:10 confirms Paul’s appropriation of the Song “as a whole” in these terms.<sup>69</sup> Rather, Paul’s interpretation depends specifically on an aporia in 32:21, resolved so as to govern a singular phrase in 32:43, against the discursive positioning of τὰ ἔθνη elsewhere in the Song and beyond as disposable instruments of discipline.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> For these categories within the Song, see previous note. If Paul’s readers are sensitive to “final form”, and so read beyond the literary borders of the Song in Deuteronomy, they will soon find the nations skewered on the horns of the divine bull (Deut 33:17), just as they were objects of destruction when the land was first taken (Deut 31:3). If instead Paul’s hearers take the Song with its generic kin in the psalms, they will find ample dualism to reinforce the election of the Lord’s people, and the non-election of the nations.

<sup>67</sup> In practice, this involves not simply hearing vv. 21 and 43 of the Song “together”, but equally Paul’s references to the two (Rom 10:19 for v. 21; Rom 15:10 for v. 43). The level of sophistication required is high: few students of the text make this connection.

<sup>68</sup> Wagner 2002:317.

<sup>69</sup> For the unwarranted appeal to “the whole”, cf. 1.2.4.

<sup>70</sup> Watson is generally more balanced in his claims (2004:450-54), and does not downplay Paul’s recognition elsewhere of the Song’s testimony to judgment (cf. Rom 12:19). As he observes, “Nothing in the Song’s robust descriptions of the divine vengeance on Israel’s enemies gives Gentiles any obvious reason to rejoice” (2004:452), so that Paul’s reading has a precarious foundation. Yet the hermeneutical centrality of Deut 32:21 in determining the import of the Song for Paul, rightly emphasised by Watson (2004:453), tends finally to obscure in his account the fact that Paul is not reading “the Song” at all, but abstracting a fragment of it (Deut 32:43b) whose utility to Paul depends on an inference licensed but by no means demanded by the text of the earlier verse. Thus, to speak of a “testimony to universal reconciliation” in the Song (2004:452), or to claim that “Moses speaks of ... a homecoming for Jews and Gentiles alike” (2004:454) is already to ask too much. Watson’s follow-up comment – “The insight is fragmentary, but it is truly to be found” – smacks of special pleading.

In light of Paul’s artful and selective approach to the Song of Moses at Rom 15:10, we must conclude that the Gentile call to praise is not predicated on the wider narrative of the Song, construed (unjustifiably) to suggest an incorporation of the Gentiles into the experience of Israel. Nor will the reader conclude otherwise; for metaleptic extension is unmotivated and unhelpful here. Rather, the co-participants in doxology of Deut 32:43 must secure their place in a Pauline narrative drawn in Romans 15 from the catena and the Christological welcome which governs it. This welcome, as we have seen, is not drawn from the texts Paul quotes, metaleptically enriched; it is rather an eschatological novelty, addressed equally to the circumcision and the nations, constituting them anew. The intertextual signs of that welcome await discovery in Paul’s next quotation, as the Christological camera rises to its fullest view.

#### 4.4 Romans 15:11: cinema and text: the fullness of sight and reference

Rom 15:11 καὶ πάλιν· αἰνεῖτε, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, τὸν κύριον καὶ ἐπαινεσάτωσαν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ λαοί.

The third quotation in the catena, and the last before Isaiah is named in conclusion, is drawn from the briefest psalm in the canon: Ps 116. It is also the most tersely introduced: no verb this time; simply “καὶ πάλιν” (15:11a). From this psalm Paul offers us the first of its two verses: a further summons to the Gentiles to praise, and the hint of something more. The psalm is reproduced in its entirety below.

Ps 116:1 αλληλουια  
αἰνεῖτε τὸν κύριον πάντα τὰ ἔθνη  
ἐπαινέσατε αὐτόν πάντες οἱ λαοί  
<sup>2</sup>ὅτι  
ἐκραταιώθη τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς  
καὶ  
ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

In bringing the psalm to speech, Paul has introduced two modifications of note from the OG.<sup>71</sup> First, he has promoted those addressed by the command to praise – πάντα τὰ ἔθνη – ahead of the object of praise (15:11a; cf. Ps 116:1a). By doing so, and with the

<sup>71</sup> The addition of καί between the two imperative clauses is of no obvious significance; it would surely be over-interpretation to claim it as distinguishing the addressees of the two clauses.

qualifier πάντα at the head of the designating phrase, Paul draws attention to the reach of the summons: *all* the nations (cf. the spare ἔθνη of Rom 15:10), a rhetorical emphasis confirmed in πάντες οἱ λαοί, which concludes verse and quotation alike. Paul's emphasis on comprehensiveness invites the reader to construe οἱ λαοί in the most encompassing terms, as denoting not only the Gentile nations (τὰ ἔθνη), but Israel also, now without distinction.<sup>72</sup>

Paul's second modification, superficially unrelated to the first, is to rework the psalm's second person plural aorist imperative ἐπαινώσατε (Ps 116:1b) in third person (i.e. jussive): ἐπαινεσάτωσαν (Rom 15:11b).<sup>73</sup> In this somewhat subtle move, discounted by most interpreters as without consequence,<sup>74</sup> the author depersonalises the speaking subject of the quotation, in a manner similar to what we have seen in David's pronouncement in Rom 11:9-10 (2.5.1). Here, as there, the psalm acquires a quasi-judicial tone which stresses its performativity: a certain state of affairs is enacted, the agency for which lies not in the speaker but in the speaker's words. It does not matter, in consequence, who is speaking here;<sup>75</sup> rather, attention is refocused on the effect of the words. In terms of our cinematic metaphor, we are urged to gaze with the camera, not at it: to see what Christ sees.

By its effects, this same amendment yields a clue to the reference of οἱ λαοί. Released from the need to secure the agency of his words, the psalmist is free – with his people (cf. ἡμεῖς in 116:2) – to be addressed by them. Accordingly, he is figured among οἱ λαοί, which now encompasses Gentiles and Jews.<sup>76</sup> In the quotation as a whole, then, where the first addressee is the Gentiles (τὰ ἔθνη), the second addressee is no mere synonym; but neither must we think that οἱ λαοί refers specifically to Israel.<sup>77</sup> Rather,

---

<sup>72</sup> The terms of parallelism imagine not complete equivalence between the two clauses, as though τὰ ἔθνη and οἱ λαοί referred identically, but some form of opposition or extension also; cf. 1.3.1.1. Here, the parallelism extends the reach of the summons. Unlike the plural ἔθνη (BDAG q.v. 2), λαοί is able to refer without ethnic restriction.

<sup>73</sup> It is also possible that Paul was working with a text tradition which featured the jussive, represented in Symmachus; cf. Koch 1986:111; Stanley 1992:182. If so, the rhetorical effect is the same, if more strictly immanent to the text.

<sup>74</sup> Wagner, usually sensitive to Paul's textual emendations and their rhetorical effects, offers no comment. Cranfield (1979:746) lists the changes, but fails to find any significance; similarly Fitzmyer (1992:707); Dunn (1988:850); Käsemann (1980:386).

<sup>75</sup> It may be for just this reason that Paul neglects to supply a verb of speech.

<sup>76</sup> Käsemann 1980:386; cf. Dabelstein 1981:193.

<sup>77</sup> Otherwise Wagner (2002:314-15), who thinks it plausible that τὰ ἔθνη and οἱ λαοί refer in Paul to the Gentiles and Israel respectively. To bolster this claim, Wagner takes into semantic orbit references to λαός in verses proximate to Ps 117 in the psalter, along with Deut 32:43, just cited in the catena.

the term encompasses all peoples, rendering the distinction among them moot in their eschatological praise.

Unlike what we have seen elsewhere in the catena, metalepsis is in no way foreclosed in the hearing of this quotation. The distinctive brevity of the psalm, its structural integrity as a single stanza, and its liturgical prominence as a Hallel, all commend at least the possibility of metalepsis; and the key lexemes of Ps 116:2 offer an excellent thematic fit with Rom 15:8-9a. Thus, where the ἀλήθεια τοῦ κυρίου abides forever with the psalmist and his people (Ps 116:2b), it was ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ that Christ became a servant (15:8). And if Christ's servanthood to the nations is on account of mercy (ὑπὲρ ἐλέους 15:9), it is this very mercy which has grown strong (ἐκραταιώθη Ps 116:2) toward the psalmist and his people.<sup>78</sup>

So we find that metalepsis (optionally undertaken) underwrites what Paul has achieved through his tinkering with the text: a universal call to praise is issued to the universal beneficiaries of mercy.<sup>79</sup> As the catena's summons comes to its climax, we find the psalmist has left the podium, and gone to stand with οἱ λαοί. A neutral subject takes over, empowered by Christ, to announce a praise in which ethnic distinctions are of no account. No longer are the Gentiles to join in a Jewish praise (as in 15:10); but "all peoples" – subject without distinction to divine mercy and faithfulness – must now voice their common praise.

The perspective of Christ's camera has increased in scope with each verse. From the relative intimacy of 15:9b, it has tracked back to discover the Gentiles – among whom Christ has been singing – now joining with Israel (15:10). With the present verse the camera rises further; having gazed at the unity of Gentile and Jew in worship, it now

---

However, Wagner mistakes the liturgical unity of the Hallel group for its literary unity, such that textually proximate verses in "adjacent" psalms might be readily construed together. Yet even if other usages were taken as salient (and Deut 32:43 is not yet excluded), this proposal founders on the term's plural reference in the quoted verse, which constitutes it as a personalising synonym for τὰ ἔθνη here (or indeed more; but not other, or less); a plurality preserved in Paul despite his evident willingness to adapt the verse to his immediate needs. The psalm's addressees include Gentiles throughout the verse.

<sup>78</sup> The metaleptic affinities of the psalm with the Christologically focussed statements of Rom 15:8-9a assert the presence of the catena's Christological author, who licenses the psalm's full voice in the absence of a prominent speaker.

<sup>79</sup> Indeed the fullness of textual reference which metalepsis accomplishes here centres attention on the psalm's subject of speech (i.e. not its speaker but the discursive "I" and that which is predicated of it), urging us to learn who are subject to mercy, and with whom the truth of God is said to remain. Put differently, metalepsis encourages readers to learn who exactly is addressed; and so, perhaps, to find themselves among them.

pans across the horizon, taking in “all the nations” in glorious Panavision. In its sweep the division of Gentile and Jew plays no part at all; a vast company, heterogeneous and equal, is in view, among whom even the psalmist comes to stand.<sup>80</sup>

But so vast and commanding a view tests the confidence of the viewer, who has agreed to travel with Christ through the catena. The shot must be matched and completed with a reverse shot, which will reveal to us who exactly has guided our sight, satisfying our desire to know that we saw truly.<sup>81</sup> That task must fall to another subject, clearly defined: the prophet Isaiah.

## 4.5 Romans 15:12: the viewing subject revealed

Rom 15:12 καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει· ἔσται ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ καὶ ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἄρχειν ἐθνῶν, ἐπ’ αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν.

We have seen how the Christological camera has guided our view in three of the catena’s four quotations. In the first (15:9b) we saw David supplanted as the speaker of the psalm, overwriting a long-cherished narrative of victory in which the Gentile foe is finally defeated with a narrative of welcome in which all is made new. In the second and third quotations, we watched this narrative take hold in a vision of ever-widening scope, so that, finally, the categories which underwrote the old narrative were swallowed up. Metalepsis, the handmaid of narrative redescription, is first disdained (15:9b, 10), then welcomed (15:11) according to its capacity to endorse the eschatologically new, in sympathy with the camera’s gaze.

The final quotation in the catena lies beyond our brief: Isaiah speaks, and not from a psalm. Yet we cannot afford to ignore him; for in his clear invocation of a messianic title – ἡ ῥίζα τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ – the great prophet supplies what for some is the explicit guarantee of Paul’s interest in Davidic messianism. Paul’s ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυλὶδ (Rom 1:3)

---

<sup>80</sup> In fact, this scene comes with a soundtrack. Paul has quoted from a Hallel psalm, one of a group of psalms prominent in liturgy. On the assumption that metalepsis is welcomed, the evocation of the psalm recalls its performance in communal life: the memory of many-voiced praise is a fitting accompaniment to the widening view.

<sup>81</sup> On the shot/reverse shot technique and its implications for subjectivity cf. Silverman 1983:201-5 and discussion below.

may be downplayed as a tradition incorporated without serious agenda;<sup>82</sup> but Isaiah is granted certain pride of place at the conclusion to a sequence rich in Christology (Rom 15:7-12).

Certainly, it is he who completes the cinematic formation begun in 15:9b. Shots of such length and complexity must not be infinitely prolonged; so it is that the camera is repositioned within the field of view, and turned 180 degrees to gaze on the field from which its gaze was constructed. The central – indeed sole – figure in that field, as disclosed by Isaiah, is Christ. Thus is confirmed the reader’s expectation, encouraged in 15:7-9a, that the view throughout 15:9b-11 has been Christ’s. And with this gesture the payoff for Paul is made; for the theological programme represented in these verses is given the highest endorsement, having been represented as Christ’s own.<sup>83</sup> Significantly, this has been the gaze of “the root of Jesse”. By qualifying the viewing subject as Davidic, license is at last given to revisit Ps 17 quoted earlier, there to reflect on Christ’s Davidic inheritance; an invitation, perhaps, to metalepsis.<sup>84</sup> But first, Isaiah’s own voice must be heard.

To reveal the Christological subject is a role sufficient to justify Isaiah’s presence at the catena’s end. But the theological contribution he offers is also germane. Isaiah is heard last not because his words are dangerously chauvinistic, in need of qualification from preceding quotations.<sup>85</sup> Rather, he sounds the note of hope that, as in 15:3-4, issues from the discovery of Christ in the scriptures.

---

<sup>82</sup> The classical formulation of this position is Bultmann’s (1952:49). Until recently, challenges were few; but cf. Scott 1992:229-36. Whitsett 2000 argues vigorously for Paul’s careful construction of the formulations of Rom 1:3-4, as part of a spirited attempt to rehabilitate Davidic messianism for Pauline Christology.

<sup>83</sup> As theorists of cinema observe (cf. Silverman 1983:202), the camera can never be identified with the figure revealed in reverse shot: this would constitute, in terms we have used elsewhere, a fictional claim that the speaking subject *is* the subject of speech. But the reverse shot accomplishes just such an illusion so as to disguise the presence of the camera – in this case, Paul. The benefits for the author in this instance should be clear.

<sup>84</sup> In the event, to metaleptic subversion, as we saw in 4.2.2. See further 4.6 below.

<sup>85</sup> Jewett thinks Isaiah’s placement, while “highly significant”, reflects subordination rather than privilege: this because “the chauvinistic potential of Israel’s military dominance over the Gentiles in Isaiah’s wording needed to be eliminated by the placement and content of the three preceding citations” (2007:895). Yet if the remaining quotations offer to qualify the rule of which Isaiah speaks, they do this only on the assumption that Christ – the one who will rise to rule in 15:12 – is the one who joins the Gentiles in worship in 15:9b. (Otherwise, to *summon* the Gentiles to worship (as in 15:10-11) is to exercise rule, not to qualify it.) To the extent that Jewett is correct, then, he reinforces our earlier analysis of 15:9b, and undercuts his preference for a Pauline subject there. In any event, Isaiah’s *rule* is governed not primarily by the quotations which precede it, but by the Christological welcome of 15:7, to which the whole of the pericope is accountable; and by Paul’s excisions from the quoted verse; on which see 4.5 n.87 below.

Who, then, has been the Christ who has joined with the Gentiles at worship (15:9b); with Jews and Gentiles in common praise (15:10); with all the peoples as one (15:11)? Whose camera has guided us through this ever-expanding scene? He is designated a ruler – “even he who rises to rule the Gentiles” – so that we realise that the one witnessing each scene, whose gaze we shared, was equally its protagonist: the one who brought each scene about.<sup>86</sup> Yet those same scenes demonstrate the character of rule: the empowerment of common praise, and the disempowerment of ethnic distinction. He is revealed to be a messianic figure – the “shoot of Jesse” – but this Davidic designation has been heavily qualified already in Christ’s vocalisation of a messianic psalm in 15:9b, itself read in light of welcome and servanthood (15:7-9a). And if its psalmic provenance was there subverted, here, it can be argued, its Isaianic derivation is also subtly qualified.<sup>87</sup> Deprived of intertextual nourishment, the messianic shoot survives primarily in the local ground of Paul’s discourse.

This local ground extends at least as far back as 15:7, where the pericope began. There we found a Christological welcome issued neither to Gentiles nor to Jews – the categories do not appear – but to the ethnically comprehensive “you” (15:7). It is this constitutive act of welcome which grounds the call to praise mapped out in the catena.<sup>88</sup> And though differentially realised in a *διακονία* of truth to the Jews (15:8a), and of mercy to the Gentiles (15:9a), this welcome signals a trajectory for the catena in which such differences no longer signify, just as we have seen. In their eschatological praise not Jew and Gentile but “all the nations” are together the welcomed of Christ, a people newly constituted εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (15:7; cf. 14:3).

---

<sup>86</sup> In this we find the equality toward which 15:9b gestured strictly qualified; the effect is similar in Heb 2:12-14, where Jesus’ worship among his brothers is reconfigured as the brothers become his children.

<sup>87</sup> In the OG of 11:10 Isaiah declares what shall be and when; but in Rom 15:12 he tells us only what: the qualifying phrase ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ is omitted. The omission is often thought insignificant (e.g. Fitzmyer 1992:707; Byrne 1996:432; Cranfield 1979:747). And yet, much more than a temporal indicator (as commentators tend to imagine; cf. Dunn 1988:850; Wagner 2002:318; Käsemann 1980:386-87), the omitted phrase is ubiquitous in the prophetic literature, not least in Isaiah (44 instances), and serves often to introduce detailed prognostication. Cf. Is. 10:20; 10:27; 12:1; 12:4; 14:3; all of which begin καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ). By Paul’s omission, Isaiah has lost the ability to claim the rising of the Davidic shoot as the fulfilment of an eschatological programme to which he is privy. The shoot of David does not rise on *that* day – on a day whose character is known to Isaiah – but on the day the Davidic seed was declared υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (Rom 1:4).

<sup>88</sup> Welcome is, of course, a prominent motif in the larger unit of paraenesis in which this passage appears; cf. Rom 14:1, 3. It is its Christological rehearsal and expansion in 15:7 which is decisive, however.

Christ himself, nominally the Jewish root of Jesse, is revealed by the new identity of the summoned as something more: not content to be the Jewish object of Gentile hope (15:12), he is instead the hope of all (15:13),<sup>89</sup> inasmuch as he is the Lord of all (14:8) in whom all have been welcomed (15:7).<sup>90</sup> In the same way, the seed of David (1:3) is not constrained by fleshly provenance (κατὰ σάρκα); he is rather the Lord (1:4b), the Son (1:4a) of God his Father (cf. 15:6); declared as such by the Spirit of holiness with power (ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης 1:4): the same Spirit whose power will cause the welcomed to overflow with hope (ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου 15:13).

## 4.6 Christ revealed, David eclipsed: the testimony of the psalms in Romans

Any attempt to argue for continuity between David and Christ must rely on metalepsis. Too few, too ambiguous, are Paul's express acknowledgements that Christ is *the* Christ: a figure whose Davidic provenance is truly constitutive of his identity and significance. The *unsaid* is required, then, to supplement the *said*; contexts must be adduced – selected from the infinite possible – and attached with care to an intending Paul. Such a procedure is fraught with uncertainty,<sup>91</sup> even where the *said* is abundant and unequivocally supportive; but in the case of David, where it is neither, the task is difficult indeed.

At various points in our study, we have noted the peculiar challenge posed to any argument for metaleptically retrieved contexts in intertextual cases involving psalmody.<sup>92</sup> This we framed in terms of the formulaic, generic character of psalmic discourse, which argues for the granularity of minimal parallel structures rather than maximal literary ones (*viz.* whole psalms), and otherwise licenses metalepsis in a non-linear, encyclopaedic mode – fostered by the prevalence of metaphor, sympathetic to such a mode – rather than a linear, literary one. The point is reinforced by the minimal narrative distinctiveness of individual psalms. Psalmic narrativity is a function not (with

<sup>89</sup> ὑμᾶς surely addresses more than Paul's Gentile readership.

<sup>90</sup> Gal 3:27-28 gives expression to the experience of eschatological welcome and its result: metaphorically "washed" (ἐβαπτίσθητε) and clothed (ἐνεδύσασθε), those ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ are one: οὐκ ἔτι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληγ.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. 1.1.2 n.20.

<sup>92</sup> See 1.3.1; 2.2.2.

rare exceptions) of individual psalms but of biblical psalmody at the generic level; rather than underwrite metalepsis within the psalm, therefore, it invites metalepsis across the full corpus of psalmody, and beyond.

The problem of narrativity allows us to query accounts which construe metalepsis along narrative lines. As we saw in our study of Rom 15:3, most interpreters, unable to discover a local context able to enrich or clarify the relevance of Paul's quotation, took it to signify the other-regarding disposition Paul had just called for explicitly. However, the only way in which the quoted psalm could be seen as figuring such a disposition is in the narrative identity of the psalmist, generically construed. It is at this point that the proposal breaks down: for the narrative identity of such a sufferer, at this level of abstraction, is not associable with the psalm, so much as with psalmody itself in its biblical form. Psalm 68, its particular voice already denied in quotation, no longer contributes a particular psalmist.

The case of Rom 15:3 is worth rehearsing for the precedent that it embodies. As an argument for a hermeneutic of continuity, metaleptic claims of the kind just reviewed, which appeal to "the narrative" of a psalm – whether implicitly (as here) or explicitly<sup>93</sup> – are almost vacuous. On such readings Christ is in continuity with the psalmist only in the most generalised, abstract sense. At the level of detail, any number of conflicts between the discourse of the psalm and what Paul predicates of Christ may be discerned which renew the challenge to continuity; this we have considered at length in our discussion of Rom 15:9.

Even in the more plausible case of, say, Isaiah, arguments for continuity must still reckon with elements of conflict between Paul's discourse and the intertexts on which he draws; and indeed they do. Sometimes this is described in terms of "suppression":<sup>94</sup> Paul suppresses conflicting elements and, presumably, "promotes" those which serve his purpose. The double intentionalism of such a statement, and the precedent it would imply, is notable, even if we could make sense of such a notion. What kind of act is suppression? And what are its consequences for (dis)continuity? The issue becomes acute when metaleptic appeals are woven – as they routinely are – into a cumulative

---

<sup>93</sup> Cf. 4.2.2 on Rom 15:9 above, where Hays makes this claim expressly.

<sup>94</sup> See discussion of Wagner 2002 in 2.5.2.

argument for Paul's scriptural hermeneutic. When promotion and suppression coincide in each instance, as they must, how is the cumulative balance to be decided?

The methodological point will be explored more fully in the conclusions to our study (Chapter 7). But it must be flagged here because we have been building a cumulative case, based in part on observed patterns of metalepsis, for a radical discontinuity between Christ and David in the discursive hands of Paul. Our case may be put in any of three forms. A weak version would hold that Paul evokes David's speech, and attaches his name to it, without thought of metalepsis; but that when Christ is named, the psalm – or more of it than is quoted – is in Paul's mind and, to some extent, intended for his readers also (this on the evidence of 15:3). But this seems inadequate, for two reasons. First, it may be thought to ask too little of Paul's familiarity with the psalms – so extensively quoted in Romans and elsewhere – that he should be so seldom aware of metaleptic possibilities. Indeed, such a conclusion would undermine our argument for metalepsis in Rom 15:3 as so well suited to Paul's evident aims: would the apostle be so clearly attuned to literary context here, yet ignorant of it elsewhere? These objections are not decisive, perhaps, since a lack of interest in context does not equate to an ignorance of the same. But here we meet the chief problem, which is that in many instances, not only in Rom 15:3, we have found the varied contexts of quotation to be peculiarly suggestive. In the face of such findings, a hypothesis of Pauline *disinterest* seems an uncharitable and counterintuitive default.

Accordingly, a stronger case may be offered, in which Paul is – all else being equal – both alert to metaleptic possibilities, and responsive to them. This is not to suggest he “welcomes” metalepsis, necessarily, or uniformly invites it; but rather, that where metalepsis may prove unsympathetic, he acts pre-emptively to counter its effects. This seems to offer a better fit with our treatment of David in Rom 3, 4 and 11, where we found evidence in the text for just such authorial action. Yet it fails as an account of Rom 15:9, where no serious impediment is offered; yet where almost all of what might emerge in the process of metalepsis is dramatically at odds with Paul's local characterisation of the quotation's subject.

For this reason, we might venture a claim still stronger, in which – all else being equal – Paul quotes texts with unsympathetic metaleptic “potential” *so as to dissociate his discourse*

*from intertextual claims*, liberating the quoted words themselves to serve his discourse without “slippage”. Thus in Rom 4:6-8, Paul evokes the penitent David so as to overturn penitence; in 3:10-18 he invokes the righteous sufferer so as to overturn the claim to righteousness; in 11:9-10 he invokes a Davidic judge so as to overturn judgment; in 15:9 he evokes the warrior-king so as to overturn violence. Dissociation is not all that obtains in the latter case; as we saw earlier (4.2.3), a positive metaleptic gesture is enacted in Rom 15:9, by which the reader is urged to follow Paul’s train of thought and image from psalm to psalm; though only for the third quotation (Ps 116:1) is an extension to the donor psalm congenial. Rom 15:3 remains exceptional on this account, not as if metalepsis were construable only here, but as its contribution is unequivocally positive only here; and that because it is required in the service of interpretation.

A final adjudication of these alternatives awaits the conclusions to our thesis (Ch. 7). At this point we will turn from Romans to 2 Corinthians, in which what we have learned so far will be put to further test. Chapter 5 examines the modulation of Paul’s discourse in 2 Cor 1 by Christological psalmody, as we find the other-orientation of Christ the psalmist (cf. Rom 15:3) played out in the experience of those in Christ, in their suffering and consolation. In Chapter 6 we turn to Paul’s lapidary citation of Ps 115:1a in 2 Cor 4:13, to learn the extent of Christ’s revision of psalmic subjectivity.

# 5. Christological psalmody in the drama of consolation

---

## 5.1 Introduction: Paul among the psalmists, in Christological voice

It may seem strange to look for psalmody in the first chapter of 2 Corinthians. Paul's text is without the favoured signs of intertextual reference: there is neither quotation nor allusion as authorially understood. The apostle does not gesture toward this or that text from the psalms, urging metalepsis; nor is there in psalmody a clear material contribution to his argument, which might be welcome here. Yet the signs of Paul's subjective engagement with psalmody, not now as text but as discourse, are richly apparent; and it is these which draw our inquiry hither.

### 5.1.1 A global psalmic subject engaged in the mode of thanksgiving/lament

The signs of Paul's engagement with psalmody are varied. Some are textual in form – distinctive lexis, in particular; but even these, by virtue of their discursive provenance, point away from the textuality of the psalms toward the subjectivity of their discourse. Put simply, they suggest Paul not as a user of the psalms, but as a psalmist. If in Romans we have found a choirmaster, assigning and shaping the voices of particular psalms, here in 2 Corinthians 1 we find Paul personally engaged with the genres which dominate psalmic discourse: lament and thanksgiving. To be sure, this engagement is not formally comprehensive – Paul is not composing a psalm – but modal. The apostle enacts the generic conventions of a letter, but does so in the mode of a psalmist.

That Paul comes to the composition of 2 Corinthians as a psalmist, or with this role available to him, we have argued elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> The apostle brings to his writing a formation in the language and disposition of psalmody, which only awaits an

---

<sup>1</sup> 1.3.2.1 n.97.

appropriate theme to assert its modal influence in discourse. This we find explicit in the *narratio* of 1:8-11,<sup>2</sup> where an experience of intense suffering calls for dramatic evocation in the categories of lament. Paul's tale is no full-orbed narrative; but this serves only to confirm his affiliation with the conventions of psalmody. Like the psalmist, Paul offers scant objective detail – we know tantalisingly little about the scope of Paul's affliction – preferring to dwell on the subjectivity of his experience as both sufferer and rescued.

The subject of these verses testifies first to its own death, then to a divine rescue which is global in reach, embracing past and future, and implicating Paul, the Corinthians and an unbounded “many” in its operation (through prayer) and its entailment (thanksgiving). Transcending the historical particularity of Paul's Asian experience, this subject is at the last paradigmatic: the subject of any and all affliction, any and all rescue. As we shall see also in the next chapter (6.3.2), a quintessential, representative subject of psalmody is being (re)constructed, with far-reaching implications.

It is tempting to find the psalmist's subjectivity represented in the structure of 1:1-11 as a whole. Turning personal epistolary convention almost on its head, Paul ends the *narratio* with thanksgiving – though not his own;<sup>3</sup> the *exordium* begins in doxology.<sup>4</sup> This structural reversal brings Paul into alignment with conventions of psalmody; for doxology is often the psalmist's opening gesture, and his rejoicing amid the faithful community a frequent end. Not that Paul is self-consciously abandoning one convention in favour of another; rather, the structural change signifies Paul's unselfconscious engagement with psalmody throughout the passage.

---

<sup>2</sup> Strictly, the *narratio* which begins at 1:8, and continues at least until 2:13; cf. Witherington 1995:viii-ix, 335-36; Kennedy 1984:87-91. Notwithstanding, the integrity of 1:3-11 is easily maintained, and will be evident in our own analysis; cf. Furnish 1984:xi-xii, 43; Hafemann 2000:37-39.

<sup>3</sup> Paul typically begins by giving thanks for signs of divine grace in his addressees, then detailing his prayers on their behalf (e.g. 1 Cor 1:4-9; Phil 1:3-11; Rom 1:8-10; cf. 1 Thess 1:2-3). Thanksgiving concludes the opening segment of 2 Cor 1 (at v.11), in anticipation of God's grace in response to petition. As is often noted, the thanksgiving element comes only in v.11, in reference to the hoped-for thanksgiving of others, not the actual thanksgiving of Paul himself. Cf. Furnish 1984:116; Wiles 1974:227-29; Harris 2005:138.

<sup>4</sup> More specifically, in eulogy; see discussion below. For 2 Cor 1:3-7 as *exordium*, see Kennedy 1984:87-91. Our study grants the label (cf. on *narratio*; cf. 5.1.1 n.2), and the general function of the *exordium* within forensic rhetoric; namely, in cultivating audience receptivity and establishing the writer's *ethos* (Kennedy 1984:129-60). Nonetheless, we will not look to traditional rhetorical categories for analytical purchase, and do not need to rule on the rhetorical species of the letter as a whole.

It should not surprise us, then, to find traces of psalmic subjectivity earlier in 2 Cor 1. These are explicit in the liturgical blessing of 1:3, and implicit, as we shall see, even in the letter's salutation.<sup>5</sup> Between eulogy to the consoler (1:3) and the drama of the consoled (1:8-11), the subject of blessing engages in dramaturgy (1:4-7): the *dramatis personae* in consolation are declared, and the play of agency made clear. Dramaturgical labour is required (we shall argue) in anticipation of a departure from the narrative paradigm expected of psalmic thanksgiving; for this psalmist is without agency in his own rescue.

### 5.1.2 A Christological psalmist engaged, the psalmist remade as an agency

It is in this last point, which we shall review at length, that we learn how Paul's engagement with psalmody is continuous with what we have found elsewhere. In the Davidic quotations of Romans we found a voice whose agency was radically circumscribed, as here: David is unable to secure God's action on his own behalf, and finds his voice co-opted to agents stronger than himself. In the Christological voicing of psalm quotations, again in Romans, we discovered a rationale for the subjective "suture" of those in Christ with the the quotation's subject: this rationale is described here in dramaturgical fashion.

But more than this, we saw displayed in the Christological psalmist a different mode of agency, one which displaced the self's agency on its own behalf in a fundamental and effective orientation to the other. In the *narratio* and its entailment we will see this process enacted, as a psalmic subject "dies" as an agent in its own behalf, and is remade as a co-agency in prayer through which the divine agent acts to rescue and console. Dramatically and rhetorically effective as this sequence is, it requires the dramaturgy undertaken in earlier verses to fill out its logic. There we find the divine agent supremely active through Christological agency, in which those in Christ participate.

---

<sup>5</sup> On the assumption that 1:1-2 were composed by Paul to introduce the letter, rather than appended by a later compiler, the "influence" of psalmody, so significant immediately afterward, is plausible also in the first two verses. Here we do not find the lexis of psalmody, or its conceptuality; for 2 Corinthians' constitution as epistle depends on the appropriate generic controls at the outset. Salutation and greeting therefore proceed according to epistolary form. Yet there are traces of the psalmist's disposition in these verses (cf. 5.2.3.1).

Paul's modification of the agency of the psalmist, and the reconfigured relationship between self and community he negotiates, together bear not simply upon the issues addressed in 2 Corinthians but upon the very nature of psalmody itself. Neither genre nor mode is immutable, but each is subject to change as the price of representation in discourse.<sup>6</sup> Thus in 2 Corinthians a subject proper to psalmody's primary genres is represented and modified; psalmody modulates Paul's discourse and is modulated in its turn. Here as elsewhere Paul's text reveals a wide-ranging yet coherent revision of the psalmic subject under the aegis of Christ: a revision offered to all in Christ, therefore, who pray the psalms.

### 5.1.3 From dramaturgy to drama: an approach to the text

Our study of 2 Corinthians 1:1-11 involves a multi-pronged, but essentially linear, approach to the text. Focussing on the ways in which psalmody modulates the opening segments of Paul's letter, we turn first (5.2) to the *exordium*, 1:3-7, in which Paul's blessing urges us to examine the terms of consolation, alert to their provenance within psalmody (5.2.1). In vv.4-7 we find Paul at work as a dramaturg, describing the play of agency in consolation that will govern the drama to follow. Fundamental to this is the co-option of terminology proper to psalmody to the lexicon of Christological experience (5.2.2). Its fruit is a Christological revision of psalmic agency (5.2.3) and the promise of spiritual formation for those who find in psalmody a Christological subject (5.2.4).

Dramaturgy invites drama, and for this we turn to vv.8-11, the *narratio*. In vv.8-9a Paul describes an experience of intense suffering in terms which betray their roots in psalmody. These do not, however, figure a "righteous" sufferer, the adequate protagonist of the drama envisioned by vv.4-7, but one of misplaced confidence, a subject in need of remaking (5.3). Dramaturgy finds rather in vv.9b-11 the drama it requires, in which a remade subject trusts in God who raises the dead, and so is restored to the community of faith. That community, borrowed from psalmody but reconfigured, acts according to the roles assigned in dramaturgy, and confirms the logic uncovered there (5.4). Our conclusions are offered in 5.5.

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. 5.3.3.1 n.100.

## 5.2 2 Corinthians 1:3-7: Christ and the psalmist in alignment

### 5.2.1 Blessing and its discursive origins

Paul's engagement with psalmody comes to explicit view with the *berakah* of 2 Cor 1:3.<sup>7</sup> Readers of Paul's other letters find in this opening eulogy a departure from convention; but departure from one convention is merely alignment with another: here, the conventions of liturgical praise, rooted in psalmody.

#### 5.2.1.1 The subjectivity of blessing

It is the apostle's εὐλογητός, and its subjective entailments, which together set this letter apart from the other accepted Paulines. Elsewhere, Paul begins with a firm εὐχαριστῶ,<sup>8</sup> or in Galatians, an equally strong θαυμάζω (1:6); in every case, Paul's apostolic identity is enacted in strong speech acts marked by knowledgeable assertion. These affirm the claim to authority, insight and agency typically afforded an ἀπόστολος in the figured world of Pauline church practice.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, though εὐχαριστῶ takes God as object, it is manifestly the reader who is addressed, affirmed as the one whose merits provoke the apostle's gratitude.

The act of blessing is of a different kind. Whether indicative ("blessed is") or jussive ("blessed be") in mood, εὐλογητός takes God not only as object but as addressee, insofar as it is a liturgical pronouncement rooted in prayer. It is at once the cry of a psalmist, inasmuch as psalmody is the fountainhead of liturgical prayer (5.2.1.2 below). And unlike εὐχαριστῶ, εὐλογητός constitutes the one who blesses as recipient rather than agent. This is explicit in 2 Cor 1:3ff., where Paul is included in

---

<sup>7</sup> In what follows the term *berakah* is used in deference to the Jewish provenance of Paul's language. O'Brien (1977:236 n.19) distinguishes between eulogy (*berakah*) and doxology, and analyses 2 Cor 1:3-4, with Eph 1:3ff. and 1 Pet 1:3ff. as instances of "introductory eulogy", insofar as they deploy the term εὐλογητός, and are without reference to δόξα or such synonyms as τιμή or κράτος. Such formal distinctions imply an unnecessary narrowness of definition (cf. Harris 2005:141 for broader definition), and belie the functional equivalence of eulogy and doxology in respect of deity: both constitute God as the recipient of praise. On blessing in the OT see Mitchell 1987; in NT, Heckel 2002; Schenk 1967.

<sup>8</sup> 1 Thess 1:2 (εὐχαριστοῦμεν); Phil. 1:3; 1 Cor. 1:4; Rom. 1:8; cf. 2 Thess. 1:3 (εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν); Col 1:3.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Schutz 1975; Dunn 1998:571-80. Influential studies focused on Paul's discourse, and indebted to Foucault, include Polaski 1999 and Castelli 1991; cf. the Weberian account of Holmberg 2004.

the “us” who are consoled by the blessed Consoler.<sup>10</sup> The clear distinction between agent and recipient at the opening of Paul’s dramaturgical section is programmatic for what follows, for the terms under which agency is offered thereafter presume the subject’s prior status as recipient, whether of Christ’s suffering (v.5) or of divine consolation (*passim*).

### 5.2.1.2 The discursive provenance of blessing: liturgy and psalmody

Paul’s blessing is a tightly woven parallel structure that richly asserts its provenance in psalmody, and declares the liturgical cast of the passage it serves to introduce. Its duties go beyond this, of course, for the divine predicates of the *berakah* encode a narrative of consolation which constitutes the theme of the whole passage, if not of the letter it opens.<sup>11</sup> The particularities of this opening verse are accordingly of great significance.

<sup>1:3</sup> Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως,

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all consolation

The liturgical force of the formula εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός is not always recognised. After all, the phrase occurs in a variety of OT contexts and beyond, only some of which may be thought liturgical;<sup>12</sup> the distribution of the closely related εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεός is similar.<sup>13</sup> In all, seven of 22 references are found within the canonical psalter,

---

<sup>10</sup> O’Brien (1977:237-39) contends that “Paul, in the introductions of his letters, uses εὐχαριστέω consistently of *Fürdank* for God’s work in the lives of the addressees, and εὐλογέω for blessings in which he himself participated ... Apparently for Paul it seemed more fitting to use the term with a Greek background (εὐχαριστέω) when referring to graces, etc., given to others, particularly Gentiles; while the formula with a Jewish background (εὐλογέω κτλ.) was more apt when he himself came within the circle of blessing” (1977:239). As such a difference of usage is gratuitous (as O’Brien notes, 1977:239), and the sample small, the explanation remains speculative; but the central observation is sound: εὐχαριστέω distinguishes Paul from his correspondents; εὐλογέω does not. In the present passage, the logic of suffering and consolation in Christ (1:3-7) and the narrative it explicates (1:8-11) are both highly incorporative, as we shall discover; though Paul is certainly “within the circle of blessing”, his place within it is scarcely privileged.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Harris 2005:139; Murphy-O’Connor 1996:310.

<sup>12</sup> In the psalter: Pss 17:47; 65:20; 67:36. Outside it: Gen 14:20; 1 Kgs 5:21; 1 Esd 4:40; Tob 11:17; 13:2, 18; Tob (S) 9:6; 11:14, 17; 13:2, 18; Dan 3:95.

<sup>13</sup> Pss 40:14; 71:18; 105:48; 143:1. Outside the canonical psalter: Gen 9:26; 24:27; 1 Sam 25:32; 2 Sam 18:28; 1 Kgs 1:48; 5:7; 8:15; 2 Chr 2:11; 6:4; Ezra 7:27; Dan 3:95. See also *Odes Sol.* 9:68. The appearance of this formula in 2 Cor. 1:3 would have made the application of κύριος to Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ somewhat awkward; similarly in Eph. 1:3 and 1 Pet. 1:3.

which constitutes the largest pool of liturgical language; of the remainder, several are expostulations removed from liturgical context.<sup>14</sup> In fact, such a ratio hardly tells against the phrase's liturgical affiliations – one in three is not insignificant; yet textual distribution is almost beside the point. Not all contexts are literary, after all. However deployed, the phrase is powerfully evocative of remembered ritual, for those with the relevant background; and here we may certainly include Paul and some among the congregations he established.<sup>15</sup> Moreover, in its form fully specified according to convention, and situated at the outset of the letter, where an audience waits to be constituted, Paul's blessing does not simply evoke the memory of ritual, but calls its liturgy to life.<sup>16</sup> And the primary linguistic and conceptual resource for Jewish liturgy is psalmody.

It seems likely, moreover, that the first reception of the letter, at least as Paul might imagine it, is in a liturgical setting, at a gathering of Corinthian believers;<sup>17</sup> further, that it would be first heard as someone – Paul's emissary – read it aloud. This being the case, any liturgical material in the text would receive clear reinforcement as the text is read, and the text's modal affinities with psalmody would be endorsed and amplified.<sup>18</sup>

### 5.2.1.3 Blessing's extension (vv. 3-4) drawn from psalmody

Thus far we have considered only the beginning of the *berakah*: the opening εὐλογητός. Yet it is the blessing as a whole which betrays the “telltale marks of *liturgicala*” found by Martin<sup>19</sup> and others. That whole extends beyond v.3 into v.4, insofar as the blessing form calls not only for the naming of the one blessed, but for the occasion of the blessing;<sup>20</sup> and this is what v.4a supplies.

<sup>14</sup> For example, Gen 24:27 and 1 Kgs 5:7, in which εὐλογητός κύριος ὁ θεός is an apparently spontaneous response to divine intervention. Perhaps 2 Cor 1:8-10 offers a similar occasion; cf. Deichgräber 1967:40, 87. Yet if so, it is noteworthy that Paul's “expostulation” precedes, rather than follows, a report of divine intervention, and this at some distance (vv. 3-7 intervene). This is not a spontaneous outburst following on deliverance, but a deliberately situated, if momentary, invitation to corporate worship.

<sup>15</sup> See 1.3.2.1 n.97; cf. Windisch 1924:37.

<sup>16</sup> For this reason, the question whether we should read “Blessed is God” or “Blessed be God” (Thrall 1994:100-1) is of no great consequence. From within the subjectivity of psalmody, in which the phrase positions Paul (and his readers), the language is performative on either reading: either constitutes God as “blessed”, and the subject as “blesser”.

<sup>17</sup> Martin 1986:7.

<sup>18</sup> On mode, see 5.3.3.1.

<sup>19</sup> Martin 1986:7.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Pss 17:48-49; 27:6b; 30:22b; 65:20b; 123:6b; 143:1; in each case, blessing precedes warrant or occasion. Cf. Pss 67:36; 71:18, where warrant or occasion precedes blessing.

<sup>3</sup>Εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως,<sup>4</sup> ὁ παρακαλῶν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ δύνασθαι ἡμᾶς παρακαλεῖν τοὺς ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Blessed be the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all consolation, who consoles us in all our affliction to enable us to console those in any kind of affliction with the consolation with which we are ourselves consoled by God.

Set in apposition to “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”, we find God characterised in v.3 with two phrases redolent of their participation in liturgy and their provenance within psalmody. The designation “Father of mercies” (πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν, 1:3), though a *hapax legomenon* in the biblical text, is represented in synagogue worship traditions,<sup>21</sup> and the plural οἰκτιρμοί is frequently associated with the κύριος in the psalms, almost exclusively in the cry of lament: God’s alone are the mercies to which the psalmists appeal; he is the sole “Father” of mercies, and constituted as such in prayer.<sup>22</sup> Thus, although Paul’s phrase is unrepresented in psalmody, the drama it encodes most surely is.

Yet the *berakah* draws not only content from psalmody, but form; for the divine predicates are set within a structure ubiquitous in Hebrew poetry: not chiasmus but parallelism,<sup>23</sup> which sets “the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ” in parallel with “the Father of mercies” and “the God of all consolation”.<sup>24</sup> Paul supplements

---

<sup>21</sup> In the *Ababah Rabbah*, which is certainly of ancient provenance; in Mishnah cf. *Ber.* 1:4, 11b-12a; *Tamid* 5:1. God’s mercies are evoked in lament, with other categories absent from 2 Corinthians, in Isa 63:15: ποῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους σου καὶ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου ὅτι ἀνέσχου ἡμῶν. Elsewhere in the prophets, in plural, cf. Hos 2:21; Dan (θ’) 9:9, 18.

<sup>22</sup> In cries of lament, primarily as appeal: Pss 24:6; 39:12; 50:3; 68:17; 76:10; 78:8; 118:77, 156. In praise, cf. Ps 144:9. In historical psalmody cf. Ps 105:46. In the NT cf. Rom 12:1; Phil 2:1; Heb 10:28.

<sup>23</sup> Kleinknecht (1984:244) discerns chiasmus in θεός - πατήρ - πατήρ - θεός (ABBA); while formally plausible, it appears to have no particular purchase. More generally, Martin (1986:7) includes chiasm among the “telltale marks of *liturgical*” – though in v.5. Parallelism is, however, a better clue to the presence of psalmody, being endemic to poetic form (1.3.1.1), and one which implies more than strict apposition among the divine predicates. This God is God and Father not of the Lord Jesus Christ *and* of compassion and all consolation: parallelism is not mere conjunction. Rather, it is precisely as God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ that God is also Father of mercies, and Father of consolation. Christ is not identical with consolation, of course; but he is intimately identified with it. See further 5.2.3.2 below.

<sup>24</sup> Though innovative, Paul’s Christological predication, by which the God who is blessed is “God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ”, is nonetheless faithful to convention. Structurally, the blessing form invites the naming of the one blessed, and calls for the acts which have provoked the blessing to be characterised. It is thus a mistake to talk in terms of christianising “additions” to a fixed formula taken from Jewish liturgy, and so to argue that πατήρ alone governs what follows, with θεός

his act of naming by declaring the divine acts (v.4a) – a further structural conformity with convention – and this in terms of παράκλησις and θλίψις, concepts which, by their mutual association, deepen the text’s affiliation with psalmody, as we will shortly see (5.2.2).

#### 5.2.1.4 A blessing uttered by the global subject of psalmody

As we noted by way of introduction (5.1.3), the rhetorical work of Paul’s text includes the refiguring of psalmic subjectivity, and this in comprehensive terms. Though Paul may reach for the language of psalmody to express the particularity of apostolic experience, that language subverts particularity, yielding a generic subject able to represent biblical psalmody in its broadest modes of thanksgiving and lament.

The signs of this subversion, later evident in Paul’s preference for first personal plural subjects (5.3.3.3), are apparent already in the *berakah*. Unlike the thankful subject of εὐχαριστῶ in other Pauline letters, who is distinguished from those he is thankful for, the one who pronounces blessing is joined with them, and opposed to a God whose responsibility for consolation and agency as consoler are comprehensive: he is twice the “Father” – the originator – and the God of “all” consolation (1:3), who consoles us in “all” our affliction (1:4). In blessing such a God this subject brings to view the full range of His acts: all the varied terrain of suffering and consolation. Thus it represents in its proclamation all suffering and consoled psalmists: a global subject of thanksgiving and lament.

It is this global subject whose agency will later be refigured in the *narratio*. The instrumentality of its refiguring is Christological, and is the subject of our next section; but it is signaled clearly in the form of blessing. Earlier the Father’s co-agent in mediating grace and peace (1:2),<sup>25</sup> Christ is now aligned with the psalmist before the Father: for God is God and Father alike of the Lord Jesus Christ and the

---

structurally distinct (so Barrett 1973:58-9; Windisch 1924:37; Furnish 1984:109; Kümmel 1949:196). This is not supplement, but a specification integral to conventional form.

<sup>25</sup> Grace and peace are ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, in a formulation which clearly identifies “God our Father” and “the Lord Jesus Christ” as together the source of χάρις and εἰρήνη; cf. Harris 2005:135-36. The omission of ἀπό before κυρίου, and the singular article which introduces the pair, stresses the singularity and unity (though not identity) of the source.

blessing subject (1:3).<sup>26</sup> This is the first of several signs of the Christological inhabitation of psalmody in 2 Corinthians 1, found chiefly, as we shall now discover, in an interplay of lexis (5.2.2) and a distinctive realignment of agency (5.2.3).<sup>27</sup>

## 5.2.2 Christology and psalmody in lexical interplay in 2 Cor 1:3-7

Liturgy and a debt to psalmody are our points of orientation for vv.3-7. Yet the powerful lexical signifiers which dominate this passage are varied in their discursive provenance; psalmody is not all. When brought together in the striking relationships of consequence and affinity discussed below, their influence is mutual, if variable in effect. Together they achieve the Christological incorporation of the psalmic subject in its experience of suffering.

### 5.2.2.1 Affiliated: key terms in 1:3-7 and their structural interrelationship

The most significant terms in 2 Cor 1:3-7, by dint of lexical frequency, are the noun *παράκλησις* and its verbal cognate *παρακαλέω*.<sup>28</sup> These are closely bound at 1:4 with *θλιψις*, which is the term by which Paul links the dramaturgy of 1:4-7 with the narrative of 1:8-10.<sup>29</sup>

In the somewhat schematic style of Paul's dramaturgy it is possible to discern a certain dependence among these terms, none of which is given independent

---

<sup>26</sup> The God who is blessed is *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The key element for interpretation is the connective *καί*, which is most simply read as identifying *θεός* with *πατήρ*. Attempts to take the connective as exegetical, such that God is blessed [who is] the Father of our Lord etc., ask more of *καί* than the text requires.

<sup>27</sup> Although the question of agency figures significantly in our study, particularly in this Chapter and the next, it is not necessary to elaborate a full-featured theory of agency to support it. As a rough distinction, which owes something to Kenneth Burke (1945:171-226, 275-320), an agent acts, while an agency is acted through. But the "acts" of an agent may encompass cognition, affect, volition, and not simply "action" in or upon the material world. Further, those figured as agencies at some points in Paul's discourse may at other points be figured as agents, according (but not reducible) to rhetorical requirement. Indeed, the possibility that an agency may at once be an agent is not ruled out; in this respect, our study is informed by a model of divine agency characterised by non-contrastive transcendence (Tanner 1988; cf. Barclay 2008a), in terms of which the divine agent constitutes richly specified human agents in dependence on himself. The Pauline picture reflects also the particular form of Christological agency associable with one who "emptied himself" (*ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*; Phil 2:7): an agent who acts precisely in becoming an agency; cf. 5.2.3, 5.2.4. For a useful collection of essays on agency in relation to Paul and his contemporaries, see Barclay and Gathercole 2008.

<sup>28</sup> The verb appears four times (1:4, three instances; 1:6, one). The noun appears six times (1:3, 4, 5, 6 (twice), 7). This modest stretch of text accounts for more than 30% of the noun's appearances in Paul (19 in total).

<sup>29</sup> *θλιψις* appears twice in 1:4, and is the topic announced at 1:8.

substance until θλίψις is glossed at 1:8. The action of consoling (παρακαλέω) is always governed by consolation (παράκλησις) as its content (1:4)<sup>30</sup> or purpose (1:6, twice). The particularity of παράκλησις is determined in turn by θλίψις since, in the programmatic statement of 1:4, particular experiences and kinds of affliction (see below) are the occasion for consolation.<sup>31</sup> θλίψις is then powerfully exemplified in 1:8-9a; its corresponding παράκλησις in 1:9b-10, in the form of rescue. As θλίψις is the most richly specified content term, its discursive affiliations are relevant for the terms which depend on it.

The Christological term πάθημα, on the other hand, is independently established and substantiated as the particular παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (1:5), and our sharing in these subordinates our experience of θλίψις (and by association, of παράκλησις) to a Christological subject. The form of this reaccentuation is addressed in 5.2.2.3 below. First, however, we must consider the character of θλίψις in its own right.

### 5.2.2.2 Localised: affliction and consolation domiciled in personal psalmody

θλίψις is native to the soil of psalmody, but does not flourish only there. The term gives expression to a pervasive element of human experience, individual and corporate, and to a central stimulus to prophetic reflection. It is unsurprising, then, to find θλίψις throughout the biblical literature; yet it is especially well represented in the prophets, and most strongly of all in the psalms.<sup>32</sup> On their own, such statistical observations tell us only that, when Paul speaks of his suffering, the term is a natural one to use; but the way in which it is used in 2 Cor 1 is characteristic especially of its deployment in the personal discourse of the psalmic genres of lament and thanksgiving.

The key phrase is found early in our passage, as Paul grounds the global proclamation of God as “Father of mercies” and “God of all consolation” (1:3) in the particularities of human experience (1:4). This God is the one who consoles us “in all our affliction” (ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν), so that we are enabled to console

<sup>30</sup> Thus we console others with the consolation with which we are consoled.

<sup>31</sup> The *content* of παράκλησις is thus dependent on θλίψις, though its *effect* is specified independently in v.6; see 5.2.4.2.

<sup>32</sup> There are 35 instances in the canonical psalter, nearly 40% of total instances in the OT: Pss 4:2; 9:10, 22; 19:2; 21:12; 24:17, 22; 31:7; 33:7, 18, 20; 36:39; 43:25; 45:2; 49:15; 53:9; 54:4; 58:17; 59:13; 65:11, 14; 70:20; 76:3; 77:49; 80:8; 85:7; 90:15; 106:39; 107:13; 114:3; 117:5; 118:143; 137:7; 141:3; 142:11.

those who are “in any kind of affliction” (ἐν πάσῃ θλίψει) with the consolation with which we ourselves are consoled by God. θλίψις is throughout 1:3-7 an experience particular to the individual subject.<sup>33</sup>

With the language of possession (*our* affliction) Paul makes θλίψις and παράκλησις alike particular to the experiencing subject. The same is achieved with the language of differentiation (*any kind of* affliction): θλίψις is not a generic affliction, but diverse and particular (as just argued) to individual subjects. Similarly with the παράκλησις we are empowered to give: it is that very consolation with which we were ourselves consoled. These qualifications require that the paradigmatic terms of consolation given in vv.3-7 be authenticated in particular biography, such as Paul’s narrative of suffering and rescue in 1:8-11 will provide: a narrative rich in psalmic subjectivity (5.3.3). By its association with that narrative, θλίψις and the παράκλησις which it occasions are further domiciled in personal psalmody.

As figured in psalmody,<sup>34</sup> God’s consolations are always momentous in their effects, at times entailing and acting upon an extremity of subjective experience. The psalmist of Ps 93 finds, in the fullness of pain in his heart (93:19a), that God’s consolations have “loved his soul” (ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχὴν μου, 93:19b). Consoled by rod and staff, the psalmist of Ps 22, having walked in the valley of death’s shadow (ἐν μέσῳ σκιᾶς θανάτου), enters immediately upon a victory feast (22:4-5). For the psalmist of Ps 70, consolation (v.21) is to be brought out of the depths of the earth (v.20). From a state of humiliation (ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει μου) the psalmist of Ps 118:50 has been brought to life (ἔζησεν) by the consolation of the divine word. In such examples we see that παράκλησις is associated with a transition from death, in its subjective interpretation, to life.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Individual, though not singular. πάθημα, by contrast, signifies the experience of suffering as shared among subjects; see 5.2.2.3.

<sup>34</sup> The lexeme παρακαλέω appears in Pss 22:4; 68:21; 70:21; 76:3; 85:17; 89:13; 118:50, 52, 76, 82; 125:1; 134:14. This represents 12 of 99 instances in total in the OT; around 12%. The noun παράκλησις is not an especially common word in OT literature, appearing 16 times in total; a further 29 instances are found in the NT, of which 11 appear in 2 Corinthians. The term appears in the canonical psalms only at Ps 93:19.

<sup>35</sup> To be sure, the poles of experience may not both be represented; but death and life make for a strong ellipse. If the psalmist has been “made alive” (Ps 118:50), in what subjective state was he before? And if the psalmist is consoled in “the valley of death’s shadow” (Ps 22:4), what is her subjective state at the ensuing feast?

Declaring παράκλησις in the mode of psalmody, Paul promises a narrative of comparable richness and impact: suffering deeply felt; consolation profound in consequence, mediating a transition from death to life. Just this we find in the *narratio*. Psalmody is not all, however. These terms are reaccentuated, as we shall see, by one with a different discursive heritage.

### 5.2.2.3 Reaccentuated: θλίψις, παράκλησις and the παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ

Bakhtin termed “reaccentuation”<sup>36</sup> the process by which language familiar from one discourse comes to mean more, or differently, by association with language from another. Such a process may be observed here, where the term θλίψις, figuring the personal experience of the psalmist in affliction, is reaccentuated by association with a distinctively Christological term.

Thus we find θλίψις aligned with πάθημα in 1:6, where “we” are the subject of both affliction (1:6a) and suffering (1:6c),<sup>37</sup> and already in 1:5, insofar as Paul’s affliction (θλίβω, 1:6a) is sequel to the sufferings of Christ (τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1:5) overflowing<sup>38</sup> “to us”. Unlike θλίψις, πάθημα is not drawn from psalmic discourse – indeed, it is found nowhere in OT – so that the affiliation of the two in 2 Cor 1 is a case of mutual reaccentuation. Aligned with θλίψις and παράκλησις, πάθημα comes to characterise the suffering of a psalmist.<sup>39</sup> But equally, defined as the sufferings of Christ (1:5), πάθημα reaccentuates the lexis of psalmody toward a distinctively Christological subject. This is at one with the term’s usage elsewhere: πάθημα is for Paul a bipolar term, marking either the passions of the flesh,<sup>40</sup> or sufferings of or

<sup>36</sup> Bakhtin 1981:290, 419-22; cf. Newsom 2004:195. For the larger framework, see Morson and Emerson 1990.

<sup>37</sup> Paul is the subject of affliction (εἴτε δὲ θλιβόμεθα) in 2 Cor 1:6, to whom the sufferings of Christ (παθήματα, 1:5) overflow. Cf. the collocation of these terms in Col 1:24; in this case, it is Christ who is the subject of “afflictions” (θλίψεις), and Paul who is the subject of what “was suffered” for the Colossians (ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν).

<sup>38</sup> περισσεύω, a term whose semantic range includes “abound” and (connotatively) “overflow”; cf. BDAG q.v.; Louw-Nida §59.52. The exact force of the term is not material to our analysis.

<sup>39</sup> The term appears in Paul in Rom 7:5; 8:18; Gal 5:24; Phil 3:10; and 2 Cor 1:5,6,7. Cf. also Col 1:24; 2 Tim 3:11. There is no real hint of a psalmic accent in Paul’s usage outside 2 Corinthians. Otherwise Hebrews, in which Jesus suffers death (2:9) and is perfected through suffering (2:10) in a context rich with psalms citations; cf. the suffering of believers in 10:32, but without psalmody. Suffering and glory are conjoined for the remaining NT author to speak of πάθημα. In 1 Peter 1:10-11 “the prophets” try to understand the testimony of the Spirit of Christ in them, who predicted τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα, and the glory to follow; might David be among them? Believers participate in the sufferings of Christ in hope of his glory (4:13); Peter is himself a witness of Christ’s sufferings and a future sharer in the glory (5:1); cf. 5:9.

<sup>40</sup> Thus Paul writes of τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν in Rom 7:5; while those in Christ have crucified the flesh with its passions (σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν) in Gal 5:24.

with Christ, as here (1:5). In the latter sense, *πάθημα* in Paul is always properly Christ's, and only derivatively predicable of believers.<sup>41</sup>

Though reaccentuation is a mutual process, *θλίψις* and *πάθημα* do not bear equal force in 1:3-7. When God's consoling agency is in the foreground, with those who are its beneficiaries (1:3-4), *θλίψις* predominates. The advent of Christ in v.5 is the advent of his *παθήματα*, which overflow to us. Paul is the subject of *θλίψις* once thereafter (v.6a), but shares in *παθήματα* with the Corinthians in v.6b and 7. The "drift" of the passage is toward the co-option of the individual subject's *θλίψις* to the *παθήματα* τοῦ Χριστοῦ, in which multiple subjects share.

Though the two terms remain finally distinct, the association of *θλίψις* with *πάθημα* lends an unmistakable Christological cast to Paul's performance of psalmody. To experience *θλίψις* is at once to share in the *παθήματα* τοῦ Χριστοῦ; but the converse is equally the case. In his suffering Christ comes to be associated with the paradigmatic psalmic experience of affliction. Christ has become, in effect, a psalmist, as we have seen elsewhere; but this by virtue not of speech (as in the Roman case) but of the subjectivity of suffering. Yet Christ is not merely one psalmist among several: he is *the* psalmist; for over the course of our passage, as we have seen, *θλίψις* gives way to *πάθημα* and is finally co-opted to it. We shall shortly discover a similar relationship between subjects in respect of agency.

First, however, we must ask to what extent the *παθήματα* τοῦ Χριστοῦ reaccentuate not only *θλίψις* but the *παράκλησις* addressed to it. As seen in vv.3-4, consolation is matched to the individual's varied experience of affliction (*θλίψις*). Once affliction is co-opted to Christological suffering (v.5), *παράκλησις* is rematched to the *παθήματα*

---

<sup>41</sup> A distinction between *θλίψις* and *πάθημα* is sustained throughout our passage, on the basis of which is proper to whom. It is "our affliction" which is the topic of Paul's narrative (ὕπερ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν, 1:8) and central to the *berakah* (1:4). "We" are the explicit subject of *θλίβω* in 2 Cor 1:6; "those who are in any *θλίψις*" are consoled in 1:4. In contrast, Christ's *παθήματα* overflow "to us" in 1:5, grounding an identity between the sufferings "we suffer" and those "you" patiently endure (1:6): for these remain Christ's, overflowing to all. Paul's firm hope in 1:7 depends on mutual fellowship in "the" sufferings (*κοινωνοί ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων*) – not, as most ETs have it, a Corinthian sharing in "our" sufferings. The pattern continues elsewhere in Paul. Being conformed to Christ's death in Phil 3:10, the apostle claims the "fellowship of his sufferings" (*τὴν κοινωνίαν τῶν παθημάτων αὐτοῦ*); believers enter into this fellowship, but the sufferings are "his" – Christ's. In Rom 8:17-18 the status of co-heir with Christ is conditional (*εἴπερ*) on co-suffering (*συνπάσχω*) with Christ, a term related to the noun *πάθημα*, but distinct from it as its verbal cognate; cf. 1 Cor 12:26. No doubt expressive of co-suffering, our own sufferings cannot compare with the glory to be revealed (8:18).

τοῦ Χριστοῦ, with which it is explicitly associated (vv.6-7). As a result παράκλησις becomes the παράκλησις τοῦ Χριστοῦ: an objective genitive, as God alone can be the agent and “Father” of consolation (1:3). To share in consolation is to be consoled as Christ himself was consoled, however this may be figured. This might be defined in many ways as one reflects on the career of Christ; indeed, given the centrality of Christ’s death and resurrection in Paul and the psalmic resonances of the term (above), παράκλησις might be identified with resurrection itself. This we will see confirmed in the Christocentric confidence of the subject in 2 Cor 1:9b in “God who raises the dead”.<sup>42</sup> Resurrection is an historical datum for the Christ, but an eschatological prospect for Paul’s readers, however more proximate deliverances from death (1:10) may render the prospect vivid. Perhaps for this reason Paul moves beyond the specific form of παράκλησις to identify it by its effects upon the suffering subject (1:6), as we shall later see (5.2.4.2).

What is the rhetorical effect of associating these various terms? Beyond the reciprocal logic embodied in vv.3-7, Paul’s associative strategies create a rich community of affect, anchored at once in the shared subjectivity of affliction and consolation rooted in psalmody, and in Christ’s own sufferings, which overflow to all. The dual anchorage we find here should not surprise us: as we saw in Rom 15, Paul’s text urges suture with the suffering psalmist of Ps 68:10 on the basis of Christ’s prior installation as subject (15:3ff.), and discovers a community of worship constituted by and around Christ, enacted in psalmody (15:9ff.). Christ does not give voice to psalmody here, as he did in Romans; but the particularity of his sufferings defines the subjectivity of categories drawn from psalmody. Experiencing affliction and consolation, Paul’s Corinthian readers become psalmists on the terms offered by Christ himself.

### **5.2.3 The alignment of Christological and anthropological agency**

To this point we have focussed on the ways in which Paul’s discourse in vv.3-7 co-opts a psalmic subject to categories of Christological experience. We shall later see how, as a result of its co-option, this subject is modified from its conventional disposition within the genres of thanksgiving and lament. Paul’s *prima facie* purpose

---

<sup>42</sup> See 5.3.1.2 below, n.67.

in vv.3-7 is not to configure a psalmic subject, however, but to set out the play of agency in any drama of consolation in which that subject might figure, such as we will find in vv.8-11. It is now time to reflect directly on the disposition of agencies in our text, which reinforce Christ's position as psalmist.

### 5.2.3.1 The divine agent foregrounded: the *salutatio*

<sup>1</sup> Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ καὶ Τιμόθεος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῆ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῆ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὔσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ,<sup>2</sup> χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Paul, apostle of Christ Jesus by the will of God, and Timothy the brother, to the church of God which is in Corinth, with all the saints who are in the whole of Achaia, grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.

The divine agent is strongly foregrounded from the first verse of 2 Corinthians.

Aside from the unusual brevity of both salutation and greeting, three features of the opening verses converge on this point. 1) Paul elides the usual signs of apostolic agency and particularity:<sup>43</sup> notably, there is no call language (καλέω/κλητός) such as would draw attention to Paul's apostolic vocation and empowerment. Instead, 2) Paul circumscribes his own identity with that of Christ (Παῦλος ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ), and asserts the will of God as cause (διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ). By contrast with his own case, 3) Paul maximises the rhetorical space of the church, made particular by geographical specification (the church ἐν Κορίνθῳ; the saints ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ), and qualified as comprehensive (πᾶσιν τοῖς οὔσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ).

These rhetorical strategies do not simply privilege the divine agent (and his Christological co-agent; see next section); they also reflect the modal presence of the psalmic subject, itself generic, yet directed to rich community life. This in turn opens the distribution of agency roles to a wider group – to the community of those

---

<sup>43</sup> Consider the way in which Paul's apostolic claim is enforced in the opening discourse of his other letters. In Galatians, the terms of Paul's calling figure the apostle as a powerful agent with a strong claim to authoritative position; and so he proves to be, defining the identity of God (1:1), disclosing the will of the Father (1:4), adjudicating the gospel (1:6), asserting his own preaching as the only true (1:8-9). In the less troubled waters of Philippians, Paul displays a comparable strength, as he offers sure insight into the Philippians' past and present (1:5) and future (1:6); an insight he enjoins on his hearers (1:9), even as he ensures its effective result (1:10). Thus as Paul knows "that he who began a good work in you will carry it on to completion" (v.6), the effectiveness of his prayer "that you ... may be pure and blameless until the day of Christ" (v.10) is already assured. (Paul does not identify himself as an apostle at the outset of Philippians, preferring to emphasise Timothy's status as co-sender, which invites a shared designation (δοῦλοι). Nonetheless, Paul's discourse from v.3 is grammatically singular; he alone speaks, and that with apostolic authority.)

who bless God – represented in the liturgical subject of 1:3. This subject comes to share in the agency of Christ, as we shall soon discover. First, however, we must learn how Paul configures the agency of Christ himself.

### 5.2.3.2 Grace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ

Though the divine agent is to the fore throughout our passage, v.2 constitutes Christ no less than God as provider of grace and peace, a genuine co-agent with the Father.<sup>44</sup> Although the benediction conforms to Pauline convention in both form and content (though it is somewhat spare in 2 Corinthians), we are entitled to ask whether the “grace” of Christ and God may take particular form in our passage.

A passage with rich affinities to our own may help. Compare Paul’s discussion in 2 Cor 8, where the grace of God (8:1) and the grace of Christ (8:9) are both at work. Thus v.9:

γινώσκετε γὰρ τὴν χάριν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι δι’ ὑμᾶς ἐπτώχευσεν πλούσιος ὢν, ἵνα ὑμεῖς τῇ ἐκείνου πτωχείᾳ πλουτήσητε.

Here we learn in what “the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ” consists, namely that in his wealth he became poor, so that others through his poverty might be enriched. The outworking of this is found already in 8:2 as an instance of “the grace of God” (8:1):

ὅτι ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ θλίψεως ἢ περισσεΐα τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ κατὰ βάθος πτωχεία αὐτῶν ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτῶν

Against the backdrop of severe affliction, the extreme poverty of the Macedonians is the very thing that overflows in a wealth of generosity.

2 Corinthians 8 offers to ground the benediction of 1:2 in particular relations between Christ and others (8:9) and among communities (8:1-2). Taking these verses together, we find the afflicted Macedonians participating in the poverty of Christ, with the result that others are enriched. Such, then, is grace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ in the first part of 2 Cor 8:<sup>45</sup> an incorporation of

---

<sup>44</sup> See 5.2.1.4 n.25.

<sup>45</sup> The latter part of this chapter complicates the picture helpfully; see 5.2.3.3 below.

those impoverished in affliction into the poverty of Christ, through which others are enriched.

These relations are figured in similar ways in our passage. For Christological poverty in 2 Cor 8 we may substitute τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ; for the enrichment of others, their παράκλησις. Grace from God and Christ in 2 Corinthians 1 is thus: an incorporation of our affliction into the sufferings of Christ, through which others are consoled. It is worth noting that what applies to a nominally apostolic subject in 2 Cor 1 applies to all in 2 Cor 8, a sign that “all” are implicated in the logic of the earlier chapter.<sup>46</sup>

If the parallel is accepted, it helps us to negotiate the transition from 1:2 to 1:3, in which the Christological agent is subordinated. Though he is lofty indeed (our Lord Jesus Christ), God is his God and Father no less than of Paul, who invokes the blessing;<sup>47</sup> thus God’s supremacy as agent is firmly marked at the point of psalmody’s invocation.<sup>48</sup> Divine agency is confirmed in its comprehensiveness: God is the God of *all* comfort (v.3), who comforts us in *all* our affliction (v.4). Equally, *all* calls to *all* in v.1: God (and no other) is the encompassing actor whose adequate object is *his* ἐκκλησία, *all* the ἄγιοι (1:1).<sup>49</sup>

As the comprehensive agent, God stands behind the overflowing (περισσεύω) of suffering and comfort in v.5. There, the sufferings are Christ’s (τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) but consolation, which takes ourselves and others as beneficiaries (and in this sense is “ours”), is God’s alone to dispense (v.3). Christ’s role in the overflow of consolation is clearly instrumental (διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ); and as this is a full

---

<sup>46</sup> For more on the ways in which Paul’s discourse implicates Paul and his readers alike as subjects see 5.3.3.2 and 5.3.3.3 below.

<sup>47</sup> The duality of relation implied by καί (God *and* Father of our Lord Jesus Christ) is decisive; see 5.2.1.4 n.25.

<sup>48</sup> Though the primary effect of the *berakah* for the Christological subject is subordination, a secondary effect can be seen, insofar as God is characterised in a parallelism, as one might expect for a psalmist’s pronouncement. God is thus:

<sup>A</sup> [God and Father] <sup>B</sup> of our Lord Jesus Christ,  
<sup>A'</sup> [Father of Mercies] and God <sup>B'</sup> of all consolation

The effect of the parallelism is to associate Jesus with that which God provides to all in Christ who are afflicted, rather than with God as provider. It is as though Christ were himself the Father’s “mercies”, and God’s consolation. The nuance is apt enough: Christ’s becoming an agency, through which consolation comes to the afflicted, is itself the Father’s doing: his merciful, consoling act.

<sup>49</sup> So it is that the Pauline “we” is the subject of divine consolation (v.4a) only so that others may be similarly subject (4b; cf. identical dynamic in 6b).

counterpart to the overflow of suffering (καθώς κτλ), it is clear that there also, and so throughout the verse, Christ is figured as an agency through which God works, not an agent.

How can God's co-agent of grace and peace (1:2) be simultaneously the agency through which God works? As we have seen: Christ as agent acts precisely in becoming an agency;<sup>50</sup> for the co-option of θλιψις to πάθημα, out of which God's παράκλησις comes to others, can happen no other way.

### 5.2.3.3 The Pauline subject in consolation: co-agency in Christ

Human agency is not denied in consolation, but is shown to consist in participation in the Christological agency described above. Thus, while the Pauline subject is empowered to console (1:4a), the shape, content and direction of consolation are all given by God. As the apostle is consoled (ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), *just so* does he console, and not otherwise.<sup>51</sup> The precise specification of παράκλησις here, such that we console with the consolation with which we are consoled, confers an objectified quality, as though consolation were an object of pre-determined shape received and handed on according to need, rather as we see in the image of manna Paul later deploys in his treatment of giving (2 Cor 8). The point is not that all consolation is alike, but that it has its origins extrinsic to human agencies through which it is mediated. As manna is always in its origins a divine provision, so also consolation. The consoling subject is accordingly an instrument, for all its empowered state: an agency, rather than an agent.

Indeed, this is what we find in v.5, where παθήματα and παράκλησις are overflowing subjects, precisely matched.<sup>52</sup> Paul's brief and only possession here is παράκλησις, but this overflows to those for whom it was always intended (vv.4, 6b). The

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Phil 2:6-8, in which the Christ subordinates himself: a narrative portrayal of what we find in 2 Cor 1. Christ elects kenosis, exercising the role of agent in the choice to become agency. Though they express a similar Christological movement, the lesson to be drawn is distinct in each case: imitation in Phil 2; participation in 2 Cor 1.

<sup>51</sup> Verse 3b-4 is thus chiasmatically arranged, such that God's consolation of "us" entirely circumscribes our consolation of others:

<sup>A</sup> God consoles us  
*so that*

<sup>B</sup> We console with consolation  
*with which*

<sup>A'</sup> We are consoled by God

<sup>52</sup> Such is the force of καθώς ... οὕτως ... καί; cf. Harris 2005:145.

sufferings of Christ – however we are to understand these – are never Paul’s, as we learned earlier: they overflow into (εἰς) him, and beyond (vv.6c, 7). God has already been constructed as the agent behind this drama; his agency is Christ, through whom (διὰ) this overflowing consolation is mediated. The Pauline subject, nominally empowered as agent (v.4), becomes an agency in Christ, following the trajectory of the Christological agent traced earlier.

That image is further developed in v.6. There we learn that *whatever* happens to “us” – whether as the subject of affliction (v.6a; cf. 4a) or consolation (v.6b; cf. 4a, 4c) – the outcome is an overflow (v.5) of consolation to others.<sup>53</sup> The particular quality of the subject’s experiences is immaterial; what signifies is the purpose of that experience, which is the consolation of others.

The Christological logic of this curious situation is elucidated in Paul’s discussion of giving in 2 Cor 8, which figured earlier in our discussion.<sup>54</sup> In 2 Cor 8:1-2, Macedonian poverty overflows (περισσεύω) in a wealth of generosity (they give beyond their means 8:3); in 8:14 a giving from abundance (περίσσευμα) is in view, whether of the Corinthians or the Macedonians. Christ is the model: though rich (or perhaps, *because* he was rich),<sup>55</sup> he elected poverty, through which “you became rich” (8:9). The paradigm offered by Christ encompasses a giving from wealth and from poverty alike; such is the result of enforcing the paradox by which poverty is neither antithetical to richness, nor identical with it, but productive of it. In Christ, then, the wealthy are wealthy, and so also the poor; in Christ, their giving from either predicament is the overflow of divine provision to the benefit of others. The same equivalence is found in 1:6, where consolation for others is the overflow of affliction and of consolation – now Christological categories – alike.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Nominally, the subject’s experience of affliction results not only in the consolation of others but in their salvation, on the best reading of the text (preferred by UBS<sup>1-4</sup>, NA<sup>27</sup>, chiefly on the strength and diversity of textual witness (cf. Metzger 2004:505)). As a single preposition and article governs both consolation and salvation in this clause (ὑπὲρ τῆς), the latter should probably be taken to elaborate the former, rather than to specify something entirely other. On the content of that elaboration, see 5.2.4.2 n.63.

<sup>54</sup> See 5.2.3.2. Indeed, the close correlation of logic is suggestive for the literary relationship between the two passages, which stand in a relation of paradigmatic to specific, subjective to objective. It is not simply that each is cut from the same Christologically-saturated cloth, but that the former supplies a detailed, paradigmatic logic that elucidates the later paraenesis.

<sup>55</sup> Barclay 2008c:421; cf. Schrage 1995:338-39 for a similarly provocative causal reading of 1 Cor 9:19.

<sup>56</sup> In turn, the logic of overflow spelt out in 2 Cor 1 helps to clarify how Paul might characterise Macedonian giving in 8:1-2 as “overflow”. The key is the divine origination of the act of giving, as also of consolation, through Christological agency. God’s consolation to us overflows through

The implied agent in this scenario (as in 2 Cor 8) is not the empowered subject of 1:4 (who consoles on the basis of consolation received, not suffering endured), but the “God of all consolation” declared in 1:3. His agency is Christ, whose grace is shown not simply in his poverty (8:9) or his sufferings (1:5-7) but in the co-option of others to the same, that consolation (2 Cor 1) and wealth (2 Cor 8) may flow. As we shall now learn, Christ’s figuring as agency enables him to take up the subject position of the psalmist, and so to offer the formation of the consoled.

## **5.2.4 The effect of παράκλησις: formation of the psalmist who suffers with Christ**

### **5.2.4.1 As agency, Christ becomes the psalmist; in Christ, the psalmist becomes agency**

Once Christ’s co-agency in bestowing grace and peace is marked in v.2, Paul foregrounds the divine agent so systematically that Christ’s status as agent is refigured as one of agency, as we have seen. In vv.3-7 Christ is aligned formally not with the divine agent but with the Pauline subject in its agency. Like that subject Christ is an agency through which God works, not an agent in his own right. Christ is the gracious content<sup>57</sup> or instrument of consolation, rather than its provider (v.3); in this he shares more with the Pauline consoler, who passes on only and exactly what he has received, than with the divine consoler, creative and free in consoling those “in any kind of” affliction.

When seen alongside the text’s lexical reaccentuations, it becomes clear that Christ’s presentation as agency, rather than agent, aids his alignment with the psalmist. It is no accident that the point at which the psalmist makes his strong entry is the point of Christ’s subordination. As we have seen, a global psalmic subject enters via liturgy in v.3, with the signature act of blessing. The world figured by that subject is one whose frame – whether in thanksgiving or lament – is occupied by God alone as addressee. The psalmist stands before God, cries out to God, and waits for God

---

Christ (1:5) whose sufferings overflow also to us; and so consolation comes to others (1:6). The Macedonians, similarly, experience an overflow of joy (consolation’s form in 8:2), and of poverty (suffering’s form), shown equally to be Christologically conformed (8:9); through these God’s generosity overflows to the Jerusalem saints.

<sup>57</sup> See 5.2.1.3 n.23.

to act upon him and on his behalf. Christ becomes the psalmist as he cedes the status of agent alongside God and takes up a role as agency, on and through whom God works.

Yet the advent of Christ in his agency works a change also upon the psalmist. Whether in lament or praise, the psalmist is accustomed to being a full-fledged agent through his speech acts: his cry is the occasion of divine action on his behalf, moves the hand of God himself.<sup>58</sup> Christ, for his part, is the agency for a consolation whose form, content and origination resides with God alone, and whose destination is always the other. Such a role is novel within biblical psalmody. As we shall see, it is played out richly in the drama of 1:8-11. Though Christ is not named in the *narratio*, it is the change wrought upon the psalmic subject by his advent which determines that subject's experience of rescue.

For the Pauline subject of 1:3-7, as we have seen, co-agency with Christ becomes a sharing in his subjectivity: a participation in Christological psalmody. In Rom 15 an equivalent participation proved to be the basis for spiritual formation. As we will now learn, the conclusion to Paul's dramaturgical segment proposes the same.

#### 5.2.4.2 Consolation's effects for the suffering psalmist

The conjunction of Christology and psalmody bears rich fruit in the verses which conclude this section (vv.6-7), and particularly in verse 6b:

ἢ εἴτε δὲ θλιβόμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας· εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν.

If we are afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation; if we are consoled, it is for your consolation which produces in you patient endurance of the same sufferings which we also suffer.

Otherwise content simply to assert the provision of consolation to those afflicted (vv.4-5), Paul now signals the effect of consolation in terms of ὑπομονή: patient endurance. While it is possible to translate the genitive τῆς ἐνεργουμένης in a variety of ways, there are good reasons to prefer the reading adopted here, in which consolation is seen to qualify the subject to endure its Christological suffering with

---

<sup>58</sup> Agency of this form was denied to the Davidic penitent of Ps 31 in Rom 4:6-7; cf. 2.3.2.

patience.<sup>59</sup> Put differently, the advent of παράκλησις brings about the spiritual formation of the psalmist as his suffering is co-opted to the παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Two other moments of formation in Paul can be brought to bear here. The first is in Rom 5:3, where θλίψις is said to produce (κατεργάζομαι) ὑπομονή:

οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται,

Affliction does not self-evidently produce patient endurance, of course; a middle term is required, which we have found in 2 Cor 1:6. The relevant agent is consolation, which is God's response to "any kind of affliction" (2 Cor 1:4).

The second moment is found in Rom 15:4-5, where παράκλησις and ὑπομονή are coordinated. In 15:5 God is named as the one who grants both παράκλησις (in general) and ὑπομονή; as such, no doubt he grants both here in 2 Cor 1:6. But Rom 15:4 supplies the logic by which the two are coordinated in a way significant for the Corinthian text. The "consolation of the scriptures" (παράκλησις τῶν γραφῶν) is associated with ὑπομονή as promising hope; but the two are coordinated by the role played by "whatever [was] forewritten" (ὅσα ... προεγράφη) in the διδασκαλία of the Romans. As we saw in Chapter 4 that role, as figured in the local context of Romans, consists in the spiritual formation of those who conform themselves to the subjectivity of Christ in psalmody – a suffering subject. Of this process ὑπομονή is one natural fruit.

Thus we find in Romans confirmation of the Corinthian case. Here equally, it is those who experience the overflow of Christological suffering – who are identified

---

<sup>59</sup> The genitive phrase may be read in a variety of ways (cf. Harris 2005:148), which may be distilled to two basic alternatives. Thus, are we to take the genitive τῆς ἐνεργουμένης, with NIV, to pursue the productivity of divine consolation: "which produces in you patient endurance of the same sufferings we suffer;" or, with NRSV, to qualify the consolation of the Corinthians: "which you experience when you patiently endure the same sufferings that we are also suffering"? The problem with the second type of reading is that it fails to register a purpose for the additional clause. Neither the Corinthians' Christological suffering, nor the quality represented by ὑπομονή, have been anywhere signaled to date; indeed, the certain overflow of consolation amid "any kind of" affliction, asserted clearly in v.4, does not invite qualification of any kind. Nor does the patient endurance of suffering figure thereafter, as Paul turns to his own affliction in v.8. In both its dimensions, then, the clause seems gratuitous at best, counterintuitive at worst. The idea of consolation as *producing* a quality of response to Christological suffering, on the other hand, offers a strong local motivation for the clause. See discussion below.

therefore with Christ – who experience consolation, and for whom the experience is one of spiritual formation: the capacity to endure patiently. If Christ is not the psalmist here, they who are joined with him are, for it is their *θλιψις* which has been co-opted to his suffering.

The picture is confirmed in v.7, with which Paul’s dramaturgical endeavours come to an end.

καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἰδότες ὅτι ὡς κοινωνοὶ ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτως καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως.

and our hope for you is secure, for we know that as you are sharers of the sufferings, so also of the consolation

The Corinthians are not sharers of “our” sufferings, much less of “our consolation”, as most ETs suppose.<sup>60</sup> The better anaphor is the more local,<sup>61</sup> and lexis confirms: just as in v.6, these are the *παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, which are never “ours”;<sup>62</sup> and consolation is always God’s (1:3-4). Duly confirmed, then: those who experience the overflow of Christological suffering are subject to God’s consolation.

But the question remains: why does the Corinthians’ participation in suffering and consolation make Paul’s hope “secure” (*βέβαιος*)? An answer is to hand already in v.6: to those who share in Christ’s sufferings, consolation comes to provide for their endurance. Paul’s hope is sure not because the Corinthians suffer, nor just because they are consoled, but because the consolation of the Christological sufferer is transformative, enabling him to endure suffering in patience; *ἀπορούμενος*, perhaps, but not *ἐξαπορούμενος* (2 Cor 4:8). His eschatological prospects are secure.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> “Our” in both cases: TCNT, RSV, JB, NIV, NRSV; cf. Bultmann 1985:24.

<sup>61</sup> The force of *καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν* (6b) is to link Paul with the consoled subject in a suffering original to neither, but common to both ἐν Χριστῷ. Cf. Harris 2005:150.

<sup>62</sup> The homology of “our” sufferings with those of the Corinthians in vv.6 and 7 is thus grounded in their common co-option, via the incorporative categories of psalmody, to the *παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*. It is not necessary to trouble over a historical basis (Thrall 1994:111-12; Windisch 1924:43); nor does the dramaturgical character of Paul’s discourse require it.

<sup>63</sup> In this way the logic of suffering’s outworking not just in consolation but salvation (v.6) is revealed. As we observed earlier (5.2.3.3 n.53), *σωτηρία* elaborates, rather than supplements, *παρακλήσις* as a consequence of suffering. But this it does not in the vague terms of “spiritual safety, health, and joy in [their] renewed experience of God’s grace” (Moule 1962:3). Rather, *σωτηρία* gives expression to the consequences of *παρακλήσις* in the lives of those who receive it (see 5.2.4.2): a patient endurance which is salvific, insofar as it secures the eschatological prospects of the consoled.

Where will we find such a sufferer exemplified? As Paul turns to a biography of suffering, we might hope to find him there. But as we shall now see, the subject of affliction whom we meet there does indeed despair, and will not be consoled until first it dies.

### 5.3 2 Corinthians 1:8-10a: the death of the self as self's agent

<sup>8</sup> Οὐ γὰρ θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν τῆς γενομένης ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὑπὲρ δύνάμιν ἐβαρῆθημεν ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν·<sup>9</sup> ἀλλὰ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχῆκαμεν, ἵνα μὴ πεποιθότες ὦμεν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκρούς·<sup>10</sup> ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτων θανάτων ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύσεται,

#### 5.3.1 Dramaturgy and drama: 1:3-7 and 1:8-11

##### 5.3.1.1 An intimate relationship between two passages

To a significant degree, as we have seen, the verses which precede this brief but powerful narrative tend ineluctably toward it. This is not reflected merely in logical or formal coherence, such that each section follows reasonably, if gratuitously, from the last, *narratio* from *exordium*; rather, there is exigency, such that each requires the next. In v.3 we marked Paul's entry into the discourse of psalmody through doxology, which promised, by virtue of generic expectation, a narrative of deliverance to come. But though 1:3-7 has elements of narrative in its disposition of various characters in relations of cause and effect, its purpose is rather dramaturgy: Paul there explicates the Christological logic by which any particular narrative of *παράκλησις* might be understood; and that particular narrative waits to be told, in dramatic style, here in 1:8-11.

The present section thus stands with the preceding in a multi-faceted relationship of need. How is the logic of 1:3-7 to be grounded if not in the apostolic experience? How will it otherwise persuade? How will the agencies of God and Christ, and of those in Christ, rendered in complex fashion through 1:3-7, be shown coherent except as realised in concrete narrative? How will the psalmist's declaration (1:3) be true unless his story is told – and in the requisite voice?

We may wonder, however, whether the ensuing story of rescue (ῥύομαι, which culminates the personal narrative of 1:8-11 (at v.10)) is quite the same thing as a story of consolation (παρακαλέω – predominant in 1:3-7). If the key categories in each passage are distinct, we might question whether the relationship between the two is as close as we have claimed. What links rescue and consolation is not overlapping semantic domains,<sup>64</sup> in fact, but a common occasion in affliction (θλιψις, 1:4, 6, 8). As θλιψις is itself reaccentuated by association with the παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (5.2.2.3 above), the Christological character of the passage as a whole is signaled: a further link between vv.3-7 and vv.8-11.

### 5.3.1.2 θλιψις here and there, but the sufferer distinct

Though we must grant a close connection between the dramaturgy of 1:3-7 and the narrative of 1:8-10, we may not entirely equate the terms of suffering laid out in the former with those experienced in the latter. Distinctive to Paul’s experience in Asia is the divine verdict of death, as we shall later argue; and it is this, together with its pedagogical *telos*, which qualify the moral integrity of the suffering subject, whose confidence has in some way been mistakenly placed in itself.<sup>65</sup> The verdict is the occasion of that subject’s reformation, as one whose trust is placed thereafter in God who raises the dead.<sup>66</sup> This sufferer *becomes* “righteous”, insofar as the disposition of faith in such a God qualifies him as such;<sup>67</sup> only then, as we shall see, does his suffering and consolation work to the benefit of others, as vv.4-7 require.

---

<sup>64</sup> In fact, although rescue does not figure in 1:3-7, it has close kin in the category of σωτηρία (1:6a), which is paired with (and so distinguished from) παράκλησις. All three terms encompass in their effects the whole person, at least in potential; and all three are capable of bearing eschatological freight. Yet in the discourse of psalmic lament and thanksgiving σώζω, like ῥύομαι – and unlike παρακαλέω – has as its implied locus of action the embodied person in the exterior world. παράκλησις, as we have seen (5.2.2.2), evinces a greater interiority in its effects.

<sup>65</sup> The periphrastic perfect subjunctive πεποιθότες ὤμεν is a durative present in force (Harris 2005:157): “Apparently, self-reliance had sometimes or even often marked [Paul’s] experience as a Christian.”

<sup>66</sup> It is this designation, associated with the reconfigured subject, which connotes a tradition of righteous suffering; cf. Kleinknecht 1984:248. The connotation can be followed only with qualification here; see discussion below.

<sup>67</sup> As in Paul’s account of Abraham (Rom 4, esp. 4:3); cf. Heb 11:17-19. Later in Romans the “righteousness from faith” (ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη; Rom 10:6) gives testimony to “the word of faith” (τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως; Rom 10:8) which sets out the terms of salvation. Here, the act of believing takes as its express object a God who raises the dead: it is the one who believes (πιστεύω) that God raised Jesus from the dead who is saved (Rom 10:9). Such resonances suggest not only the Christocentric orientation of the transformed subject’s confidence in 2 Cor 1:9, but the Christological character of consolation itself, noted in 5.2.2.3 above, as enacted in God’s resurrection of the Christ.

Of the nature of Paul's suffering in itself we know little, though the Corinthians may have known more; but we cannot automatically assume it is of the kind described in 1:3-7. There, as we saw (5.2.2.3), divinely ordained suffering is signaled through the association of "our" θλιψις with the παθήματα of Christ. Indeed, this association may license a divine verdict of death, in both objective and subjective terms, and so comprehensive in effect: objective, insofar as the παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ led to, or indeed comprehended, Christ's death; subjective, insofar as this is represented as such in Paul's own experience of carrying in his body the dying (νέκρωσις) of Jesus (2 Cor 4:10; cf. 6.2.2.5).

However, the positive entailments of participation in Christ's suffering in 1:6, and of the bearing of death in 4:10, are missing from the apostle's experience in 1:8-9. There is no sign that Paul understood the verdict of death (1:9a) to have as its corollary the consolation of others, or the mediation of life to them; nor that he means his readers to make the inference. Paul is not, in his Asian affliction, a self-evidently "righteous" sufferer. The ἀπόκριμα had for Paul quite different effects: proximately, it led him to despair of life; finally, it occasioned a radical redirection of trust.<sup>68</sup> Elsewhere, bearing in the body the dying of Jesus (4:10a), Paul precisely *does not* despair (4:8), but trusts in the prospective revelation of life (4:10b).

In light of this, we shall see that the logic of 1:3-7 is exemplified not in the suffering subject of 1:8-9a per se, but in the consequences for that subject introduced by the verdict of death, articulated in 1:9b-11.<sup>69</sup> This we shall argue in 5.3.3 and 5.4 below; but first, we must get a fix on the voice of the *narratio*.

### **5.3.2 Dramatic narration as Aristotelian rhetoric and more: persuasion and transformation in 2 Cor 1:8-10**

The voice of Paul's *narratio* is a distinctive one that requires some accounting. Nowhere else in Paul do we find such a combination of inwardness and extremity, intentionally offered (1:8a). Paul's narrative is short on circumstantial detail,

---

<sup>68</sup> 2 Cor 1:10 confirms the effectiveness of the move in Paul's (newly) established hope (cf. perfective form): εἰς ὃν ἠλπικαμεν. Dodd (1953:80-81) takes the transformation expressed here to mark a "second conversion", in which the last traces of Paul's personal pride (evident to Dodd in the "earlier" letter of 2 Cor 10-13) are expunged. For a less incautious reflection upon the kind of transformation effected through Paul's experience, see Kraftchick 2002.

<sup>69</sup> Consequences elaborated in the experience of the Pauline subject in 2 Cor 4 (6.2.2.5).

prompting much speculation as to the occasion of his suffering.<sup>70</sup> But while it is not illegitimate to correlate the apostle's inner states with outward circumstance, it is easy to miss the point by doing so: it is precisely Paul's inward experience and its affects which he wishes to convey, and on which his rhetoric depends.<sup>71</sup>

This very point should alert us to the kind of work a text of this kind might be expected to do, and so, perhaps, may signal Paul's intentions in setting out his *narratio* in just this way.

Allowing the apostle a conciliatory purpose at this point, we might discover, with Welborn,<sup>72</sup> the way in which Paul's text seeks to arouse pity (ἔλεος), among other emotions, in his hearers; and that in doing so it conforms to the expectations of ancient rhetorical theory on the conduct of "pathetic proofs".<sup>73</sup> As we shall see, in its strategies the *narratio* transcends the rhetorical tradition, grounding itself more securely in psalmic discourse.

### 5.3.2.1 With the rhetorical tradition: exaggeration in the service of persuasion?

Welborn's argument is significant to our argument for at least two reasons: one negative, the other positive. Negatively, insofar as Paul's account is driven by rhetorical considerations – that is, by a need to present his narrative in the most persuasive manner possible – the idea that 2 Cor 1:8-11 constitutes a "truthful" narrative is cast in potential doubt. This is because persuasion, as Aristotle so famously analysed it, turns not only on *logos*, but also on *pathos* and *ethos*: not only on

---

<sup>70</sup> Paul simply has not given later readers enough to decide the nature of the "Asian affliction". A majority opt for violent persecution, perhaps involving incarceration; similarly Furnish 1994:42, 122-24; Thrall (1994:115-17). Harris (2005:164-82) reviews the options and concludes for a severe illness; similarly Barrett 1973:64; Allo 1956:11-12, 15-19.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Furnish 1984:122. Harris (2005:153) takes Paul's omission of detail to confirm that the Corinthians knew of the salient events, but not their severity. This is confirmed by Paul's choice of prepositions. Nowhere else in Paul do we find ἀγνοεῖν modified by ὑπέρ; nor indeed by two modifiers, such as ὑπέρ and ὅτι. It is accordingly best to take ὑπέρ to modify the whole sentence, and ὅτι, with the clause it governs, to specify the content of ἀγνοεῖν. Thus, Paul does not want the Corinthians to be ignorant, *concerning* (ὑπέρ) his affliction, *that* (ὅτι) it was severe. Yet even if the Corinthians are being informed for the first time about this particular θλίψις, it is clearly its severity, and not its facticity, which is the point to be taken.

<sup>72</sup> Welborn 2001, for whom 1:1-2:13 is to be taken with 7:5-16 as a letter aimed at conciliation. In this he follows Windisch 1924 and many others.

<sup>73</sup> Welborn believes that "[t]he pathetic proofs are crucial to 2 Corinthians, because this writing was occasioned by the Corinthians' emotional response to a previous epistle (2:1-4) by which Paul had caused 'pain' (λύπη)."

a coherent argument, for which fidelity to agreed and known “facts” is a desideratum, and which constitutes a narrative as (factually) “truthful”, but also on the creation of sympathetic emotion and a demonstration of the (reliable) character of the speaker. Specifically, Welborn claims to find here extensive signs of exaggeration in service of *pathos*.<sup>74</sup> Paul overstates his suffering so as to provoke a heightened emotional response. Our text-driven reading does not require a perfect match between report and experience – a chimeric notion, in any event – but a grave overstatement would be problematic; for Paul’s disposition as psalmist, and his ultimate transcendence of that disposition, strongly suggest as provocation a specific experience or experiences of suffering of high degree, just as Paul appears to relate. In fact, Welborn’s argument for exaggeration is far from secure.

Consider how Paul conducts his appeal to the emotions. In the *narratio* of 2 Cor 1:8-11, Welborn singles out Paul’s claimed proximity to death, the recency of his experience, his helplessness, his (eventual) resilience, and the brevity of his account and its exaggerated style as strategies approved by Aristotle and others to arouse pity.<sup>75</sup> Welborn’s case is a cumulative one, which depends on extensive resonances between theory and practice, and between Paul’s text and others. This is in part because pathetic appeals are necessarily indirect, and so yield little tangible evidence; Paul cannot name what he wishes to engender. Equally, the complexity and variability of affective response to so emotive a text is such that a wide variety of witnesses (in particular, theoreticians of rhetoric) is needed to secure one emotion – ἔλεος – as rhetorical “target”.

An extensive case like this is hard to sustain. Not unexpectedly, perhaps, some of the matches claimed between Paul’s rhetoric and the explanations offered by classical theorists are strained;<sup>76</sup> a few of the parallels are forced;<sup>77</sup> and the judgment

---

<sup>74</sup> Welborn 2001:43-44.

<sup>75</sup> Welborn 2001:41-44.

<sup>76</sup> For example, Welborn thinks “[t]he resilience of Paul’s spirit in his escape from suffering also enhances the piteous affect” (2001:43), adducing Aristotle (*Rhet.* 2.8.16) in support: “When men show themselves undaunted (σπουδαῖος) at critical times it is especially pitiable.” But if Paul was resilient after his deliverance, he was anything but at the “critical time” of his suffering: in contrast to 2 Cor 4:8 (ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι), Paul despaired of life altogether: ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν (1:8b). Yet if Aristotle should fail him, Welborn can find support in Paul’s weakness for his thesis, this time from Cicero (*De Inv.* 1.55.109): for that in which “one’s helplessness and weakness and loneliness are revealed” is a *locus misericordiae*. The problem is that Aristotle and Cicero are – at worst – in disagreement, suggesting that an appeal to one theorist or few may be arbitrary or tendentious. At best, both theorists are correct, revealing that ἔλεος may be aroused by quite varied,

that Paul exaggerates for rhetorical effect in 1:8-9 – a point of some importance to our case – cannot be granted. The persuasiveness of his self-portrait requires, to no small degree, its plausibility; and the best reading of 1:8 suggests the Corinthians already had some idea of Paul’s *θλίψις*, and so could judge his claim to its effects.<sup>78</sup> Notwithstanding, we may question whether, in regard to suffering of this kind, the idea of exaggeration in respect of “the facts” is genuinely meaningful.<sup>79</sup> What signifies, rather, is that Paul characterises the effects of his troubles in the terms he does. Second Corinthians 1:8-11 presents a narrative of psalmody, as suffering is recalled, its rationale in formation discovered, and rescue proclaimed. Far from exaggerated, Paul’s speech from the subjectivity of the psalmist is entirely “true”.

### 5.3.2.2 Transcending the tradition: Paul seeks the transformation of his hearers

The second, and positive, point at which Welborn’s argument bears on our own is one which returns us to a familiar theme. Welborn finds in the *narratio* not only a dramatised “conversion” of Paul’s emotional disposition – from despair to hope – but evidence for a desired transformation in Paul’s listeners. In this proposal, there are resonances with the formative potential of psalmody, as we have seen in other Christologically rich environments, and already in 2 Cor 1:6-7. The uses of psalmody in the transformation of emotions are later recognised and developed by

---

not to say contrary, rhetorical means; or equally, that *ἔλεος* is a much broader category than it appears.

<sup>77</sup> Welborn offers the second epistle of Demosthenes as an appropriate parallel (2001:45-46), wherein he finds two significant points of similarity with Paul’s text (2 Cor 1:1-2:13 and 7:5-16): like Paul, Demosthenes indicates his proximity to death, and stresses his separation from his interlocutors as ingredient to his suffering (cf. 2 Cor 2:12-13, 7:5). But the two characterise their relationship to death in entirely different ways. Demosthenes contemplates suicide (*Ep.* 2.22), preferring death should reconciliation be denied (*Ep.* 2.21). Paul has already encountered death (1:8), but figures his experience as divinely purposed, engendering trust in God who raises the dead (ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐγείροντι τοὺς νεκρούς), who indeed rescued him (2 Cor 1:9-10). Though figured initially to attract pity (1:8), Paul finally resolves the *aporia* of death’s sentence by assigning it a role in formation (for Paul and, by extension, for the Corinthians). This is in keeping with the requirements of psalmody (cf. Pss 117:8; 145:3ff; 77:7; cf. Windisch 1924:46-47), but not with the rhetoric of pity. *Contra* Welborn (2001:43), 1:9b does not “make clear his helplessness and weakness”, so that Paul becomes more pitiable – 1:8 is sufficient for this, and less ambiguous – but reorients attention to Paul’s source of strength: God who raises the dead. This is in fact an instance where Paul transcends the aims of the rhetorical tradition, as Welborn also believes (2001:57-59); see discussion below.

<sup>78</sup> See 5.3.2 n.71.

<sup>79</sup> As Elaine Scarry has argued (1985:4), the experience of physical (as opposed to psychological) pain is finally incommunicable. Taking Paul’s suffering to have entailed physical pain of high degree, whether from illness or bodily mistreatment – or what else might prompt the inward reception of a “sentence of death” (5.3.3.7)? – we might judge his report of its effects in other terms than its (in)commensurability with the suffering itself. Paul is engaged formally in recollection of something never accessible to himself or others as “facts”, such that we could compare the one with the other and find exaggeration.

the church fathers, many of whom understand Christ to be the speaker of the psalms.<sup>80</sup> To find Paul also engaged in emotional transformation, with the psalms as paradigm and in rich association with Christ, would confirm an intriguing precedent.<sup>81</sup>

Where Welborn found in Paul's strategy of exaggeration an apparent conformity with the rhetorical tradition, here he finds Paul transcending that tradition. In this case Welborn is on somewhat firmer ground. The counsel given by the tradition is addressed to the task of persuasion in the service of conciliation; but the apostle, evidently, seeks more. Not content merely to elicit certain emotions, Paul wishes to chart and foster their transformation. Writing not just to achieve common understanding (1:13-14), Paul pursues a community of affect, the criterion of whose authenticity is found in participation in the *παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (1:5-7).<sup>82</sup>

According to Welborn,<sup>83</sup> Paul does this by “dramatising the conversion of emotions in his own soul.” The signs of this transcendent activity are, he argues, two. First, in Paul's choice to open the *exordium* with a blessing, rather than a thanksgiving, he “is able to locate the source of the emotion he feels, not in the giftedness of the Corinthians, but in the fullness of his own heart, which overflows with praise for unexpected deliverance ... Like the Psalmist of old”, Paul blesses God because he has been consoled, and so “dramatises, in the *narratio* that follows ... the transformation of ‘despair’ into ‘hope’.”<sup>84</sup>

The second indicator of Paul's intention to go beyond rhetorical counsel, according to Welborn, is in the emotions he exemplifies: not those which he seeks to inspire in his hearers,<sup>85</sup> but his own, as these begin in despair, sorrow, and fear, and are transformed into “others which are more genuinely Christian – hope, love, and joy.”<sup>86</sup> Doing this, “Paul leads the Corinthians to reconsider the quality of their own emotional response,” formerly characterised by grief (*λύπη*, cf. 2:1-4). Thus, “Paul

---

<sup>80</sup> Cf. 1.3.2.1 n.95.

<sup>81</sup> Seen already in Rom 15 (cf. 3.5.2).

<sup>82</sup> Welborn 2001:59.

<sup>83</sup> Welborn 2001:57.

<sup>84</sup> Welborn 2001:58.

<sup>85</sup> As urged by Cicero (*De Orat.* 2.45.189).

<sup>86</sup> Welborn 2001:59.

seeks to transform the Corinthians' pity into hope (1:3-11, esp. 1:7, 10), anger into love (2:5-11, esp. 2:8, 10) and zeal into confidence (7:5-16, esp. 7:13-16).<sup>87</sup>

But while we may grant the transformation of affect in Paul's *narratio*, and (with some qualification) an intention to elicit pity, and then hope, it is a mistake to conflate the two trajectories. Paul's dramatised movement from despair to hope enacts a transformation, to be sure; but the Corinthians are not – on Welborn's account – to share passage. Their elicited starting point is not despair but pity; and the relationship between pity and hope is not one of transformation but of coextension. The Corinthians may be roused to pity for the suffering apostle, who will suffer again; they may accordingly (and simultaneously) be urged to hope for his continued deliverance (v.10).<sup>88</sup> Pity for the sufferer may live alongside hope for his deliverance.

Welborn's proposal cannot finally account for the emotional productivity of Paul's text for its readers. Though he is right to find Paul's text engendering strong, perhaps specific, emotions in its readers, these are not such as may be transformed along lines suggested by Paul's own experience. Yet the central insight remains intact: Paul's story does indeed dramatise an emotional transformation – from despair to hope. What if the reader were invited not to respond to Paul's emotional states (with pity), but rather to experience them?

Welborn appears to presume a reader for whom the drama is only Paul's; but could the reader enter into the drama for himself, he too might experience its emotional states, and share in the subject's transformation. This possibility Welborn does not seem to imagine; yet it is just what the modal influence of psalmody may facilitate.

---

<sup>87</sup> Welborn 2001:59.

<sup>88</sup> Such claimed transformations appear to suppose (or impose) strong categorical distinctions among emotional states. But why may not "pity" and "hope" (if these can even be said to denote specific emotional qualities) be held together in respect of a common object? If pity is to be transformed into something else, a better provocation might be found earlier, in vv.3-7, where the experience of affliction is shown, by its co-option to Christ's sufferings, to issue in consolation. Such sufferings are not to be pitied but, in a passage where consolation is to the fore, desired; or in terms of emotional states, envied. Only with great difficulty might pity and envy simultaneously take a common object.

### 5.3.2.3 Outside the rhetorical tradition: Paul's pursuit of transformation is rooted in psalmody

Ultimately, Welborn's proposal cannot account for the subjectivity of Paul's prose in the *narratio*. There are two reasons for this. First, although Welborn acknowledges Paul's activity as psalmist at certain points,<sup>89</sup> and despite demurrers as to Paul's dependence on specific rhetorical traditions,<sup>90</sup> the overwhelming impression is of an author thoroughly indebted to Graeco-Roman thinking on the elicitation of emotions.<sup>91</sup> Yet this neglects the persistent signs of Paul's indebtedness to scriptural traditions, most notably the psalms, whose potential for the cultivation and transformation of emotional states is singularly rich, and richly signalled, elsewhere in Paul.<sup>92</sup> Not only this: but psalmody offers to shape affect in community, to the extent that Paul and his hearers enter together into its subjectivity; and community of affection, as Welborn argues, is Paul's aim.

Second, and relatedly, Welborn's analysis is a rhetorical one, whose point of departure is an author with a purpose, making "pathetic appeals" in service of a conciliatory aim. Such an author deploys scriptural phraseology and diction with a high degree of intentionality. But it is questionable whether this is the best way in which to understand Paul, or others for whom a formation in the language and disposition of psalmody can be argued.<sup>93</sup> Might Paul not fall "naturally" into the subjectivity of psalmic lament and thanksgiving, especially given the recent experience of suffering related – without great exaggeration – in vv. 8-9a? If so, too tight a focus on intentional rhetorical acts may be misleading. And whether intentionally deployed or no, it is the discursive operation of psalmody, rather than its rhetorical effect, which promises most toward Paul's conciliatory aims.

It seems, on balance, that a desire to appeal to the emotions is not decisive for the character of Paul's *narratio*, though it is neither immaterial to nor inconsistent with it. Paul cannot write such prose without estimating its effect on his auditors. But the discursive logic of the text – decisive for its rhetorical form – is drawn from

---

<sup>89</sup> As in the quotation above; cf. 2001:43 n.50 on 2 Cor 1:9b.

<sup>90</sup> Welborn 2001:38.

<sup>91</sup> A similar impression is given by Welborn's stimulating monograph on Paul and the comic tradition (Welborn 2005).

<sup>92</sup> Cf. 1.3.2; 3.5.2.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. 1.3.2.1 n.97.

psalmody; and the promise of emotional transformation for Paul's readers depends on joining the psalmist, not responding to his story. Indeed, it is in recognising that Paul continues to speak in the mode of psalmody, from the figured identity of the psalmist, suffering and consoled, that we may best appreciate the intensely subjective quality of his prose, and discover its invitation to the reader. To the particularities of the text, and its subjective possibilities, we now turn.

### 5.3.3 Paul among the psalmists in 2 Corinthians 1:8-10a

#### 5.3.3.1 Paul writes in the mode of psalmic thanksgiving

Paul's engagement with psalmody in this dense biographical passage is not straightforward. Nor would we expect it to be so; for the apostle is not writing in any genre of psalmody, but in an epistolary genre,<sup>94</sup> in which these verses constitute the *narratio*. Our claim is rather that in composing his *narratio*, Paul writes in the *mode* of psalmic thanksgiving. Such a claim might at first be thought disingenuous. Have we merely substituted a broader, vaguer term (*mode*) for one more precise (*genre*), so as to retain for Paul a nominal claim to engagement with psalmody, but one emptied of definable force?

Such is not the case, however. Here, the work of Alastair Fowler<sup>95</sup> is of service, who distinguishes *mode* from *kind*<sup>96</sup> in a variety of ways relevant to our discussion. Denying that the wide usage of modal terms entails that they be vague, he argues "they can be used exactly enough so long as the limits of their repertorial implication are kept in mind."<sup>97</sup> In particular:

Modal terms never imply a complete external form. Modes have always an incomplete repertoire, a selection only of the corresponding kind's features, and one from which overall external structure is absent. ... In short, when a modal term is linked with the name of a kind, it refers to a combined genre, in which the overall form is determined by the kind alone.<sup>98</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup> Or genres; precisely which is a contested matter, not in need of review here. See 5.1.1 n.4.

<sup>95</sup> Fowler 1982:106-11. Fowler's work is referenced primarily to modern literary genres, but his theoretical categories – richly exemplified in his account – can readily be extended to ancient forms.

<sup>96</sup> By *kind* is meant *historical genre* (Fowler 1982:56-58), among which we may include the genres of biblical psalmody.

<sup>97</sup> Fowler 1982:107.

<sup>98</sup> Fowler 1982:107.

We may readily concede, then, that Paul's *narratio* is governed formally by epistolary conventions, and not by any genre of psalmody. What then does the claimed modal extension of psalmic thanksgiving contribute? Fowler again:

Modal extension can be either local or comprehensive. Locally, modes may amount to no more than fugitive admixtures, tinges of generic colour. All the same, they are more than vague intimations of 'mood'. ... [A] mode announces itself by distinct signals, even if these are abbreviated, unobtrusive, or below the threshold of modern attention. The signals may be of a wide variety: a characteristic motif, perhaps; a formula; a rhetorical proportion or quality.<sup>99</sup>

It is reasonable to infer, though Fowler does not address the matter, that modulation of this kind represents a less evidently self-conscious reception of psalmody than would the formal presence of a psalmic genre. The formal qualities of psalmic genres are alien to those of the ancient letter, such that the interpolation of elements of the former in the latter – especially at the outset of a letter, where formal conventions are relatively strong – would betray a self-conscious intervention: an authorial manipulation of generic objects. By contrast, the more subtle modulation described below is of a piece with the subjective, rather than objective, engagement with psalmody we are claiming for Paul.

In the following sections we shall discern a variety of ways in which Paul's *narratio* is modulated by psalmic thanksgiving. But we must note, finally, that modes are no more static in their application than generic kinds.<sup>100</sup> We will not find a slavish obedience to convention, but one which inflects, transcends, even counters modal expectation in significant ways; which, in so doing, offers to psalmody a reconfigured subject, and to the reader a broad invitation to identity.

---

<sup>99</sup> Fowler 1982:107.

<sup>100</sup> The concept of genre followed here, and by extension of mode, owes much to the sociohistorical account of Mikhail Bakhtin (cf. esp. Bakhtin 1981:259-422). Though we have classified Paul's text in terms of epistolary genre and psalmic mode, a text's relationship with generic kind is not a matter of essential classification but of dynamic relativity. In Carol Newsom's words (2003:12), "texts do not 'belong' to genres so much as participate in them, invoke them, gesture to them, play in and out of them, and in so doing continually change them. Texts may participate in more than one genre, just as they may be marked in an exaggerated or in a deliberately subtle fashion. The point is not simply to identify a genre in which a text participates, but to analyze that participation in terms of the rhetorical strategies of the text." The psalmic modulation described here is part of this complex "participation".

### 5.3.3.2 The signs of psalmic modulation, and their invitation to the reader

The signs of Paul's psalmic modulation in 2 Cor 1:8-10 are three. First, Paul's characterisation of his Asian affliction is light on material detail and heavy on subjective effects. However this may play to a rhetorical strategy which favours pathos (5.3.2), it is entirely consistent with the practice of psalmic lament and of thanksgiving, which likewise read affliction in terms of subjective experience rather than objective detail.<sup>101</sup> Modulating the *narratio* in this way, Paul's text gains from the narrative discourse of psalmody an openness to the reader's identification. Not content merely to elicit a response (of pity, say) to a narrative particular to Paul, the *narratio* comes to invite its readers to share in Paul's subjective experience: to empathise, not merely sympathise.

Further, as we argued earlier (5.2.2.2), in the characterisation of affliction in terms of its particular subjective effects, the keyword *θλίψις* – available to other discourses and genres than those of the psalms – is clearly domiciled within psalmic lament/thanksgiving. Symptomatically, the psalmist is able to take *θλίψις* as his own possession.<sup>102</sup> So also Paul:<sup>103</sup> for what took place in Asia was not affliction, but “our affliction”, concerning which he writes (ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν, 1:8). The plural possessive which predominates here, as elsewhere in the highly personal discourse of 2 Corinthians, strengthens the invitation to the reader to find herself represented in Paul's experience.<sup>104</sup>

The second sign of psalmic modulation is the way in which rescue, like the affliction to which it responds, is also rooted in the discourse of psalmody. Specifically, it is

---

<sup>101</sup> Of course, Paul's focus on the subjectivity of his affliction may suggest he presumes that the Corinthians knew sufficient of the circumstances already (cf. 5.3.2 n.71). Yet as we noted earlier (5.3.2), it is not the details of Paul's affliction which are salient here, but precisely Paul's subjective response to it.

<sup>102</sup> In the genres of lament and thanksgiving the term does not always belong to the psalmist, but becomes his possession in the context of a cry to the Lord, or more generally in moments of deep subjective awareness, as here. Cf. “the troubles of my heart” (Ps 24:17-18), collocated with distress (*ἀνάγκη*), humiliation (*ταπείνωσις*) and trouble (*κόπος*).

<sup>103</sup> Unlike *παθήματα* (cf. 5.2.2.3), *θλίψις* is already proper to the Pauline first person plural; cf. 2 Cor 1:4; 7:4; 1 Thess 3:7.

<sup>104</sup> The invitation is formally enhanced in the way Paul names his affliction. The full designation is: “our affliction which happened in Asia”, a formulation which eschews particularity, both in content and form. As a location for Paul's suffering, “Asia” is scarcely specific. Formally, Paul's gesture toward location is couched in a (detachable) relative clause; what signifies is rather “our affliction”, a species of any and all affliction. Shaking Paul's slight qualification loose, the reader also experiences “our affliction”, supplying his own relative clause.

the dead who are subject to God's rescue,<sup>105</sup> and the characterisation of suffering as an experience of death is particular to lament.<sup>106</sup>

It is worth noting here a further kinship between affliction and rescue. Both are made formally particular to the speaker: θλίψις is “our affliction” (1:8); rescue also is “ours”, inasmuch as 1:11 differentiates the “us” of 1:10 from a Corinthian “you”. Yet both are also global categories: θλίψις is given its full extension as early as 1:4, as “all affliction” and “every kind of affliction”; rescue is extended pan-temporally in 1:10, as retrospect and prospect. Identified as psalmic categories by their attachment to particular experience, they are made to serve a generic subject by their extension across time and space. Particular though Paul's story of Asian affliction may be, it becomes a tale of all affliction, and every rescue, by its modulation in psalmody. As such, it issues the broadest possible invitation to the reader to identify its story as her own.

The third sign of modulation is structural, consisting in the movement from suffering (1:8-9) to rescue (1:10-11a) to corporate rejoicing (1:11b) which, in schematic terms, is the narrative of psalmic thanksgiving. This is a limited claim, to be sure: Paul's text is able to yield a narrative scheme, but does not embody in full the tale of a psalmist in thanksgiving; it owes its basic form rather to the conventions of *narratio*. This is as we might expect; for as a modal influence,

---

<sup>105</sup> Thus the Rescuer is “God who raises the dead”, a designation that acquires Christological weight in 2 Cor 4:14 (see 6.2.2.5). Here, it continues the liturgical affiliation marked in the *berakah*: God is so named in the second blessing from the Eighteen Benedictions; cf. Windisch 1924:47; Thrall 1994:119 n.275. Kleinknecht 1984:244 takes ῥύομαι to be a “terminus technicus für Gottes Rettung des leidenden Gerechten aus (Todes-)Not”; but this is debatable, since the subject of 1:8-9a is not straightforwardly “righteous” (5.3.1.2). In its Corinthian context, the appellation asserts the experience of the rescued as analogous to resurrection from a genuine state of subjective death, not from “danger of death” (*contra* Thrall 1994:119 n.278). The mistake is to construe θάνατος in strict objectivity as physical death, then to minimise the force of ῥύομαι on the grounds that the speaker did not physically die (as, e.g. Thrall 1994:119). In the context of lament and thanksgiving, where language is to be taken to refer subjectively, θάνατος may take a metaphorical sense: the psalmist's experience of θλίψις is an experience of death. This is evident especially in psalms in which death is thematic, not merely betokened lexically; thus Pss 114-115 (116 MT), 87 (88 MT). Otherwise those examples cited by Windisch (1924:48). Thus Job 33:30, whose testimony – God ἐρρύσατο τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἐκ θανάτου – parallels Job 33:28, in which preservation from physical “corruption”, not rescue from death's experience, is shown to be at issue. Similarly Ps 32:19, where “rescue from death” is parallel to being “sustained in famine”. Yet neither Elihu nor this psalmist are engaged in thanksgiving or lament, but in instruction; the subjective experience of death is not in view, but its objective state. The same applies *a fortiori* to Prov 10:2; 23:14, which Windisch also cites.

<sup>106</sup> Pss 9:14; 17:5, 6; 21:16; 43:20; 55:14; 87:7; 114:3, 8. Nowhere truer than in Ps 116 MT; see Mays 1994:369-70. Cf. 5.3.3.5 in connection with ἐξαπορέομαι.

psalmody is not to be thought a primary determinant of surface form. Its contribution to structure may be better seen in abstraction, as here.<sup>107</sup>

Though the structure evident here owes more to thanksgiving than lament, the two are closely aligned within biblical psalmody in terms of the subjectivity they offer.<sup>108</sup> It is primarily in terms of aspect that the two are distinct: lament holds out the prospect of rescue; thanksgiving celebrates its coming. As Paul concludes we see this aspectual difference transcended: rescue is retrospective and prospective alike (1:10). Thus Paul gives voice to a (supra)generic subject.<sup>109</sup>

As we have seen, the signs of modulation in vv.8-10 are diverse in kind. They share, as we might expect, a certain subtlety, not supplanting but inflecting the expectations of epistolary *narratio*. They share also a tendency to open the text to the subjective identification of the reader, who finds the historical particularity of Paul's story – and the story is assuredly his – voiced by a subject generic to psalmody, and so able to represent her own voice.

Critical to the opening of the text is Paul's use of the plural pronoun throughout the passage, an additional sign of psalmic modulation and one which, because it features so widely in 2 Corinthians, merits further discussion.

### 5.3.3.3 A pronominal mode of invitation: the rhetorical work of “we”

The deployment of singular and plural pronouns in signifying the subject is one of the central fascinations of 2 Corinthians, not least in our passage. The immediate puzzle is less the variation from “we” to “I” and back again, so much as Paul's apparent preference for a plural subject in passages of a personal, not to say

---

<sup>107</sup> In light of this, it seems unreasonable to restrict the structural modulation of Paul's text to the formal limits of the *narratio*. Specifically, if we include the doxology of 1:3 which opens the letter proper, we find the larger passage in closer continuity with the conventional narrative of thanksgiving. Such a narrative typically begins in the subjective present with praise for rescue accomplished, before doubling back to tell the story from its beginning in distress, through appeal to deliverance, with the psalmist's restoration to community as *telos*. This pattern is observed (with qualification to the appeal; see below) in the larger frame of Paul's text: the doxology of 1:3, then the narrative of 1:8-10. 1:4-7 functions as a dramaturgical interlude, as we have seen.

<sup>108</sup> Particularly in terms of the aspect of subjectivity with which we are most concerned, and in relation to which Paul's modulation will differ: the agency of the subject's speech in appeal to YHWH; see 5.3.3.6. In general, subjectivity is notoriously multivariate (de Sousa 2004); alignment in other respects than agency need not be assumed.

<sup>109</sup> The “breadth” of the subject is further underwritten by its incipiently corporate reference. Paul enforces this also, his voice, already formally plural, at last commingled explicitly with a wider community in praise (1:11).

biographical, character, through most of the text of 2 Corinthians.<sup>110</sup> The puzzle is perhaps most acute at this point, where an episode of intense suffering particular to the apostle is nonetheless cast as “ours”.

To a large extent, the debate has focused on reference: to whom does Paul refer when he says “we”?<sup>111</sup> But in a rhetorically charged document, there is much to be said for bracketing the problem of reference – insoluble, in any event – in favour of a different question: what is the rhetorical effect of Paul’s use of “we”? This is quite to the purpose here, of course: for the incorporation of the reader is a rhetorical effect.

In some ways the most elegant account of the matter has been offered by Jeffrey Crafton in his Burkean study of apostolic agency in 2 Corinthians.<sup>112</sup> Crafton contends that the differential use of singular and plural reflects varied rhetorical strategies in the five letters which, on his account, make up the canonical whole.<sup>113</sup> Thus:

In [the] Letter of Initial Response, Paul uses the first person plural almost exclusively, in order to divert attention away from himself as distinct persona. In the Letter of Attack, Paul emphasises the first person singular in order to act forcefully as an agent. In the Letter of Reconciliation, he alternates between the two in order to fulfill the role of co-agent and mediator.<sup>114</sup>

Crafton’s solution depends very strongly on a hypothesised division of the letter which, though widely supported, is not unassailable. While we may grant a separate identity to the so-called “Letter of Attack”, not least for Paul’s relentless

---

<sup>110</sup> The exception is Chapters 10-13, where first person singular predominates in a text rich with Pauline particularity. Cf. Crafton 1991:103-36 for the rhetorical strategy.

<sup>111</sup> Treatments of this question abound. The classic discussion, with reference to the larger Pauline corpus, is Dick 1900. Among more recent students of the text, some conclude that “we” is predominantly a true plural, referring to Paul with his colleagues, or ministers in general (so Carrez 1980; Belleville 1991:275-76, 296). Others take it as a “literary” or “authorial” plural, which really designates Paul alone (so Cranfield 1982; Schlatter 1969:494-96; and Windisch 1924:33-34). Still others find generalisation impossible (so Thrall 2004:105-07; Harris 2005:139-40), concluding diversely on individual cases.

<sup>112</sup> Crafton 1991.

<sup>113</sup> Crafton follows a widely adopted division: 1. The Letter of Initial Response (2:14-6:13 + 7:2-4); 2. The Letter of Attack (10:1-13:13); 3. The Letter of Reconciliation (1:3-2:13 + 7:5-16); and 4. and 5. The Letters of the Collection (2 Cor 8 and 9 respectively). His own analysis leaves aside the Letters of the Collection as peripheral to his project.

<sup>114</sup> Crafton 1991:67 n.2. He goes on to observe that however one takes the reference of the first person plural, “it seems clear that the effect is to divert attention away from his distinct personal identity”, binding himself entirely to the office of apostle; similarly Hafemann 1990:12-18; Collange 1972:25-26.

individuation as “I” in chs 10-13, the data elsewhere are more ambiguous. In particular, the extraction of the Letter of Initial Response (2:14-6:13) from the Letter of Reconciliation can only be performed at great cost, which our study has no need to pay.<sup>115</sup> Significantly, the Letter of Reconciliation – within which the present passage falls – proves far less pliable to Burke’s powerful rhetorical categories than the Letters of Initial Response and of Attack.<sup>116</sup> A more satisfactory solution would dispense with unnecessary literary dissection, and attempt rather to account for Paul’s usage throughout 1:1-7:15 (perhaps excepting 6:14-7:1).<sup>117</sup> As this complicates the distribution of the data, and so precludes the sort of global strategic solutions Crafton offers, we have to look beyond rhetorical considerations to discursive influences of a different kind; and for this we may turn again to psalmody.

### 5.3.3.4 Pronominal subjectivity in psalmody and its modulation of 2 Corinthians 1

The relationship of singular and plural subjectivity in the biblical psalms is a subtle matter. While individual and corporate psalms are regularly distinguished in form critical accounts, the way they dispose their respective subjects is curiously similar. As Harold Fisch has observed in his study of the poetics of biblical psalmody, the

---

<sup>115</sup> The literary integrity of 2 Corinthians is endlessly debated. See Bieringer 1994a and 1994b for detailed analysis; cf. Vegge 2008:7-37 and *passim* for judicious review of the debate and a carefully mounted defence of the integrity of the whole. For all its intrinsic interest, the matter is of limited import to our study, which does not depend on any particular literary-historical reconstruction. Nonetheless, it does embody a limited claim: that a) that Paul authored the entirety of the canonical letter (2 Cor 6:14-7:1 optionally excepted), whether on one occasion or several; and b) that 2 Cor 1-7 at minimum constitutes a literary unity (6:14-7:1 excepted once again). The former is uncontroversial; the latter widely defended (e.g. Harris 2005:13-14; Barrett 1973:9, 12, 232; Furnish 1984:36; Thrall 1994:24).

<sup>116</sup> The Burkean “ratio” of agency-agent, well developed in his dramatisic account, serves well for the Letter of Initial Response, while the ratio of agent-counteragent is entirely apt for the Letter of Attack. Crafton cannot find a ratio for the Letter of Reconciliation, however; here, Paul is “co-agent” and “mediator” – terms with limited play in Burke (see 1945:xix-xx for the former), and a good deal fuzzier in their definitional import, inasmuch as they do not benefit from the precision of antithesis. Yet the behaviour of singular pronouns is more variable in this Letter, requiring local explanations to which fuzzy terms have little to offer. Instead of a specific ratio, Crafton understands this Letter to be governed by a “movement from *θλιψις* to *παράκλησις*” (1991:47) in which Paul’s correspondents are to share, to the purpose of reconciliation, now that conflict is (formally) at an end. Paul’s co-agency with God and his mediating role facilitate this shared movement. Well and good: but such a movement, as also the co-agency which facilitates it, could be extrapolated to cover Paul’s rhetoric in the Letter of Initial Response. It is not clear that Crafton is able sufficiently to distinguish the rhetorical terms of the “initial response” from the (later) “reconciliation”.

<sup>117</sup> The discontinuity represented by this passage within the text of 2 Corinthians is a good deal more severe than any other, though the current trend is to argue Pauline redaction and even authorship. See discussion in Thrall 1994:25-36.

subject of individual lament or of thanksgiving is very far from the lyrical “I”, alone in its inwardness and introspection. “The undeniable emphasis on the collective experience of worship radically compromises the subjective, lyric quality of the Psalms.”<sup>118</sup> The biblical psalmist’s state of fulfilment consists in being joined to the collectivity of Israel (horizontally), and to the past and future elements of its history (vertically). Commenting on Ps 22 MT, Fisch notes, “Not the transcendental moment of lonely communion is the desired end but the trials and consolations of history as the nation experiences it.”<sup>119</sup> The psalmist begs for his individual life, but once delivered will leave his solitude behind “and make his ordeal an occasion of rejoicing for the community.”<sup>120</sup> In this movement the psalmist’s agency is affirmed, for what he has to offer the community is witness as to what God has done; in his testimony he becomes an agent in building up the community.<sup>121</sup> A modified version of this trajectory appears in our passage, as we shall see (5.4.2.1).

Yet the movement is both outward and inward. If the experience of the singular psalmist is rooted in and oriented to that of corporate Israel, it is equally true, as Fisch observes, that “the trials and struggles of the community often take on the character of a lonely, individual ordeal in which the suffering soul cries out to God and is answered. ... The people in short take on the marks of lyrical subjectivity, giving us idiolect and sociolect all together.”<sup>122</sup> Indeed, Fisch finds the distinction between idiolect and sociolect “stultified” by such psalms as 103 MT.<sup>123</sup> These observations do not imply an ontological claim, such that the distinction between

---

<sup>118</sup> Fisch 1988:112.

<sup>119</sup> Fisch 1988:114.

<sup>120</sup> Fisch 1988:114. Encoded in the shared language of a collectivity, and directed toward that collectivity, the ego of biblical lament is by no means autonomous; cf. Di Vito 1999:234-37. Its moral agency is assured nonetheless (cf. discussion below).

<sup>121</sup> Ps 115, quoted by Paul in 2 Cor 4:13, offers striking illustration of this movement. As the psalm begins, the psalmist is found not simply alienated from community, as in many laments, but denying its very possibility, insofar as he discerns a moral failure in which all are implicated (πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης, 115:2). Yet in posing a question as to how best to repay YHWH for his (presumed) deliverance (v.3), his answer commissions acts (115:4, 8) which immediately counterpose the community for their validation (Ps 116:14 MT, omitted at 115:5 by the OG translators as a duplicate, and 115:9-10). In addition, Ps 116 MT is one of two psalms (with Ps 66 MT; cf. also Ps 40:9-10 MT) which might be thought to belong to a (sub)genre of “vow fulfilment psalms” (O’Brien 1987). If so, O’Brien argues, the form critical distinction between individual and communal psalms breaks down still further. As she contends, “the fulfillment of a vow, while a matter between an individual and the deity, nonetheless is an act which involves the community ... While the crisis that prompts the vow may be a private concern, the exultation which arises from the deity’s answering the request is not; rather, this joy belongs to the community and to its record of God’s mighty acts” (1987:292-93).

<sup>122</sup> Fisch 1988:115.

<sup>123</sup> Illustrating from Ps 103, Fisch concludes with the idea that “such a psalm stultifies the very distinction [of idiolect and sociolect] itself” (1988:116).

individual and community is nullified or otherwise meaningless in psalmody. Idiolect and sociolect denote singular and plural varieties of *speech*; and it is inasmuch as the psalmic subject is constituted in and by speech, precisely *as* one who speaks, that the failure of difference among speech varieties is of such profound import. The psalmist is not Israel; yet when she speaks, it is in Israel's voice; and Israel speaks in hers.

In light of all this, what does psalmic modulation suggest to the puzzle of first person plural pronouns in our passage? Certainly, it makes the fact of their employment less surprising. As the narrative trajectory of a biblical psalmist is toward corporate praise, Paul's εὐλογητός calls for the plural to govern the *berakah* which follows, and licenses its extension to the *narratio* of 1:8-11.<sup>124</sup> A similar effect may be observed at 4:13, where the grammatical singularity of the quoted voice is undercut by Paul's gloss in plural: here again, the discourse of psalmody evokes a plural subject.

As to the question of rhetorical effect, psalmic modulation suggests that the voice of Paul's experience, though never less than his own, is never completely his own: the psalmist's voice can never be pre-empted by just one, but implies and invites the speech of the whole community of faith, and indeed of Christ himself. Such would be the case even were Paul to speak in singular voice throughout; but with the plural, implication and invitation alike are enforced. In the *narratio* in particular (1:8ff.), the invitational force of the pronoun is unchecked by any opposition between "us" and "you"; and when at last the two are distinguished, it is only so that all, severally and together, may be implicated in the praise of God (1:11) – the very trajectory by which an individual psalmist is incorporated.

### **5.3.3.5 A psalmist at the limit of canonical experience: despair and a failed appeal**

By psalmic modulation, then, the invitation is made to join with the apostle in his experience. Yet in its full dimensions this is only just the experience of a biblical

---

<sup>124</sup> The undoubted truth that Paul is not composing a psalm encourages Thrall (1994:101, 103) to dismiss the incorporative potential of the plural, which predominates until the distinction drawn in v. 6 between "us" and "you" (and predominates in 1:8ff.). But this is to miss the extent to which the entire segment, and not merely its first phrase, has a "liturgical cast" (Furnish 1984:110), as we have also argued. In any event, incorporation may be licensed modally rather than generically, requiring less than a well-composed psalm as evidence.

psalmist. Indeed, the existential arc traced in Paul’s Asian affliction defines its subject at the limit of that experience; for despair is hardly licensed in biblical psalmody. The extremity of Paul’s position is captured in the verb *ἐξαπορέομαι*. Three chapters later Paul will characterise “us” as *ἀπορούμενοι ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι* (4:8); from this second usage, we learn that the term expresses for Paul a state of despair which is not customarily his. This unusual verb is found only once elsewhere in the biblical text, in Ps 87 (Ps 88 MT), at v.16.<sup>125</sup> The psalm in question is unique in the biblical literature for its failure to resolve the troubled testimony of lament in a conclusion of praise, or of hope, or even of appeal,<sup>126</sup> rather, this psalmist, like Paul, has been brought low,<sup>127</sup> and finds himself in the shadow of death (87:7), with no prospect of remission.<sup>128</sup>

Thus, while Harvey is incorrect to suggest that in his extremity Paul steps beyond the subjective limits of the lamenting psalmist,<sup>129</sup> it is fair to observe he stands at that limit. No other psalmist entertains despair; only Job offers a personal narrative of similarly unremitting bleakness (Job 3). Though it does not recognise the value of suffering – indeed, the psalmist contests this very point (vv.11-13) – Ps 87 legitimates the discourse of suffering, independent of a narrative of rescue. This is a psalm for one who, overwhelmed by suffering, despairs *καὶ τοῦ ζῆν* (2 Cor 1:8).

Of equal interest in Ps 87 is the architecture of despair, displayed in the sequence of three moments of appeal and their sequels. Over the course of his appeals, the psalmist moves subtly further from the presence of God. The psalmist cries out in vv.2-3, 10, and 14. In the first – with which the psalm opens in apparent hope – he

<sup>125</sup> The Greek text has taken the Hebrew *הִפְסִיחַ* (Ps 88:16 MT) to indicate despair (*ἐξαπορέομαι*). HALOT gives the Hebrew verb as “uncertain” in meaning at this point, which elsewhere expresses enfeeblement (q.v.). The unremitting bleakness of the psalmist’s experience certainly justifies despair, though it is the Hebrew text, and not the Greek, which characterises that experience as “dying since [I was] a youth” in the same verse (*רַחֵם אֶת־נַפְשִׁי*, 88:16 MT), a striking notion softened in most ETs (but cf. NASB “mortally afflicted”). The Greek admits in this verse a little less: poverty and trouble (from infancy), and a descent from exaltation to the despair of depravation (87:16); though death is the subject’s experience earlier in the psalm (87:7f.).

<sup>126</sup> Appeal is made at three points in the psalm (vv.2-3, 10, 14), but is not the last word; see discussion. Cf. Brueggemann 1997:398-99; Brueggemann 1984:78-81.

<sup>127</sup> The psalmist is *ἐταπεινώθη καὶ ἐξηπορήθη* (87:16b); Paul is *ἐβαρήθημεν ... ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι* (2 Cor 1:8b). The verbs *ταπεινώω* and *βαρέω* are semantically distinct, but for the passive subject, faced with death, existentially close.

<sup>128</sup> Although at its outset the psalmist acknowledges the Lord as “God of my salvation” (*κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῆς σωτηρίας μου*, 87:2), no sign of salvation is present thereafter; the psalm concludes with estrangement (Ps 87:19) or darkness (Ps 88:18 MT).

<sup>129</sup> Harvey 1996:18-19.

stands before (ἐναντίον) the God of his salvation, asking that his prayer may enter in before (ἐνώπιον) God, and that God may incline his ear. In later verses he cries out not before God – in his presence – but toward (πρός) him (vv.10,14), spreading out his hands toward (πρός) him (v.10); it is his prayer that will come before God (προφθάνω, v.14), not himself. Tellingly, the substance of each cry reflects the growing distance. Vv.4-9a lay out the symptoms of distress, first in the form of subjective statement (4-5), then in the form of accusation: “You” have done these things.<sup>130</sup> The challenges of vv.11-13 are posed as rhetorical questions which neither expect nor require direct answer.<sup>131</sup> And no sooner is the final appeal made (v.14) than the psalmist protests he is forsaken (ἀπωθέω, v.15), the face of God turned away (ἀποστρέφω) from him. Thus he despairs (v.16), and concludes his psalm overwhelmed and alone; earlier similes<sup>132</sup> have become actualities.

The psalmist of Ps 87 is revealed as one whose appeal diminishes in confidence, until it is finally denied by God. Appealing to God for life, the psalmist receives a verdict of death, whose existential reality is displayed in total isolation from his God and his community. It is worth emphasising how distinctive this is within biblical psalmody. Conventionally the subject of lament is transposed at the moment of appeal to a posture of thanksgiving, the agency of its appeal marked by a change of aspect: God’s rescue has been accomplished. But even where divine response remains prospective, either the proclamation of hope or the appeal which guarantees it is ever the psalmist’s last word. Not here, however; nor in the experience of the apostle.

The denial of formal closure to the psalm, and the psalmist’s existential terminus in darkness and isolation, are both modes of resistance to the generic offer of narrative.<sup>133</sup> His appeal denied, this psalmist has “fallen out” of the conventional narrative which would make sense of his experience, and which would offer a

---

<sup>130</sup> The Hebrew text of the psalm is especially clear in its claim that God is the one who has ordained the psalmist’s experience of death, however inexplicable may be its purpose. Thus in Ps 87:7 MT YHWH himself sends the psalmist to the place of darkness (בְּמַחְשֵׁה). The Greek psalmist demurs: the agents of suffering are multiple in Ps 87:9; “they” have laid him there (ἔθεντο).

<sup>131</sup> The psalmist ponders how his death would further God’s interests, and fails to find an answer (87:11-13). Paul, for his part, is willing to hazard an explanation (2 Cor 1:10b); see below.

<sup>132</sup> The psalmist is earlier “like” a helpless man (ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἀβοήθητος, v.4); “like” the discarded wounded (ὡσεὶ τραυματῖαι ἐρριμμένοι, v.5).

<sup>133</sup> Cf. Job who, in the extremity of his experience, resists the attempts of the friends to configure his experience narratively (see Newsom 2003:93-105, 132-36).

further horizon;<sup>134</sup> subjective death is the sign and result. To anticipate a later point (5.3.3.7), the Pauline subject of 2 Cor 1:8-10 will likewise “die” to the narrative expectations of psalmody; unlike the psalmist, that subject will be constituted anew.

In his affliction Paul evidently stands with the psalmist of Ps 87; though we do not find explicit notice of appeal, just this is implied, and a negative verdict – τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου – is the reply. As for the psalmist, so for Paul, the only agent capable of levying so severe a verdict, or alternatively, of bestowing life, is the κύριος of the biblical psalms.<sup>135</sup>

We have no way of knowing whether Paul meditated on Ps 87 in particular during his affliction, or as he later wrote. Nonetheless, the particular collocation of despair with a death divinely ordained and against which appeal is denied is, as we have seen, unusual; and the shared lexeme ἐξαπορέομαι suggestive, the more so for being elsewhere unrepresented (save negatively, in 4:8). At the level of experience, Paul and this psalmist have much in common.<sup>136</sup> More generally, we can affirm that, in his despair, Paul may be identified not with psalmody in any genre or mode, but at its bleeding edge: in the lament which finds no prospect of rescue, for God has ordained the psalmist’s death, and his appeal cannot overturn it.

### 5.3.3.6 Paul at the limit of psalmic experience: a verdict of death

We have explored an apparent sympathy between Paul and the despairing psalmist of Ps 87, but we have yet to argue the point. At issue is the force of the ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου of 2 Cor 1:9, which we have taken to imply a context of appeal and a divine verdict-giver. This elliptical claim merits further discussion.

The key lexeme ἀπόκριμα is itself a distinctive term whose discursive roots lie elsewhere than in psalmody.<sup>137</sup> Its intrusion into a narrative otherwise shaped by the

---

<sup>134</sup> Cf. Turner 1998:134.

<sup>135</sup> So also Harris 2005:155.

<sup>136</sup> Of course, a single shared lexeme ought not to persuade us that Paul has been studying Ps 87, however suggestive the term may be in its rarity and evident significance to Paul. Nor should the psalmist’s preoccupation with death (more pressing in the Hebrew text than the Greek, in any event) encourage us to think the apostle had recourse to this psalm in particular as an object of reflection, more than, say, Pss 114-115 (cf. Harvey 1996:18). But the disposition of this psalmist, and of no other, was Paul’s in his despair.

<sup>137</sup> The term is typically translated “sentence” as though juridical in origin (cf. Windisch 1924:46), but is in fact a *hapax legomenon* in biblical Greek without contemporary evidence for juridical use. Hemer

affectivity and lexis of the psalms is therefore striking; but Paul modifies its impact by stressing not the form of address *per se* but the interiority of its effects: we received the verdict of death “in our very selves” (αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, 1:10a). In this way the term is reaccentuated to play a role in lament or thanksgiving, since it has now to do with the subject’s experience.

That role is first of all to warrant Paul’s despair. The existential severity of the apostle’s experience is conveyed in v.8, most of all in the notion of being “overwhelmed beyond capacity [to endure]” (καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ὑπὲρ δύναμιν ἐβαρήθημεν); but this in itself does not underwrite despair. It is rather the internalised ἀπόκριμα of v.9 which offers a warrant for Paul’s despair, because it bears an aspect of permanence or finality which is otherwise unmarked. Severity of suffering is not the sufficient cause of despair, though it may encourage it,<sup>138</sup> unless no hope exists of remission. In the experience of this subject there is no quarter given to hope, for the verdict of death, resonant with the firmness of official process, is received or is had precisely in the self.

But whence does the verdict originate? ἀπόκριμα is a rich term, whose figuring potential includes not only a verdict (and hence, a verdict-giver), but a context of appeal to which the verdict is a response. Fully figured, the ἀπόκριμα is shown to originate with a divine verdict-giver, who alone can pronounce “death” so definitively, and to constitute God’s response to an appeal for life, originating with Paul.

But must the term be “fully figured”? Rather than adduce a failed appeal on Paul’s part, and a divine verdict in response, we might take the absence of appeal at face value: Paul simply interpreted his suffering as a verdict of death, without originator.<sup>139</sup> The reader has no grounds to figure a divine judge. Perhaps he did

---

(1972:103-106) observes that ἀπόκριμα “became a technical term for an official decision in answer to the petition of an embassy” (1972:104); as such, it is a response to presumed appeal: a verdict (whether positive or negative in force); cf. Thrall 1994:118. Even were we to imagine a judicial context and a “sentence”, rather than “verdict”, we remain free to figure an appellant and judge. A “sentence of death”, then, like a “verdict of death”, retains the character of response, though its content is presumed to be negative.

<sup>138</sup> As in fact Paul claims (v.8): we were overwhelmed ὥστε (with the result that; BDAG q.v. 2β) we despaired of life itself.

<sup>139</sup> Some mistake the interiority of Paul’s formulation with an absence of objective reference. So e.g. Furnish (1984:108); Martin (1986:12): “it seemed to us that we had received”; cf. Louw and Nida

not even appeal for help. We might find support for this view if we take the “confidence in ourselves” (1:9), which the verdict of death brought to an end, to imply a reluctance to ask for God’s aid on the grounds that Paul could rescue himself. In such a scenario, Paul made no appeal at all.

This will not do, however. Paul knows he cannot rescue himself, having already signaled his incapacity in 1:8b: *καθ’ ὑπὲρ δύνάμιν ἐβαρήθημεν*. As to an absent appeal: the image of Paul failing to pray when in distress is hard to reconcile with his appeals elsewhere for prayer and the regular assumption of prayerful agency, whether his own or that of others. Just two verses later he will solicit the prayers of the Corinthians amid the prospect of future trouble; acknowledgements of his own prayers for the communities he writes to are frequent and strong.<sup>140</sup> This image is likewise at odds with the expected disposition of a psalmist, modally present in our text, who records his cries to God and anticipates their effectiveness. Should we imagine less of Paul?<sup>141</sup> And if we eliminate the assumption of divine agency from the sentence in its moment of utterance, Paul obliges us to reintroduce it as he draws its pedagogical import: by using the ἀπόκριμα to rework the basis of Paul’s confidence, God shows himself its true author.

In fact, Paul does indeed depart from psalmic expectation, but not so crassly as to have neglected to pray. We are better to assume that he did; and if he did, then ἀπόκριμα is a fully figurable term, whose verdict of death, in response to Paul’s appeal, evokes a divine Lord of life and death to utter it. Yet this scenario expresses

---

(1988: §56.26). Rather more find themselves in this camp unwittingly. In particular, ETs and commentators who qualify the sentence as something “felt” or “felt to have been received” (cf. NIV; NRSV) reduce its force to that of simile (e.g. Harris 2005:155, who nonetheless claims an objective verdict). Paul “feels” as one subject to a verdict of death; he does not claim to have received such a verdict, whether from himself or some other agent. But this subjective enhancement is not invited by the text, which is both objective and interior in import: the sentence was received indeed in “our very selves”. Alternatively, some claim a divine-human conjunction: Paul feels a (pre)sentiment sent by God (so Plummer 1915:6; cf. Windisch 1924:46-47). But this is to eat one’s cake (subjectively) and have it too (objectively).

<sup>140</sup> For example, Rom 1:9; Phil 1:4, 9; 1 Thess 1:2; Phlm 4. It is worth noting, however, that in each case the agency of the praying subject is for the other, and not for the self. Just such a pattern we find here (5.4.2.2). For 2 Cor 12:8-9, in which Paul does indeed pray for himself unavailing, see 5.3.3.7 below.

<sup>141</sup> Moreover, it is far from clear how internalising a false prognosis – “I shall die” – might provide the occasion for renewed confidence in God (the minimum signified by ἰνα in v.9), much less lead directly to it. If we point out that this confidence is precisely in “God who raises the dead”, we open the way for Paul to expect imminent death yet hope legitimately in resurrection, thus linking prognosis and confidence. Yet, suggestive though it is that God is characterised this way, it is imminent rescue from death, and not the eschatological resurrection of the dead, to which Paul testifies in the ensuing verses.

a radically different experience from that of the psalmist. Paul appeals to God for life; God replies with “death”. The agency of Paul’s appeal is subverted or denied. The appeal of the righteous psalmist may be met with temporary silence (in lament), but not with so decisive a denial.<sup>142</sup> Indeed, the contrast with the psalmist’s conventional experience throws Paul’s treatment of agency into relief.

There is one further objection to be met in relation to a divine sentence-giver here, and it is one which will help us to determine in what sense exactly Paul was sentenced to death. The objection is this: Paul did not die, but was rescued by God (1:10); in what sense, then, might a divine verdict of death be considered true? Presumably, an imminent corporeal death was not in view, for this would make God a liar. Or if it was, then we must return to the subjective view we have discarded, in which Paul adduces the sentence for himself.

An alternative account, which allows for a divine verdict and a fully corporeal death, hears in the divine sentence a revelation concerning Paul’s survival until the *παρουσία*, such that he would not – contrary to his earlier expectation – be alive when the Lord appeared; or (more weakly) that his survival was not certain.<sup>143</sup> Thus Paul was indeed rescued from death on this occasion, but the verdict of death pre-Parousia remains in force for him, and is productive elsewhere in 2 Corinthians. Whatever its merits, such a reading struggles to account for Paul’s climactic assertion of a confident hope (cf. the perfect *ἠλπικαμεν*) of future rescue (1:10b),<sup>144</sup> and must find there signs of diminished confidence, rather than (as may be thought) unwavering confidence newly grounded on God who raises the dead (1:9b): the necessary proof of Paul’s transformation (1:8-9).<sup>145</sup>

Such considerations raise the possibility that something other than an objective, corporeal death is at issue in both 1:9-10; or more precisely, that the *ἀπόκριμα τοῦ*

---

<sup>142</sup> Ps 87, discussed earlier (5.3.3.5), represents the exception that proves the rule.

<sup>143</sup> Harvey (1996) premises his reading of 2 Corinthians on just this hypothesis. Some recent commentators (e.g. Harris 2005) incline to it also. The fact that Paul demonstrably has not died as a result of his afflictions in Asia does not require a more elaborate account of the force of the death-sentence, however. In one sense, at least, Paul’s afflicted self does indeed die; see discussion.

<sup>144</sup> See Vegge 2008:161-64 on the strength of Paul’s confidence.

<sup>145</sup> See further 5.4.1.2.

θανάτου of 1:9 refers to a qualitatively different death than the τηλικούτοι θανάτοι<sup>146</sup> of 1:10, from which Paul was delivered. Only a non-corporeal death in 1:9 allows the sentence to be divinely given and duly effective, ensuring its truth, and yet to remain consistent with Paul’s rescue from corporeal death (on this and other occasions) – from “such tremendous deaths” – in 1:10.<sup>147</sup> The next section considers the nature of these “deaths”.

### 5.3.3.7 Death to the agency of the self on its own behalf

Such was Paul’s state that he “despaired even of life” (ἐξαπορηθῆναι ... καὶ τοῦ ζῆν), a phrase that suggests the prospect of corporeal death. Yet he does not die, but lives. The verdict of death, then, as something divinely prosecuted and therefore true and effective, refers ultimately to something other than the end of Paul’s physical life. This is signaled in our translation of ἀλλά, which relates the verdict of death to the despairing of life which precedes it. Most translations take ἀλλά to be rhetorically ascensive, as “indeed”; thus, Paul not only despaired of life but indeed (felt that he had) received a verdict of death. This reading presumes a continuity of reference between the two verses. However, it is not clear why an ascensive reading is required;<sup>148</sup> and ἀλλά may equally be taken adversatively (“but”), which opens the

<sup>146</sup> The singular form (τηλικούτου θανάτου) benefits from stronger external attestation; the plural, the oldest Greek witnesses (Metzger 1994:506). Scribal corrections could be argued either way: plural intensifies; singular eliminates pedantry. In sum, either reading could be followed, though plural is *lectio difficilior*. The assumed directionality of Paul’s statement also bears upon the matter: if Paul is reflecting on his rescue from the affliction just described, a singular “tremendous death” is a natural fit. If, on the other hand, Paul is stepping beyond the particularity of that experience to a pan-historical pattern of rescue, a pluralised, generalised version of his recent encounter with death is an appropriate referent. On this reading, the aoristic force of ἐρρύσατο consists less in capturing the aspectual past than the certitude of the pattern of the rescue, exemplified in many completed acts. This is in any event more in keeping with the agent of rescue named here: “God who raises the dead” (v.9b). The present participle τῷ ἐγείροντι is atemporal, denoting a permanent characteristic of God (Harris 2005:157); but like the psalmist, the apostle is not content with an atemporal, much less ahistorical, approach to naming God. Instead, he finds warrant in narrative redescription: God whose characteristic is to raise the dead is shown as such in rescue, and shown better in rescue from multiple deaths than from one, and in multiple times than in one; thus God has rescued us *and will yet rescue us* (καὶ ἔτι ρύσεται, 1:10c). In addition, the designation “God who raises the dead” is liturgical, featuring in the second prayer of the “Eighteen Benedictions”, a staple of daily worship in the synagogue (see SB 3.212; 4.208-49). Thus the reader finds himself caught up with Paul in the story; but each has a tale of deliverance to tell at the hands of this God, not just a tale of Paul’s rescue in Asia. Many are the “tremendous deaths”, multiple the rescues.

<sup>147</sup> The plurality of death in 1:10 (see previous note) is additional evidence that the singular, corporeal death implied in 1:8b does not closely govern reference thereafter. Death may be plural in 1:10, rather than singular; it may be incorporeal in 1:9a, rather than corporeal.

<sup>148</sup> It is not clear that the sentence of death (1:9a), quickly harnessed to a pedagogical end (1:9b), offers to intensify the richly figured suffering of the subject of 1:8, whose overwhelmed state and despair of life is already tantamount to a sentence of death. And while αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς is emphatic (“we in our very selves”), it may be so less to intensify the subject’s experience so much as locate the effect of the sentence precisely, a rhetorical effect which does not require an ascensive reading of

question of reference anew. Paul despaired of corporeal life (1:8), yet does not die (as the reader knows already at 1:8, and will learn at 1:10); “but” (1:9) a verdict of death was received nonetheless.<sup>149</sup> This must be a death of non-corporeal kind.

The possibility of alternative referents should not surprise us. The subjectivity of Paul’s experience is after all paramount in his account, such that the question of reference for death and other categories of experience is not foreclosed. Paul’s subjective prose we have taken as evidence of psalmic modulation; we might therefore add that the category of death in psalmody is by no means always straightforwardly corporeal, but serves to represent a variety of subjective states. In psalmody, when not prospective, death names the experience of the living.<sup>150</sup>

What then might death entail, if not the physical end of life? A solution is suggested by the change in Paul’s relationship with the self, which is not only consequent on the verdict of death (cf. ἴνα, 1:9), but which offers itself as its pedagogical *telos*: that “we should no longer have confidence in ourselves, but put our trust in God who raises the dead” (2 Cor 1:9).<sup>151</sup> Death, on this account, has something to do with a divinely wrought end to self-confidence.

But what exactly did the self fail to do, such that confidence in it could not be sustained? As we have just seen, it was not that Paul was so confident in his own resources that he failed to seek divine aid in his distress. Paul did indeed appeal, as a psalmist must; but against the expectation of psalmody, his appeal for life elicited a verdict of death. The apostle could be confident no longer in the effectiveness of

---

ἀλλά (*contra* Harris 2005:155), but profits from an adversative one. The assumption that ἀλλά should be read ascensively may be what compels interpreters to qualify Paul’s receipt of a death verdict as something “felt”; for to do so is to align the statement of v.9a with the existentiality of v.8b, and so promote the impression of rhetorical ascent, a “felt” verdict (v.9a) intensifying (felt) despair (v.8b). The elliptical qualification is, however, unwarranted; cf. note following.

<sup>149</sup> The tendency among ETs, noted earlier (5.3.3.6 n.139), is to qualify Paul’s receipt of the sentence: “we *felt* the sentence of death” (NIV); “we *felt that we had received* the sentence of death” (NRSV). A death sentence which is (merely) “felt” or “felt to have been received” may be objectively false. But this qualification is elliptical, and scarcely required by the perfect ἐσχίκαμεν, which posits a real and ongoing state (cf. the perfect forms which follow: πεποιθότες, ἠλπίκαμεν), not one (merely) perceived (so also Harris 2005:156, who nonetheless translates “feel we received” (2005:155)). *Contra* Bultmann 1985:28; Furnish 1984:113; Kraftchick 2002:159, there is no need to take the perfect aoristically. Paul’s death sentence was not only received indeed, but took enduring effect.

<sup>150</sup> Cf. 5.3.3.2 n.106.

<sup>151</sup> Watson (1983) takes 1:9b to express the “heart” of Paul’s theology, and the coinherence of many aspects of his thought. Even if we prefer to ask less of this verse, the point remains: the shift of confidence negotiated in 1:9 is no small adjustment, but a fundamental reconstitution of the self in line with God’s redemptive practice (vv.10-11).

his appeals on his own behalf. Thus we find the subject sentenced to a very particular death: the praying self experiences death as an agent on its own behalf. Such a death has a sequel, in Paul's experience, in life: for the one who is no longer an agent on his own behalf is subject to the agency of God who raises the dead, as rescuer (1:10), and as the subject's co-agent on behalf of others (1:11).

The point becomes clear as we consider how this journey constitutes a departure from psalmic subjectivity. The clear expectation of the narrating subject in lament or thanksgiving is that it will articulate its own role in consolation. To be sure, in biblical psalmody only God can save; but the psalmist is an agent in his own deliverance as he declares his suffering, and more when he speaks out his suffering to God; for his speech is the occasion of God's epiphany.<sup>152</sup> Agency and speech are thus closely related,<sup>153</sup> insofar as the one is marked in the other: the psalmist cries out, and is answered.<sup>154</sup> In Paul's account, however, the moment of agency is twice subverted. Paul's appeal is unmarked, though we may legitimately infer it; and the divine response is the opposite of that hoped for: "death!"

In the subversion of Paul's agency, shown in relief against the generic background of psalmody, we see what has been sentenced to death: the subject's agency in

---

<sup>152</sup> See Fisch 1988:104-35. Recall the Davidic penitent of Ps 31 in Rom 4:6-7, whose claim to have no deceit in his mouth (Ps 31:2b) – a claim which would constitute the agency of his speech (on his own behalf) in confession – Paul was unwilling to grant. See 2.3.2.

<sup>153</sup> The psalmist's agency is primarily evidenced in acts of speech: in the declaration of divine attributes; in testimony to divine activity; in appeals, whether explicit (as petition) or implicit (as lament), which occasion the display of divine power. Speech does not exhaust agency, to be sure – the psalmist at times acts upon others (the nations; the enemies; the community of faith) in other than spoken terms. Yet all the psalmist's acts, whatever their kind, or however addressed, are expressed in prayerful speech whose ultimate audience is God, who alone can underwrite the performativity of such acts. Speech directed proximately or ultimately to God is in every case the mode of psalmic agency.

<sup>154</sup> In practice, the evidence for the agency of speech varies from psalm to psalm. At times a past appeal is recalled; at other times, past deliverance is rehearsed, which forms the ground of present appeal. But even where there is neither, the conventional language of a given psalm invokes a wider covenantal discourse in which the presumption of agency may be maintained. The discursive coherence of "biblical psalmody" in this respect is cast into relief by its dissimilarity from the *Hodayot*, a body of psalmic literature broadly contemporary with Paul, in use at Qumran. There, as Carol Newsom has shown (Newsom 2004), thanksgiving is divorced from lament – indeed, lament as a genre is essentially unrepresented – and the speaker's agency, enacted in the cry of lament, is precluded. In the *Hodayot*, rather, the speaker "is not an agent but an agency through whom God works" (Newsom 2004:207). In respect of agency we find the Pauline subject more akin to that of a *hodayah* than to the subject of biblical thanksgiving. Not that we should claim direct contact or influence; rather, Paul shares with the *Hodayot* a strong conviction as to the supremacy of divine agency – rigorously assumed in the former, powerfully asserted in 2 Cor 1. Such a conviction represents a fertile pretext for revision of the agency of the human subject, which both undertake. More generally on speech and subjectivity in biblical psalmody, cf. Fisch 1988:115-17, 134.

respect of its own rescue. The conventional narrative has been undone; the subject dies accordingly and must be remade. As we shall later see (5.4.2.2), God’s rescue, when it comes (1:10), is shown to be contingent not on Paul’s request, but on the prayers of others (1:11). Thus we see sketched in biography what we shall discover in the exhortation of 1:10-11, and have seen most precisely in 1:3-7: a community in which one is an agency for the other, and not an agent on one’s own behalf.

The divine verdict of 2 Cor 1:9 is a constitutive moment in Paul’s experience, bringing about a radical change in the object of his confidence: God who raises the dead is substituted for the self. This movement, from biography to revelation to a reconfigured relationship with the self, is at one with what we find elsewhere in 2 Corinthians. Consider the most celebrated instance of Paul’s speech in request of deliverance, 2 Cor 12:8, where the apostle has appealed (παρακαλέω) three times for the removal of the infamous “thorn in the flesh” (σκόλοψ τῆ σαρκί ; 12:7). Paul’s appeal in 2 Cor 12:8-9 and Christ’s response<sup>155</sup> are worth quoting in full:

<sup>8</sup> ὑπὲρ τούτου τρίς τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῆ ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ.<sup>9</sup> καὶ εἴρηκέν μοι· ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται. ἥδιστα οὖν μᾶλλον καυχῆσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου, ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ’ ἐμέ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Despite Paul’s forceful and insistent advocacy on his own behalf, the thorn remains; the agency of Paul’s appeal is denied. Christ replies, yet not in proportion to Paul’s request. Instead – and here, Paul’s experience is like that provided by a *bodayab*<sup>156</sup> – an insight is conferred (ἡ ... δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται), whose reflex is a new-found knowledge of the self in relation to God; here, focused on Christ (ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου). Like the sectarian, Paul discovers his place “within an already scripted drama”;<sup>157</sup> unlike him, Paul’s script is Christologically derived, as we saw in 2 Cor 1:3-7 (5.2).

---

<sup>155</sup> It is the κύριος who is addressed, who may in principle be God or Christ, based on Pauline usage (cf. Hurtado 2005:108-18). Windisch (1924:388) is undoubtedly correct to see Christ here, though not on the grounds of a role in countering Satanic agency, whose salience here is unclear, given the positive purpose for which the σκόλοψ is given. See also Thrall (1994:820); Harris (2005:855, 860); cf. Plummer 1915:353.

<sup>156</sup> See 5.3.3.7 n.154.

<sup>157</sup> Newsom 2004:208. Windisch (1924:391) notes the gnomic quality of the insight given: ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται.

The kinship between the two episodes is close. As in 2 Cor 1:8-9, the affliction is described not in terms of objective particulars but subjective effects, which are made to serve pedagogical, and indeed epistemological, aims. Divine initiative is predicated on similar grounds in each case, and the results are akin. In 2 Cor 12:7 the thorn is given “to keep me from becoming conceited” (ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι; *bis*); conceit, like the self-confident appeal which occasioned a verdict of death in 2 Cor 1, reflects an inappropriate orientation to the self and an erroneous estimation of its capabilities. The fruit of the verdict of death is the attenuation of the self as an agent, and confidence in the sufficiency of the divine agent; the fruit of the enduring thorn is correlative: a weakened self and insight into the grace and power of Christ “in me” (ἐπ’ ἐμὲ; 12:9): a clear statement of Christ’s co-agency.

But while the example of 2 Cor 12:8 well illustrates the failure of agency we have found in 2 Cor 1:8-9, it might equally be taken to challenge the reformation of the subject observed in the latter passage. Why, if Paul has died as an agent on his own behalf, does he attempt to assert such agency (admittedly, without success) in 2 Cor 12? The problem is in fact chimeric, posed by the simple linearity of written form in which Chapter 12 is found “after” Chapter 1. The episode reported as past in 2 Cor 12 might be situated at any remove from the epistolary present, quite plausibly before the Asian affliction of 2 Cor 1.<sup>158</sup> Accordingly, it illustrates Paul’s disposition before the “verdict of death” was levied; indeed, it might confirm the need for such a verdict. Viewed from the text’s present aspect, however, and in light of what we have discovered in 1:8-10, Paul’s persistent entreaties (12:8) reveal a weakness beyond the affliction of the thorn: the futility of Paul’s appeal to be delivered of it.<sup>159</sup> The apostle’s failure of agency on his own behalf, no less than the thorn, is an occasion for rejoicing (12:9-10), insofar as it clears the ground for the divine agent,<sup>160</sup> and the manifestation of Christological agency.<sup>161</sup> The subject that rejoices

<sup>158</sup> Priority would be confirmed with recourse to partition theories in which 2 Cor 10-13 constitutes an earlier letter than that which includes 2 Cor 1. On the structure of the letter, see 5.3.3.3 n.115. Like the “Asian affliction” of 2 Cor 1:8, the “thorn” is finally irreducible; see the survey in Thrall (2000:809-818), who elects a recurring physical malady; this is probably the majority view (cf. esp. Allo 1956:11-19, 311, 320-21). Some associate the σκόλοψ with the experienced θλίψις of 1:8, both being taken to indicate physical illness; cf. Alexander 1904:469-73, 545-48; Allo 1956:312; Dodd 1953:67-68; Harris 2005:171-72. Though the case cannot be proved, such a link would enhance the symmetry between the two episodes, such as we have seen.

<sup>159</sup> The plural “weaknesses” (12:9b) denotes a referent broader than the singular “thorn”.

<sup>160</sup> The ground remains clear in Paul’s unusual formulation two verses later (2 Cor 12:12). There the assertion of apostleship is clearly not a matter of Paul’s agency: τὰ ... σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατεργάσθη ἐν ὑμῖν.

is the subject we know from 1:9b-10, who also trusts not in his own agency in appeal, but in an all-sufficient God.

The translation set out below incorporates elements (in italics) of the reading we have developed for 1:8-10a.

<sup>8</sup> For we do not want you to be unaware, brothers, concerning our affliction which took place in Asia, that we were weighed down far beyond our ability to endure, such that we despaired even of life (*expected to die physically*). <sup>9</sup>But we have received the verdict of death in our very selves (*a divine sentence which has taken real effect*) in order that we might not be reliant on ourselves (*having died as agents on our own behalf*) but on God who raises the dead, <sup>10a</sup>who has rescued us from such tremendous deaths (*we have not died physically, on this or any occasion*) and will rescue [us] ...

Set out in this way, the present passage displays some affinity with Paul's extraordinary declaration in Gal 2:19-20, reproduced below.

Gal 2:19 ἔγω γὰρ διὰ νόμου νόμῳ ἀπέθανον, ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω. Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι.<sup>20</sup> ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός· ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῆ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ.

Although the divine verdict by which the subject comes to its death in 2 Cor 1 is not an instrument of law, it is suggestively judicial in tone, as we have seen.<sup>162</sup> More salient is the death itself in Gal 2 and the life which ensues: the death is a death *of* the self which does not mean its extinction, but its displacement as agent by the indwelling Christ. The embodied life is a life sustained precisely in a confident trust directed to<sup>163</sup> the Son of God who “gave himself”. What Paul has inflected toward divine agency in the Corinthian case he has posed Christocentrically in Galatians:<sup>164</sup> the nexus of cross and resurrection is invoked by Christ's self-giving here, and by God's raising of the dead in 2 Cor 1:9. Notwithstanding the different focus, the trajectory of the subject in each case is similar. Both undergo death as an agency, mediated by a judicial instrument, and are Christologically reconstituted in a

---

<sup>161</sup> It is the power of Christ that dwells in Paul (12:9b).

<sup>162</sup> See 5.3.3.6 n.137.

<sup>163</sup> My translation presumes an objective reading for the much debated πίστις Χριστοῦ formulations in Paul. For the closest intersection between this debate and our study of Christological psalmody, see 6.2.3.1.

<sup>164</sup> Save that the life described Christocentrically is lived “to God” (θεῷ; Gal 2:19).

confidence extrinsic to the self, tied to the event of the cross and the agents associated with it.<sup>165</sup>

If our reading is correct, we will find it demonstrated in the terms of rescue which now obtain; these are set out in 2 Cor 1:10-11, and are the business of 5.4 below. Before we attend to them, however, we must consider the “reach” of Paul’s experience. Though proper to him, as we shall see, it is not his alone.

### **5.3.3.8 A death enjoined upon all via the global subject of psalmody**

Paul’s death as an agent on his own behalf has been undertaken in a psalmic mode. His is not a death which belongs to him alone, therefore, but to the psalmic subject represented in his text. To judge by the narrative form of that representation, the subject concerned is proper to psalmic thanksgiving; but the coinherence of thanksgiving and lament in subjective terms,<sup>166</sup> and their predominance within the subjective range of biblical psalmody, allow us to speak of a global or representative psalmic subject. It is this subject which is represented here: which is subject, with Paul, to death, and thence to life, whose terms are elaborated in 1:10-11 (5.4 below).

Thus we see in 2 Corinthians 1 what we have observed elsewhere: Paul reconfigures the subjectivity of the psalmist according to a Christologically driven logic. Where, in Romans, this reconfiguration took place as Christ himself occupied a psalmic voice, here it is Paul’s biography which forms the site of transformative action, modulated by psalmody, while the Christological logic which underpins it is set out earlier, in 1:4-7.

The trajectory of the psalmist’s transformation confirms what we have seen elsewhere in its turn to the other. Relinquishing the agency of speech on his own behalf, the psalmist is remade as a speaking agency on behalf of others, as we shall see in 5.4 below. Believing in God who raises the dead, the agent of all rescue (1:9b-10), the psalmist speaks twice for others, as an agency in petition (δέησις, 1:11a) and in thanksgiving (εὐχαριστέω, 1:11b). This believing, speaking agency will reappear explicitly, as psalmody’s quintessential subject, in 2 Cor 4:13 (see 6.3.2).

---

<sup>165</sup> Cf. Barclay 2008b:152.

<sup>166</sup> Cf. 5.3.3.2 n.108.

The summary just offered may be thought to elide the distinction between Paul, whose death and renewal are described, and others (you, the many, the many; 1:11) who are implicated in the apostle's future rescue, subsuming both to the singular person of the psalmist. But such a move is warranted on several grounds. The Christological logic of Paul's dramaturgy, seen earlier, expects a drama in which human roles may be interchanged, and so held in common. We have noted in the *narratio* the varied ways in which Paul's rhetoric incorporates his readers in his own experience; indeed, this is one substantial effect of the psalmic modulation we have traced. And if all are implicated in the death and reformation of the suffering subject, they are equally named participants in the regime of petition, rescue and thanksgiving in which that subject cooperates. All are, in other words, present at every node in the matrix: all, whether Corinthian "you", or "the many", or apostle, or psalmist. All must die as agents for the self; all must hope in God who raises the dead; all must speak for the other in petition and thanksgiving.

Paul's verdict of death, then, could not apply more widely. Enforced upon the psalmist, it is commended to all who bless God for his consolations at 1:3, and who find in Paul's trajectory of suffering the pattern of their own.

#### **5.4 2 Corinthians 1:10b-11: the reconfigured self as co-agency for the other**

The pedagogical *telos* of Paul's narrative of suffering (1:8-9) is found in a singular confidence in God who raises the dead. Vv.10-11 elaborate the terms of this confidence; as such, they do not merely conclude the earlier passage formally but amplify its central theme. Yet these verses gather elements from throughout our passage and beyond. Crucial here is the reciprocal dynamic of 1:4-7, now given narrative form, with the pre-eminence of the divine agent governing here as there.<sup>167</sup> A diverse multitude is invoked at the last, as it was in the salutation (1:1-2), and its signature role in thanksgiving (1:11) matches the act of blessing to which all were

---

<sup>167</sup> Syntactically, this is represented in the form of vv.9-11, which constitute a single sentence, the main clause of which culminates in Paul's confidence and its divine object (1:9b). Subsequent clauses depend from this.

enjoined in 1:3. All told, 2 Cor 1:10-11 is not a coda to the larger passage, but its climax.

The text of our final verses, and my translation, are given here, and justified in discussion below:

<sup>1:10</sup> ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτων θανάτων ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ρύσεται, εἰς ὃν ἠλπίζαμεν [ᾧ] καὶ ἔτι ρύσεται, <sup>11</sup> συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῇ δεήσει, ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστηθῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

<sup>1:10</sup>... who has rescued us from such tremendous deaths and will rescue [us], in whom we continually hope that he will yet again rescue us, <sup>11</sup> provided you also join in helping [God] on our behalf by your petition, so that thanks might be given from many faces on our behalf for the gift of grace to us through many.

#### **5.4.1 Where dramaturgy finds its true drama: 1:10-11 as a narrative embodiment of 1:4-7**

##### **5.4.1.1 Continuity between 1:4-7 and 1:10-11, but not with the subject of 1:8-9**

The ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου has taken effect: the suffering subject dies as an agent on its own behalf and is reconstituted on a singular confidence in God who raises the dead (v.9b). The following verses figure the world in which this new-minted subject subsists.

The continuities are worth spelling out. It is not in the suffering subject of 1:8b that the logic of consolation set out in 1:4-7 finds its exemplar, but in the reconfigured subject of 1:9b. The former subject trusted (wrongly) in its own agency, and was thus required to die (as agent); its suffering was for its own death, not for the consolation of others. It is the latter subject which, trusting only in the divine agent, participates in a regime of suffering and rescue which brings consolation and life to others. Again: the drama which the dramaturgy of 1:4-7 represents is not that in which the suffering subject came to be reconstituted in hope (1:8-9b) but that which ensued thereafter (1:10-11): a prospective drama of future rescue, prayer and thanksgiving, deeply reciprocal in structure.

What does it mean to suggest that 1:4-7 finds its “narrative embodiment” in 1:10-11? What does the relationship between the two segments imply for each? As we

explore the second segment in detail we will observe its enrichment of the first in several matters of content; but here we can make some formal observations. Where the earlier passage encodes its principles atemporally, as statements of “how things work”, the later verses enact those principles in a narrative of “how things *will* work”, which is the form of historical possibility. Vv.10-11 thus confer on dramaturgy the claim of historical truth, a grounding in the experienced “real”. The effect is intensified by the richness which narrative form affords to discourse: the freedom to use language not merely to denote, but to figure. Through the use of evocative language and imagery, the later verses figure the world of reciprocity described in 1:4-7 as a place of real habitation.<sup>168</sup>

In the other direction, the timelessness of 1:4-7 confers on the particularity of any historical narrative, even prospective as here, a claim of permanence. Thus 1:10-11 sets out a narrative of “how things will *always* work”, not a one-off prospect, insofar as it embodies the permanent state of affairs described in the earlier verses. Such a narrative continues the trend we observed in 1:8-9 in which a journey particular to Paul is opened to all readers, so that they may find in it their own. If this is how things will always work, then it will be so for all readers, wherever in the matrix of rescue – as sufferer or co-agency – they find themselves. Finally, 1:4-7 supplies the Christological key to the world of reciprocal agencies figured in the later passage.

#### **5.4.1.2 Paul’s hope is qualified, but not because he doubts the prospect of rescue**

The claim that 1:10-11 portrays a permanent prospect might be taken to imply that its central outcome – “our” rescue accomplished by God who raises the dead – is an unqualified certainty. But Paul’s text does appear to offer qualification.

The first clause of 1:10, building on the newly established confidence of 1:9b, offers firm pronouncement: God who raises the dead, in whom is our confidence (1:9b), *will rescue [us]*. The clause which follows, however, may be thought to qualify the picture.<sup>169</sup> Formally, it appears redundant:<sup>170</sup> hope’s expectation (1:10b) restating

<sup>168</sup> Cf. the active subjectivity of hope; the co-operative imagery of the *hapax legomenon* συνυπουργέω; and the liturgical resonances of faces offering thanks. Discussion in 5.4.2 below.

<sup>169</sup> Unless ὅτι is omitted, in which case the sentence ends with ἠλπίκαμεν. Yet the profusion of scribal amendments to the sequence of particles argues for the full sequence as original. Cf. Metzger 1994:506.

confidence's claim (1:10a); if not redundant, then, the second clause must qualify the first. For those who understand the ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου as addressed to Paul's certainty about surviving until the parousia, this expression of hope is an instance of epidiorthisis:<sup>171</sup> Paul qualifies the apparent presumption of his bold declaration ῥύσεται; the prospect of rescue for one who has received a divine verdict of death cannot be certain.

But this is quite unnecessary. It is questionable whether, in Paul's theological lexicon, the act of hope (ἐλπίζω), when directed to God, is less sure than that of confidence (πείθω) similarly directed; if not, this is no qualification at all.<sup>172</sup> Both confidence and hope are perfectly expressed (πεποιθότες, ἠλπικάμεν), denoting an ongoing subjective state to which uncertainty or doubt have no access. Rather than qualify the certainty of Paul's claim, the statement of hope may simply fill out its subjectivity: the declaration "God will rescue!" is precisely the testimony of one who hopes. In this way, Paul particularises the confidence of 1:9b in God who raises the dead: this confidence enacts itself in hope of rescue.

These developments carry the argument forward, not back; εἰς ὃν κτλ introduces a genuine elaboration of the terms and conditions of rescue, not a softening of its prospect. In the perfect ἠλπικάμεν, by which Paul signifies an ongoing state of expectation, Paul's active hope proposes not only itself but the elaboration to follow as a permanent state of affairs: an ongoing structure of interrelationship. Verse 11 thus supplies the enduring conditions of hope in divine rescue, not those which vary according to particular circumstances of need.

Nonetheless, there is in v.11 a qualification of sorts: not of the certainty that God will rescue, but of the singularity of agency in rescue that the declaration ῥύσεται might be taken to imply. In this verse the psalmic modulation of Paul's discourse

---

<sup>170</sup> No doubt for this reason, some mss omit καὶ ῥύσεται earlier in the verse, or render καὶ ῥύεται so as to create a temporal sequence. Formally redundant, καὶ ῥύσεται has superior attestation and is certainly the most difficult reading; cf. Metzger 1994:506.

<sup>171</sup> Harris 2005:159.

<sup>172</sup> In its Corinthian context, hope (ἐλπίς) for the Corinthians has just been declared secure (βέβαιος, 1:7), a hope underwritten, as in 1:9-10, by divine agency manifested in Christ (here, the overflow of suffering and consolation; in 1:9-10, resurrection). There is no reason to believe that 1:10 offers something less sure. To read this as qualification, we would be obliged to supply new language: thus Harris (2005:159): "(at least) on him we have placed our reliance ...". And even if we were to grant a rhetorical gesture, by which Paul modifies a bold statement lest he *appear* presumptuous, it does not follow that he believed himself presumptuous.

continues; and it is in examining the ways in which this is manifest that we will best understand the play of agency represented there.

## **5.4.2 Restored to a praying community: psalmody and agency in 1:11**

### **5.4.2.1 Psalmody engaged: the psalmist rejoins the community of faith in its quintessential act**

Throughout our study of 2 Corinthians 1 we have learned how Paul's text incorporates its readers, whether in the evocation of liturgy (1:3, 1:9) or through the modal influence of psalmody, whose discourse is always incorporative. In these final verses Paul's strategy of incorporation is explicit, as a widely drawn community, Corinthian and beyond, is invoked in prayer and in thanksgiving. In the latter, but not the former (5.4.2.2 below), Paul aligns himself fully with the conventions of psalmic thanksgiving.

The psalmic subject is constituted above all by acts of speech, in genres of thanksgiving as elsewhere: by the declaration of suffering, the articulation of appeal, and the eventual testimony of thanksgiving and praise. Suffering and appeal are made independent of the community of faith; indeed, separation from that community is often the occasion of suffering. Thanksgiving and praise, however, are acts performed, above all, with that community; the psalmist, rescued by God and restored to fellowship, makes the occasion of her rescue a call to praise, which she and her community take up together.

Just this is the image given to us by Paul in 2 Cor 1:11. Leaving aside for the moment the Corinthian's co-operation (συνυπουργέω) through prayer which conditions Paul's hope of rescue (1:10b; 5.4.2.2 below), we find that the *telos* of that rescue is the offering of thanksgiving to God:

συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῇ δεήσει, ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστηθῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.

provided you also join in helping [God] on our behalf by petition, so that thanks might be given from many faces on our behalf for the gift of grace to us through many.<sup>173</sup>

ἵνα ... εὐχαριστηθῆ does not describe the purpose only of the Corinthians' assistance in prayer,<sup>174</sup> but of the divine deliverance itself. This is a pattern well-established in psalmody: the psalmist's rescue, meaningful for himself, must nonetheless be consummated in community (5.3.3.4); there he declares what God has done for him, and others join him in the act of praise. In Paul's account (1:11b) what signifies is the thanksgiving of the many: for this is offered ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.<sup>175</sup> It is as though to give thanks on one's own behalf (though this is included in the blessing of 1:3) were not the chief or ultimate thing; what counts is that others should thank God for "our" rescue, just as this was aided by the petition of the many (διὰ πολλῶν, 1:11b),<sup>176</sup> and not of oneself.

We noted earlier that Paul's narrative of rescue and reciprocity (1:10-11) enriches the formal logic of 1:4-7 by figuration; here we find one of its signs. The corporate act of thanksgiving is suggestively figured in the πρόσωπα from which (ἐκ) thanksgiving is rendered for the charisma (of rescue) granted Paul. πρόσωπον is a rich term in biblical discourse, and indeed in 2 Corinthians, so that to take it strictly as metonym or synecdoche, as in most ETs,<sup>177</sup> and so translate "people", is to

---

<sup>173</sup> It is doubtless the desire to avoid ellipsis that compels Furnish (1984:115) to take διὰ πολλῶν and ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων alike with the one verb supplied (εὐχαριστηθῆ) and so introduce redundancy (though cf. Thrall 1994:126); but διὰ πολλῶν may equally be taken with τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα. The article might have been expected on strict grammatical grounds (τὸ διὰ πολλῶν), but its absence is not decisive; cf. Barrett 1973:67; Moule 1960:108. Similar omissions occur elsewhere in Paul where a prepositional phrase modifies a preceding articular substantive; cf. Robertson 1934:474.

<sup>174</sup> *Contra* Harris 2005:161; Thrall 1994:123.

<sup>175</sup> In fact, there is significant manuscript evidence for an alternative reading, in which thanks is given ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The variant could have arisen by an itacistic error (Metzger 1994:575), and ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is doubtless the more difficult reading, not least for being the second instance in the verse: for why must others give thanks on behalf of us for "our" rescue, when "our" consolation is the very ground of eulogy in 1:3? (In answer, we may say that Paul's eulogy constructs a liturgical subject, as we have seen, whose consolations include those granted to Paul, but are far from limited to these.) By comparison, if the Corinthians have been God's co-agents by prayer, it might be thought only proper for others to thank God (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) for the gift which is its effect. In fact, with regard to the distribution of agency, the logic of the two alternatives is closely similar. In either case a displacement of agency is implied, in such a way that one is not empowered to act on one's own behalf, but only on behalf of others. In the case of thanksgiving ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, the displacement is fullest, as those who are made co-agents with God on behalf of "us" cede even the agency of thanksgiving (in regard to their own acts) to others unnamed.

<sup>176</sup> Taking διὰ πολλῶν as masculine (Thrall 1994:125), and therefore referring to human agency, rather than neuter (Bultmann 1985:34), so as to refer to the prayers in which that agency took form. Cf. Windisch 1924:50-51, who takes Paul to be stressing the abundance of participants. See 5.4.2.2 and 5.4.2.3 below.

<sup>177</sup> Cf. NASB, NKJV.

diminish its force. Allowing the term to refer literally – as a fuller reading of the letter would commend<sup>178</sup> – enables us better to figure the experience of a community joined in word and song.

#### 5.4.2.2 Psalmody enhanced: the community as co-agency in the economy of rescue

The community of faith is not figured only in thanksgiving, but as a co-agency in the act of divine rescue itself. Such a role for the community is not conventional to psalmody, but rather confirms and extends the Christological modification of psalmody lexically signalled in vv.3-7 (5.2 above). This should hardly surprise us; as we saw (5.3.3.7), Paul’s drama fails to observe the conventions of psalmic thanksgiving precisely in the matter of agency. In 2 Cor 1:11 we learn that it is granted to the community, and not to the psalmist himself, to appeal for the psalmist’s rescue.

So significant is the prayerful appeal of the Corinthian community, indeed, that Paul’s hope of continued rescue is contingent upon it:

<sup>2</sup> Cor 1:10b εἰς ὃν ἠλπικαμεν [ὅτι] καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται,<sup>11</sup> συνυπουργούντων καὶ ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῇ δεήσει

Contingency is marked in the participial phrase συνυπουργούντων ... ὑμῶν, which conditions Paul’s hope in some way. The force of the genitive absolute could be taken temporally, as in most ETs, so that Paul hopes for rescue (merely) “as” the Corinthians also join in helping by prayer. But the fact that Paul feels compelled to qualify his bold declaration of 1:10a – “he will rescue!” – with the restatement of 1:10b suggests what follows as a strong and necessary condition. Thus, Paul stands in hope of rescue “provided that” the Corinthians pray.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>178</sup> πρόσωπον is richly figured in literal terms as “face” in the narratives of the veil (3:7 *bis*, 13, 18; cf. 4:6). Note especially 3:18, in which “unveiled faces” gaze upon the glory of the κύριος: an image of corporate worship, as equally in 1:11. Assuming the integrity of the first seven chapters and multiple hearings of the text, the concentration of such literal usage in chapters 3 and 4 privileges a literal referent and the images it evokes earlier in the letter.

<sup>179</sup> Modal (“through”) and causal (“because”) readings are also possible, and would offer a similarly strong connection between the two clauses; but neither is likely. The former reduces the semantic load of the entire second clause to instrumentality: rescue shall be through co-assistance through petition. But as the subsequent clause shows, the point is not instrumentality but thanksgiving to God for his gracious gift (of rescue). A causal reading, on the other hand, promotes Corinthian agency too high, as though divine action were caused, rather than assisted, by petition. But again, the

Contingency is signaled moreover in the quality of prayer required. Rather than the general term προσευχή, which elsewhere Paul is happy to solicit (and that in plural),<sup>180</sup> δέησις carries the sense of petition, of focused request, enforced here in the singular. τῇ δεήσει is of course a dative of instrument; the article supplies possession, such that this is “your petition”.<sup>181</sup> The effect is of a specific petition addressed to God, presumably for Paul’s rescue, on which the sure hope of rescue is contingent.

Though help’s beneficiary is clearly stated (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν), it is not immediately clear whom the Corinthians are to join in the act of helping; συνυπουργέω takes a dative object which Paul neglects to supply. There are three plausible options: God, Paul, or the Corinthians themselves.<sup>182</sup> Most interpreters exclude the possibility that God is the one joined,<sup>183</sup> and argue rather for Paul.<sup>184</sup> But the grounds to construe Paul as the one helped are not as strong as generally supposed.

In support of Paul, Rom 15:30 is often thought to offer a close parallel:

Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος συναγωνίσασθαι μοι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν θεόν,

Bultmann argues for συναγωνίσασθαι in this verse as the counterpart of συνυπουργέω in 2 Cor 1:11; as the one calls for Paul’s readers to join with him, so also the other.<sup>185</sup> But while we may grant the Roman case, it is precisely because there the object (μοι)<sup>186</sup> is supplied; the absence of the object in the Corinthian case can be read as easily for distinction from Romans as for parallel. Without the object,

---

circumscription of agency which follows shows petition to be an agency through which God acts, rather than a causal agent in itself. See discussion below.

<sup>180</sup> Thus Rom 15:30; see discussion below.

<sup>181</sup> Harris 2005:160.

<sup>182</sup> Few contemplate the Corinthians joining one another, though cf. Hughes (1962:23 n.20). Harris (2005:160) rightly asks why ἐν ἑαυτοῖς was not supplied, as so often in Paul; without it, this option seems unheralded by anything in local context.

<sup>183</sup> In support of God as the one helped, see Plummer 1915:20; Schlatter 1969:468.

<sup>184</sup> For example, Harris 2005:160; Thrall 1994:122; Allo 1956:13; Furnish 1984:125.

<sup>185</sup> Bultmann 1985:29. Harris (2005:160) and Thrall (1994:122) think this decisive.

<sup>186</sup> Both verbs take a dative object; BDAG, LSJM q.v.

indeed, the observation that the act of helping is ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν makes Paul an unlikely candidate to be “joined in helping”.<sup>187</sup>

It makes better sense to envisage the Corinthians assisting God in the act of rescue, whose beneficiary is Paul. On this reading petition (δέησις) is the coherent means by which the Corinthians “join in helping” God.<sup>188</sup> When Paul writes “you also” (καὶ ὑμῶν), then, he indicates the Corinthians are “also” involved in Paul’s rescue, together with God who is already named as the object of hope.

The idea of partnership with God might be thought startling, even presumptuous; yet it benefits both from support elsewhere in Paul, and from qualification in its local context, where partnership is closely circumscribed. The term συνεργός, which captures the idea of partnership between multiple agents, is significant in Paul. For the most part it serves to constitute human agents as partners,<sup>189</sup> but in environments where the divine agent is expressly in play, the potential exists for it to figure human co-agency with God.

Such is the case in 1 Thess 3:2, where the most straightforward reading of the Greek verse figures Timothy as “our brother and God’s co-worker” (τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν καὶ συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ).<sup>190</sup> It is equally the case in 1 Cor 3:5-11; though

---

<sup>187</sup> Word order is significant here. Harris (2005:160), who finds for Paul, reads: “Provided you, for your part, join in helping us by your prayer for us”, aligning the present text with the sense of Rom 15:30. But where the word order supports such a reading in Romans (ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἑμοῦ), in 2 Cor 1:11 it does not. “On our behalf through prayer” is a more straightforward reading of ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῇ δεήσει, taking ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν with the participle; but this is problematic if Paul is the participial subject. “Provided you also join in helping me on my behalf through prayer” is tautologous at best, and incoherent at worst.

<sup>188</sup> Harris (2005:160) thinks it unlikely that God is helped, “since he is addressed in the δέησις”. But how are these incompatible? If prayer directed to God does not help God, in this case by facilitating his agency in rescue, then it is without consequence; why would Paul’s expectation of rescue be contingent upon it? Comparison with the case of Rom 15:30 is instructive. There, God is the express object of prayers (πρὸς τὸν θεόν): proof that Paul is happy to make a direct link between prayers on his behalf and the God to whom they are directed (and whom they may thus be said to “help”). In 2 Cor 1:11, where the link is implicit in τῇ δεήσει, why may it not be forged in the genitive participle συναποργαζόντων?

<sup>189</sup> Thus Rom 16:3, 9, 21; 2 Cor 1:24, 8:23; Phil 2:25, 4:3; Phlm 1, 24.

<sup>190</sup> Fee (2009:115-16) imagines Paul to have dictated “our brother and co-worker”, then added the possessive “of God”, inciting a history of misunderstanding (in which Wanamaker (1990:128), Malherbe (1989:191), Witherington (2006:92) and others have a share). The problem is reflected in the manuscript tradition, where some witnesses elide the genitive addition or substitute διάκονος for συνεργός (cf. Metzger 2005:240-42), in order to avoid a reading which, Fee claims, “borders on nonsense in terms of Pauline usage and theology” (2009:112 n.28). This may be thought to beg the question. Fee’s reconstruction does not adequately address the problematic logic resulting from a post script; what exactly is the sense of “Timothy, God’s (our-brother and) our-co-worker”? Sensing

frequently taken to signify multiple human agents together as coworkers, the συνεργοί of 1 Cor 3:9 are not united simply with one another, but more significantly with God.<sup>191</sup> Closer to home, the divine agent who appeals for reconciliation (παρακαλέω) through us in 2 Cor 5:20 is the likeliest associate for the co-workers (συνεργούτες) of 2 Cor 6:1, who likewise appeal.<sup>192</sup>

A reluctance to grant human co-agency with God in Paul, as though such a role were too exalted, can be countered by observing that, in the last two examples, such co-agency is figured just where the divine agent is seen to circumscribe it; any risk of presumption is averted. Schematically evident in the agricultural model of 1 Cor 3:6-7, marked in the isomorphism of divine appeal “through us” and our own appeal (2 Cor 5:20, 6:1), Paul’s strategy to circumscribe human co-agency is rigorously pursued in our passage; to this we return in 5.4.2.3 below.

On our reading, then, the Corinthians appeal independently of Paul for his rescue. They are co-agencies in the divine action through prayer, but on his behalf (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν). As 2 Cor 5:14 demonstrates, the phrase has equally the force of representation and of substitution, and the two may be held together.<sup>193</sup> Along substitutionary lines we may say that Paul does not appeal; in representational terms,

---

the difficulty, perhaps, he appeals to the “clear passage in 1 Corinthians” (2009:115-16 n.38) to determine the meaning of the genitive phrase here; an awkward appeal, as the two passages are quite differently structured. On the later passage, see discussion below.

<sup>191</sup> Although Paul marks the unity of the one who plants and the one who waters (3:8) the substantive point of this passage (1 Cor 3:5-11) is not to establish Apollos and Paul as servants (3:5) together, but to assert severally the divine agent behind their respective labours, and the Christological character of the result (3:10-11). Within this framework, the critical opposition in 3:9 (θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοί, θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε) is not between the agency of God’s servants (“we” as co-workers together) and the domain of their labour (“you” as field or building), but between the divine agent in relation to his servants (θεοῦ ... συνεργοί) and the Corinthian church (θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή). Word order confirms this reading through emphasis, foregrounding the divine subject throughout. Along such lines Fee (1987:134) imagines that possession must be in view: everything – including the co-workers – is God’s. Granted; but (*pave* Fee) possession does not decide the force of συν-. God’s co-workers may as easily be those who, belonging to him, accordingly work with him, as those who, belonging to him, work with one another. As the agency of God is in view, rather than the unity of Apollos and Paul, the former is the better reading. No threat to the supremacy of the divine agent is implied; the terms of Paul’s agricultural model leave no doubt that, however significant the roles of planter and waterer (who are self-evidently in partnership with each other and with God in terms of that model), growth is God’s alone to give (3:7).

<sup>192</sup> So also Windisch 1924:199; Barrett 1973:183; Harris 2005:457.

<sup>193</sup> At first glance, 2 Cor 5:14 appears to privilege representation: ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν denotes representation, rather than substitution, insofar as the death of one “for” all instantiates the death “of” all. Yet the logic of this verse does not present the two as true alternatives, but as causally related, if not entirely identified. A substitutionary act is precisely an act of representation. Were such a logic transplanted to the present verse, it would imply that Paul’s appeal is now instantiated in the appeal of others on his behalf: others come to represent his voice, even as their voice is substituted for his own.

Paul's appeal is articulated through the appeal of others.<sup>194</sup> In neither case, however, does Paul possess agency on his own behalf.

A similar picture emerges in Phil 1:19,<sup>195</sup> where his readers' petition (δέησις) and the "supply" (ἐπιχορηγία) of the Spirit of Jesus Christ underwrite Paul's prospects: he "knows" (οἶδα) salvation is ahead. In the correlation of specific human request (δέησις, singular) with God's general provision we see paralleled the dynamic in 2 Cor 1:11 by which the Corinthians become, through their δέησις, the agency of God's provision: the χάρισμα which is Paul's rescue.<sup>196</sup> Instrumentality is the form of agency in Phil 1 as in 2 Cor 1.<sup>197</sup> In the Philippian case we see also the Christological means of supply, which we find in 2 Corinthians not in the drama of 1:8-11 but in the dramaturgy of 1:4-7.

Rom 15:30, discussed above, offers further evidence. The verse might be read as counterevidence for our claim that agency is always and only on behalf of the other, if Paul's call to the Romans to strive with him (συναγωνίασθαί μοι) on his behalf (ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ) required identity in the mode of striving, such that Paul and the Romans were both labouring in prayer (ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς) on his behalf. This would appear to make Paul an agent on his own behalf in prayer; just what we have argued he is not. In fact, insofar as the benefits of prayer "ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ" accrue not to Paul's personal benefit but to the success of the mission (in contrast to rescue from death for the Pauline psalmist of 2 Cor 1:10), we need not insist that Paul be excluded from such prayer.

In any event, no identity is implied between Paul's striving and that of the Romans. Not least for being introduced near the material end of the letter, the scope of Paul's striving is very broad, comprehending not the activity of prayer in particular – to which the Romans are enjoined – but the entire trajectory of mission, to

---

<sup>194</sup> The logic of representation in appeal is explicit in 5:20, though the disposition of subjects is different. There Paul's appeal to the Corinthians "on behalf of Christ" (ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ) is understood as God appealing "through us" (δι' ἡμῶν). Analogically, the Corinthians' appeal to God on behalf of Paul might be taken to enact his own appeal to God through them.

<sup>195</sup> οἶδα γὰρ ὅτι τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως καὶ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

<sup>196</sup> Cf. Philm 22: ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἐτοιμαζέ μοι ξενίαν· ἐλπίζω γὰρ ὅτι διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν. From v.21 to v.22 Paul's addressee shifts from singular to plural: it is the prayers of the community which avail.

<sup>197</sup> διὰ governs both δέησις and (καὶ) ἐπιχορηγία in genitive case.

Jerusalem and beyond, which Paul has just been outlining (Rom 15:25-32), and which is the subject of prayer in 15:31. By their prayers on his behalf the Romans join in that much larger struggle,<sup>198</sup> as they will by offering material assistance (15:24).<sup>199</sup> That the Romans' prayers are required for Paul's success, including the prospect of his "rescue" from Judean unbelievers (ὅτι ἴνα ῥυθῶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπειθούντων ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ), confirms not Paul's agency but that of others, as we have seen in the Corinthian case.

What is distinctive about our passage in relation to these other examples is the modulation of Paul's prose by psalmody; and in an environment of psalmic modulation it is striking to find the hope of rescue contingent upon the petition of the community, however circumscribed (see 5.4.2.3). Paul transcends the grounds extended for hope by the psalmist, for whom consolations past configure Yahweh as deliverer, so that the history of salvation and the divine identity it underwrites together guarantee the prospect of deliverance. Such is the burden of 2 Cor 1:9b-10a. But the apostle has supplemented this (though his is not the language of supplement, but of the integral) not with his own appeal but with the community at prayer. In biblical psalmody the community enters the frame rarely as co-petitioner (unless it is itself "the psalmist"), still less as intercessor for one without agency before God, but rather as co-worshipper after the fact of deliverance. Paul figures the community as integral to his rescue, before he invokes it as co-worshipper; indeed, precisely *so that* (ὅτι) the community may worship.

#### **5.4.2.3 Agency amended: the circumscription of human agency by the divine agent**

We have observed throughout this chapter the privilege given to divine agency in Paul's treatment of consolation (1:3-7) and rescue (1:8-9). That privilege is sustained in 1:10-11, even where human agency is acknowledged as conditioning Paul's hope. Indeed, the apparent awkwardness of Paul's prose in 1:11b can be largely traced to the need to circumscribe human agency.

---

<sup>198</sup> Cf. NIV "to join me in my struggle by praying to God for me"; similarly NASV; otherwise NRSV "to join me in earnest prayer to God on my behalf". On the nature of the struggle, see Jewett 2007:935.

<sup>199</sup> The scope of prayer (here, προσευχή) is accordingly broad: "through prayers ... toward God" (ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ... πρὸς τὸν θεόν, Rom 15:30); rather more general than the singular dative "by your petition" (τῇ δεήσει, 2 Cor 1:11, with the article denoting possession).

In particular, Paul has elected an elliptic means to acknowledge petition's effect (1:11b): that for which thanks will be given is τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν: “the gift of grace to us through many.” The verb, which would denote the agency of the Corinthian petitioners, is elided, while the characterisation of divine rescue as a χάρισμα stresses its gratuitous origins in the divine will.<sup>200</sup> The praying Corinthians are shown to be an agency through which God gives Paul a gift of grace (in the form of rescue), rather than full-fledged agents.

The same effect is manifest grammatically in the thanksgiving occasioned by the χάρισμα. The passive forms of 1:11b foreground the action of thanksgiving itself rather than those who offer it. Thus it is not that the many give thanks for the χάρισμα, but that the many are the agency (ἐκ) of thanksgiving whose grammatical subject is the χάρισμα itself. God is the adequate agent of thanksgiving, the many the agency through whom it is offered.

Taken together, these strategies mark the form of human agency to be instrumental, conforming it to the logic set out earlier in 1:4-7. There we found Christ's agency, itself instrumental, to be the ground of human agency; and so we discover Christ here, unnamed but assumed. In prayer and thanksgiving, the form of Corinthian agency is determined by the Christological psalmist.

Finally, human agency is diffused by its association with the diverse communities invoked in this verse. The “many faces” from whom is thanksgiving, and the “many” through whom is grace's gift, are distinct.<sup>201</sup> The former is supplied by psalmody, as we have seen, and as such is not a closely defined group, but a figured community of worshippers as broad as faithful Israel of old: those in Christ of Paul's day. The Corinthians – designated agencies in petition earlier in the verse – are the many “through whom”, though their particularity is subsumed within the simple plural form. Indeed, plurality is the point; for Paul is figuring a regime of suffering, petition, rescue and thanks which will obtain always and everywhere, not only in Corinth. Just as the co-option of individual θλιψις to τὰ παθήματα τοῦ

---

<sup>200</sup> Additionally, the omission of the expected article (not τὸ διὰ πολλῶν; see 5.4.2.1 n.173 above) formally weakens the link between the χάρισμα and the agency of the many; the latter is duly attenuated.

<sup>201</sup> If they were identical, we would be faced with a renewed challenge of redundancy: the many named twice without any purpose save, perhaps, to emphasise a plurality of agents.

Χριστοῦ entailed a shared suffering, so here: petition and thanksgiving are from and through the many, for the many are psalmists, and the psalmist is in Christ.

## 5.5 Conclusions

Our exploration of psalmody in 2 Cor 1 has been a subterranean exercise. Nothing by way of quotation or allusion has been available to test for the voice of Christ or of another subject as psalmist. Yet our earlier discovery of the Christological psalmist as one with whom to be identified (Chapters 3 and 4) yielded another means to discern his “presence”: namely, in the reception of psalmody by one so identified. Paul’s “reception” in 2 Cor 1 we observed in the modulation of *exordium* and *narratio* alike by psalmic categories. The co-option of some among those categories to their Christological counterparts confirmed Paul’s reception of psalmody as Christological.

The apostle’s identification with the Christological psalmist is not simply a matter of categorical co-option, however. In Rom 15:4 we discerned a schematic connection between such identification and the development of patient endurance (ὑπομονή) and of hope (ἐλπίς). Such a connection is worked out dramaturgically in 2 Cor 1:4-7 (see esp. 5.2.4.2): the one identified with the Christological psalmist in his sufferings experiences a consolation with transformative results, specifically in the capacity to endure (ὑπομονή again). In the *narratio*, dramaturgy turns to drama. Paul dramatises the act of identifying with the Christological psalmist: the death of the self as agent for itself; its life as agency for the other, in partnership with and orientation to God as agent. Such agency, recall, was that demonstrated by Christ himself as psalmist at Rom 15:3 (cf. 3.4.1): ecclesiocentrically directed, but theocentrically circumscribed.

Operative in a dynamic of reciprocity in which all are implicated (1:11), the play of agency is firmly aligned with the Christological welcome of Rom 15:7 and the catena of psalm quotations it governs (Rom 15:9-11); for there, as here in 2 Cor 1, categorical distinctions within the community of faith are dismantled. Even the apostolic subject is sublimated within a more inclusive subject figured from psalmody, as we saw.

Recall also how the Christological subject of Paul's quotation at Rom 15:9 was installed somewhat at David's expense, were metalepsis pursued. That psalmist is also spurned here; for the subjectivity figured for psalmody in 2 Cor 1 represents a departure from the conventions of biblical lament and thanksgiving, whose (prototypically Davidic) psalmist is an agent on his own behalf, who joins the community of faith once his salvation is accomplished, but does not require its intercession. In 2 Cor 1 the community is implicated in God's agency as deliverer, while the suffering psalmist himself is not.

Paul is not done with such amendments. Distilled to its essential acts of belief and speech, the psalmic subject receives its coordinates from Christ himself in 2 Cor 4. Such is the subject of Chapter 6.

# 6. Christ as the voice of psalmody in 2 Corinthians 4

---

## 6.1 Introduction

### 6.1.1 Christ and psalmody co-implicated in the formation of those in Christ: an emerging pattern

Our journey through Paul's writings in search of Christological psalmody has led us into ever thicker undergrowth. We began in Romans, where the rhetorical censure of David (Ch. 2) revealed in Christ a psalmist who overturns, even as he inherits; yet who, in so doing, comes to play an unprecedented role in the formation of Christian identity, with a degree of intimacy and specificity which David could never offer. Far from conquering overlord, Christ enters as worshipper among the Gentiles, taking up the declarative voice of psalmody in their company (Rom 15:9; Ch. 4). At no point an agent on his own behalf, Christ is seen to be the incarnation of other-regard in the person of a suffering psalmist (Rom 15:3; Ch. 3). Amid this rich intertextual confluence, Christological psalmody is urged as paradigmatic, and identification with Christ as psalmist offered as a means to Christian formation. Agency on behalf of the (weaker) other is the content of that paradigm; hope, formation's result; a common mind and united voice – a community of psalmists – its corporate outcome.

In the programmatic opening of 2 Corinthians (1:1-11; Ch. 5) we saw the lines of association converge around the same points. Affliction – signature experience of the biblical psalmist – is co-opted to the sufferings of Christ, forging an indissoluble link between the two along narrative lines, and making them together constitutive of the identity of those in Christ. This identity was found to consist in a community of shared affect, which is the natural outcome of the performance of psalmody in corporate ritual life; thus, the formative role of psalmody under the aegis of Christ (a feature of Rom 15:3ff.) is confirmed. Specifically, God's consolation accomplishes in those who share in the sufferings of Christ the ability patiently to endure. Later in the same passage (1:8-11), we saw how a Christological narrative

has modified the framework offered by psalmody to experience. In particular, the other-orientation of Christological agency – seen already in Romans – has reconfigured the psalmist’s relationship with his community in the dynamic of affliction and rescue. The one who suffers in Christ learns that others are consoled; and she is herself rescued by the agency of others, who cooperate with God by prayer.

It is perhaps no accident that, at the most explicit site of Pauline identification with a psalmist (2 Cor 4:13), we find the subject again configured as agency for the other (4:10-12), licensed by the imbrication of personal and Christological suffering (4:10a).<sup>1</sup> But here, unlike 2 Cor 1:3-11, we have a quotation from a psalm (at 4:13). The verse in which the quotation appears, and the verse quoted, are reproduced below; words in common are italicised.

**2 Cor 4:13** Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· *ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα, καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν,*

**Ps 115:1** ἀλληλουια *ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα* ἐγὼ δὲ ἐταπεινώθην σφόδρα

Our reading of the earlier passage may tempt us to assume that the voice of psalmody, heard only in brief yet introduced here with gravity (κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον), contributes significantly to the narrative or theological “substructure” of the later passage. But this cannot be asserted without further proof. As we shall see shortly (6.1.2), the force of Paul’s epigrammatic quotation is contested, as also the scope of influence of the psalm from which it is drawn. Unless we decide both aspects of the matter, we cannot rule with any confidence on how psalmody, anthropology and Christology are correlated in the passage as a whole.

Critical to this issue is the identity of the quotation’s subject. For here we have a potential limit case for the conjunction of Christological and apostolic speech. Only here – if anywhere – does Paul explicitly identify himself with a psalmist. If that psalmist is not Christ, then we will have learned, significantly, that Christ’s installation within psalmody in Paul does not require his assumption of its every voice. In 2 Cor 1, narrative connections on the axis of suffering were sufficient,

---

<sup>1</sup> Epitomised in the “dying” (νέκρωσις) of Jesus carried “in our body”.

without quotation; perhaps also here (see 2 Cor 4:7-12), even where quotation is available. Yet if the subject of Paul's quotation is found to be Christ, the suture implied in 2 Cor 1 and urged in Rom 15 would be seen to be fully and explicitly enacted here.

### **6.1.2 In search of Christological ventriloquism: a metaleptic debate**

The question of metaleptic scope and process has occupied us throughout our study, and lies at the heart of current debate over 2 Cor 4:13. Without exception, those who claim a Christological subject for the quotation make a metaleptic appeal to any or all of the psalms associable with it;<sup>2</sup> most regard metalepsis as essential. Others, for whom Christology is not at stake in the verse, see no need for psalmic context at all. The aptitude of these psalms for Christological habitation will occupy us at length.

Subterranean enquiries of this sort are the order of the day in 2 Corinthians, which is not rife with quotations. Indeed, with the exception of Chapter 3, Paul's discourse in this letter is not overly marked by explicit engagement with biblical texts; not, at least, in comparison with 1 Corinthians,<sup>3</sup> addressed to the same audience; still less in comparison with Romans. As a clearly intentional reference to a biblical text, Paul's quotation at 2 Cor 4:13 is thus a somewhat isolated event.<sup>4</sup> It is possible, then, to read the letter's intertextual horizon in two ways: as characterised by icebergs, of which Paul's few quotations are the occasional tip;<sup>5</sup> or as fundamentally untouched by biblical texts, such that quotation signifies only a rhetorical act: a biblical ice fragment chosen to freshen Paul's prose, or sharpen his appeal.

When we come to Paul's quotation of Ps 115:1 in 2 Cor 4:13, we find the alternatives amply staked out. In one corner stands Chris Stanley, who finds Paul's quotation out of sympathy with its original context, judging that "Most likely, Paul

---

<sup>2</sup> See discussion below.

<sup>3</sup> See the dismissive assessment of Moody-Smith (1988:275): "In 2 Corinthians Paul's use of the OT is if anything more incidental, and even casual, than in 1 Corinthians."

<sup>4</sup> It is the first clear quotation; cf. also 6:2, 16, 17, 18; 8:15; 9:7, 9, 10; 10:17.

<sup>5</sup> Following the metaphor, the modulation of psalmody in 2 Cor 1 (Ch. 5) suggests there an iceberg with no tip.

simply ran across a set of words that sounded like a good ‘motto’ for his ministry and then copied them down (or memorised them) for later use without regard for their original context.”<sup>6</sup> In the far corner we find Scott Hafemann, who thinks “that in 4:13 Paul summarises the force of vv. 7-12 in terms taken from the scriptures.”<sup>7</sup> These terms encompass not just the quoted words but the entirety of Ps 116 MT: “Far from being merely a pious outburst or scriptural colouring, Psalm 116 provides an interpretive lens through which Paul sees the significance of his experience in Christ, the suffering righteous one.”<sup>8</sup> In the centre of the ring, Richard Hays argues for a Christological voice, but declines (just) to press an entire psalm into metaleptic service.<sup>9</sup>

Recent engagements with the issue have converged on a Christological subject enriched by the entire narrative of the Greek psalm,<sup>10</sup> or of the two Greek psalms which together translate Ps 116 MT.<sup>11</sup> While such “iceberg” accounts look for sympathetic indicators in the Pauline text, the plausibility of their Christological readings turns critically on metalepsis of a whole psalm or psalms, construed in narrative terms; or so at least it is claimed. Our discussion will accordingly play close attention to the dynamics of metalepsis.

In fact, the speaking subject of the quotation may be identified, or at least characterised, with recourse to any of five textual domains, each of which constitutes a different metaleptic “option”. The first option, represented above by Stanley, is to regard the quotation as delimited, requiring no supplement. A second option, taking seriously the distinctiveness of the site from which the quotation is drawn, considers the opening distich of Ps 115. A third invokes the entirety of Ps

---

<sup>6</sup> Stanley 2004:98-99; cf. Barrett 1973:143; Harrisville 1985:174; Attridge 2003:111: “a scriptural grace note to accompany his autobiographical reflection”.

<sup>7</sup> Hafemann 1998:250.

<sup>8</sup> Hafemann 1998:251. Cf. Williams 2004:174-75; Kleinknecht 1984:273-76; Harvey 1996:18, 61. An even more extensive claim for psalmody in relation to 2 Cor 4 is offered by Young and Ford (1987:63-69), who “wish to share the insight that Paul’s self-understanding and his perception of what was going on in Corinth were grounded in a deep assimilation of certain parts of Scripture and certain scriptural models” (1987:63), in which biblical psalmody is strongly implicated. Young and Ford think the *Hallel* psalms (Pss 112-117) especially important; in the early chapters of 2 Corinthians, “Paul almost seems to follow themes in progression from a group of Psalms [110-118 MT] of which the core [the *Hallels*] might well be particularly familiar and significant to him” (1987:68). The evidence offered for this striking claim is, alas, cursory and ambiguous.

<sup>9</sup> Hays 2005:108-09. See 6.2.2.1.

<sup>10</sup> Campbell 2009.

<sup>11</sup> Schenck 2007; Stegman 2005, 2007.

115; a fourth adds Ps 114, with an appeal to Ps 116 MT, in which the two Greek psalms are combined. Fifth and finally, the subject may be figured from a domain which comprehends the entirety of first-person biblical psalmody, centred on the genres of thanksgiving and lament, rather than any particular psalm or psalms literarily defined. The first (quotation only) and third (Ps 115) are most commonly adduced; the second (Ps 115:1-2) and fifth (all psalmody) not at all, though they have the most to commend them. By no means all of these options constitute a subject position suited to Christological inhabitation, as we shall discover.

Reasons for the relative popularity of each option are easy to find. A choice for the first or third domain requires, at first glance, the least justification. The first (the quotation alone) has the advantage of dealing with what is said, rather than what is unsaid: it dispenses altogether with metalepsis, at least as a diachronic trope. The third draws the shortest line between a quotation in Greek and the psalm which yields it, requiring no recourse to translation or appeal to the literary history of Ps 115, unlike the fourth option, which entails both. Accounts which require a Christological subject for the quotation, all of which presuppose metaleptic assistance, elect either the third or fourth option. But certain unexamined assumptions are entailed in these options which, when exposed, challenge their relative simplicity.

As we shall learn (6.2.1), the quotation yields an underdetermined subject which invites supplement, not least by metalepsis; thus, the first domain is exceeded. The distich from which the quotation is drawn is a rich candidate for metalepsis; but the subject it configures is not one whose “spirit of faith” will serve for imitation, much less participation,<sup>12</sup> as might be required by 2 Cor 4:13b (though it offers a suggestive fit with the Pauline subject of 2 Cor 1:8-9; see 6.4.4). The textual domain represented in Ps 114, or in Ps 116 MT, grants to the subject of each a narrative coherence missing from Ps 115, but at the cost of diminished moral stature, so that neither subject is a fit candidate (Christological or otherwise) for imitation. Ps 115, by contrast, offers a subject whose moral stature is uncertain, primarily figured from the opening distich; and though the psalm contains elements which are Christologically suggestive, it cannot constitute the “entire narrative” desired by

---

<sup>12</sup> As Campbell (2009) desires; see 6.2.2.4.

those who claim a Christological subject, except at a level of abstraction which calls the coherence of metalepsis itself into question.

For these reasons, we will find in the fifth option the best domain for metalepsis. Doing so will entail a revised assessment of the nature and operation of metalepsis: one sensitive to the discursive properties of biblical psalmody. Within that domain we will find a richly figurable subject: in an unusually complex case of “Christological ventriloquism”, Christ is installed as the speaking subject not of a particular psalm, but – via this singular quotation – of psalmody in its essence, a written voice represented as the “spirit of faith”.

### **6.1.3 Approaching the text: a synopsis**

Though metaleptic claims are of enormous significance for our understanding of Paul’s quotation, they are not all. Quoted language is always, to some degree, in thrall to its receiving text; and the context of this quotation enforces strong constraints on its subject. The *prima facie* priority of receiving over contributing context instructs us on where to begin. Thus we will consider first what is demonstrably “there” – the quotation (6.2.1) in its Corinthian context (6.2.2) – and consider what kind of subject it imagines for the quotation, assessing as we do the candidacy of Christ as speaker, to the extent that Paul’s text makes possible. Finding local evidence inconclusive, we look for signs of a believing, speaking Christ elsewhere in Paul’s writings (6.2.3).

Assured of Christ’s candidacy, we return to the quotation’s immediate context (2 Cor 4:13a) to learn what kind of subject position is being offered. Here, the characterisation offered by the “spirit of faith” and the language of writtleness configures the subject as the representative of psalmody (6.3). Turning to the psalms, we explore at length each of the metaleptic options identified above: the opening distich of Ps 115 (6.4); that psalm as a whole (6.5); and Pss 114 and 115, with reference to Ps 116 MT (6.6). Finally, we draw the various threads of evidence together and reflect on what we have learned (6.7).

## 6.2 A Christological psalmist in 2 Cor 4:13

**2 Cor 4:13** Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα, καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν,

**Ps 115:1** αλληλουια ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα ἐγὼ δὲ ἐταπεινώθην σφόδρα  
<sup>2</sup> ἐγὼ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης

### 6.2.1 Indeterminacy in quotation: ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα

Three words from the opening of Ps 115, yet a surplus of possible meaning. Taken on its own, Paul's quotation offers no clear fix on its subject. Though semantically narrower than its MT counterpart (6.4.2), it remains an open text. First person subjects pose an ongoing problem of reference not shared by many quotations;<sup>13</sup> and Paul's verbs are objectless, glossed in absolute terms (2 Cor 4:13b), offering no explicit hint as to the content of "believing" and "speaking". πιστεύω may signify a propositional belief, or confidence in another.<sup>14</sup> All these variables must be filled by context, but the task is fraught with indeterminacy.<sup>15</sup>

Of course, Paul's compact citation, neatly mapped to its sequel – "also we believe therefore also speak" (2 Cor 4:13b) – might simply be thought a slogan, as some have claimed:<sup>16</sup> the conjunction of belief and speech is clearly a happy one for Paul,<sup>17</sup> succinctly and conveniently expressed in psalmic language. Formally, Paul's spare, snappy three word extract – ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα – has the air of a self-standing maxim, though it is introduced as κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, with the formality due a quotation from literature, inviting metaleptic extension. If indeed a slogan, the quotation reinforces Paul's voice but adds nothing to his argument; it draws no context from Ps 115 (via metalepsis) but submits entirely to Paul's own. If this is so, a metaleptic route to a Christological subject is denied. The psalmist is Christ if Paul's text so installs him; but not otherwise.

---

<sup>13</sup> 2 Cor 4:13 is rich in first person subjectivity. First person plural is marked in ἔχοντες and named in ἡμεῖς, which governs πιστεύομεν and λαλοῦμεν; singular is marked in ἐπίστευσα and ἐλάλησα. On pronominal subjectivity, see 1.3.2.2.

<sup>14</sup> BDAG q.v.

<sup>15</sup> See 1.3.2.3.

<sup>16</sup> See 6.1.2 n.6.

<sup>17</sup> The conjunction is emphatic in Rom 10:8-10, where believing and speaking are twinned as the conditions of salvation. Paul's logic there is cued by Deut 30:14, where ῥῆμα, στόμα and καρδιά are co-figured, but the extension to verbs of believing (πιστεύω) and speaking ("confess", ὁμολογέω) is Paul's own. On this passage in relation to the present, see 6.2.2.3.

In fact, this is now a minority view; a growing number of scholars find for a Christological subject, and do so by blending a metaleptic claim with appeal to the Corinthian context of the quotation. At issue for many of these is the potential for a Christological subject to reinforce a subjective genitive reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ.<sup>18</sup>

It is useful to observe that, as the persistent appeal to contexts – whether from the larger psalm or from 2 Cor 4 – makes apparent, the quotation *in itself* does not immediately commend a Christological subject. Indeed, it offers no full-fledged subject at all, but rather a radically underdetermined subject: one which, beyond its spare verbs and logic, must be determined by context. Yet its deployment toward imitation invites the reader to construe the identity of the speaking subject, however this may be done, in hope of enriching the imitative framework it offers, and enhancing its claim to be imitated. We want to know who we are imitating, and in exactly what way.

A search for determining context will occupy much of our energy below. But we should note, if only briefly, the logical possibility of a singular event, such that Christ is figured here uniquely but truly as one whose speech issues from belief. Paul's letters represent a modest corpus, within which any number of singularities could be expected; and 2 Cor 4:13 offers a singular environment, in which an uncommon formula (κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον), an unprecedented characterisation (πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως), and an unqualified identification (καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν) all converge. These singularities might be thought sufficient warrant for a Christological subject, even were no wider context in support. In the event, we shall find a range of suggestive evidence from further afield; but the distinctiveness of the present verse should not be forgotten.

### **6.2.2 Evidence from 2 Corinthians 4 for a Christological subject**

The plausibility of hearing Christ as psalmist in 2 Cor 4:13 is often argued from the context of 2 Cor 4. Such arguments take various forms, as the survey below reveals. What they have in common is a commitment to a “narrative substructure” by which

---

<sup>18</sup> Thus Campbell (6.2.2.4), Schenck (6.2.2.3), and Stegman (6.2.2.2). As we shall see (6.2.3.1), a Christological subject for the quotation can offer little to the subjective genitive project.

the career of the Pauline subject and that of Christ may be aligned, or may even coinhere (Campbell). Each of those surveyed looks for signs of that substructure in the Pauline text; most look for reinforcement from the psalms “behind” the quotation, in which a Christological narrative is more fully adumbrated (see 6.4-6.6). None is entirely successful, so that we will need to turn elsewhere in Paul (6.2.3); but the structure of their arguments is illuminating.

#### **6.2.2.1 Hays: symmetry between the careers of Christ and Paul in 2 Cor 4**

Though Christ had been suggested as psalmist in 2 Cor 4:13 before,<sup>19</sup> it is Richard Hays who has brought the possibility to centre stage in recent times.<sup>20</sup> Hays’ treatment of the matter is part of a larger claim for Christological psalmody centred on texts in Rom 15, a claim with which this study is in qualified sympathy.<sup>21</sup> In pursuing his claim Hays is typical in grounding his argument both in metaleptic appeal and in the exegesis of Paul’s text.

In the case of 2 Cor 4:13, the metaleptic element is for Hays relatively muted, indeed circumspect: though he argues for the Christological aptitude of the larger psalm to Paul’s view, he does not insist on Christ’s metaleptic voicing of the whole psalm in connection with 2 Cor 4:13. Rather, he contends only that the “obscure Pauline passage, 2 Cor 4:13-14, is greatly clarified if we see in it another instance of Christ as the praying voice *in the psalm quotation.*”<sup>22</sup> In this view he is encouraged, it seems, by an apparent symmetry between the careers of Christ and Paul, played out in 2 Cor 4, into which a Christological quotation would fit well. Thus, Jesus: died so that others might have life / trusted and spoke / God raised him from the dead; while Paul: suffers so that others have life / trusts and speaks / will be raised with Jesus. The words we are to hear as Christ’s are, it appears: “I trusted and spoke”; and the subject of the clause that follows – the “we also” who trust and therefore speak – is Paul.

Hays’ argument is situated in a wide-ranging and programmatic article; perhaps unsurprisingly, his formulation of the symmetry between Paul and Jesus is

---

<sup>19</sup> A messianic reading is urged by Goudge (1927:41-42) and Hanson (1987:51-53).

<sup>20</sup> Hays 1983:259 n.44 is his earliest comment on the matter; cf. Hays 1986:276-77. His fullest discussion is Hays 1993a, reprinted with revisions in Hays 2005. My references to Hays below are to the later version.

<sup>21</sup> See Chs 3 and 4.

<sup>22</sup> Hays 2005:108, emphasis mine.

imprecise, limiting our ability to assess it; we will return to Hays' metaleptic proposals in 6.5.4.1. Others have pursued the matter in more depth; while they typically make more of the metaleptic contribution of Ps 115 than does Hays,<sup>23</sup> their arguments from the context of 2 Cor 4 are also somewhat more developed.

#### 6.2.2.2 Stegman: the “story” of Jesus in 2 Cor 4

Perhaps the most thorough examination of the question to date is that of Thomas Stegman,<sup>24</sup> who contends that Paul makes the psalmist's words “a self-testimony from the mouth of (the risen) Jesus.”<sup>25</sup> Key to Stegman's argument is Paul's thoroughgoing evocation of and identification with the story of Jesus in 2 Cor 4:7-15, by which Christ becomes the most salient subject for the quotation, and the best candidate for imitation (2 Cor 4:13b). So installed, Christ the psalmist declares his own πίστις;<sup>26</sup> he believes in the prospect of his resurrection, and so speaks. Paul's believing and speaking are predicated on the same prospect (2 Cor 4:14).

How is the story of Jesus evoked, and how does Paul identify himself with it? Stegman presents three kinds of evidence. Firstly, and “critically significant” to Stegman,<sup>27</sup> Paul heavily favours “Jesus” over “Christ (Jesus)” in this passage,<sup>28</sup> in a notable departure from his practice elsewhere. This reflects, according to Stegman, an “emphasis ... on Jesus' *human* identity and character.”<sup>29</sup> But this asks more of the data than it can supply. Paul is clearly referring to events in the life of the “historical” Jesus, for which his name is entirely appropriate: his νέκρωσις (4:10); his resurrection (4:14). However, this does not in itself connote an emphasis on “identity and character”, human or otherwise.<sup>30</sup> In order to strengthen his claim Stegman invokes the “story” offered by Pss 114 and 115, which we shall later review; this is the second form of evidence he offers. Third, and of equal importance, is the attachment of Paul's testimony of suffering and endurance to categories in Christ's experience, by which a fuller testimony of Christ is invited, not least in quotation. Duly attached, Paul's story evokes Christ's own, who then

---

<sup>23</sup> Later sections take up the matter of metaleptic appeals to Pss 114, 115 and 116 MT.

<sup>24</sup> Stegman 2007, presenting and developing the argument of Stegman 2005 in relation to 2 Cor 4:13.

<sup>25</sup> Stegman 2007:726.

<sup>26</sup> Stegman 2007:733.

<sup>27</sup> Stegman 2007:728.

<sup>28</sup> Thus 2 Cor 4:10 (*bis*), 11 (*bis*), and 14 (*bis*); see 4:5.

<sup>29</sup> Stegman 2007:728; cf. Schenck 2008:528.

<sup>30</sup> In addition, it is uncertain how much capital should be made of a distinction between the “human” Jesus and the (divine?) Christ in Paul. Note that in 2 Cor 4:5 the κύριος proclaimed is Jesus Christ.

becomes the most salient subject for imitation in 2 Cor 4:13. The idea is at first appealing, not least because we have seen the lexical co-option of human θλιψις to Christological παθήματα already in 2 Cor 1 (5.2.2.3). The narrative expansions offered as evidence by Stegman do not convince, however.<sup>31</sup> Without them, Paul's participation in Christological experience is not less real – it is, after all, axiomatic in 2 Cor 1:4-7 – but rather less storied; as such, it does not require Christ to narrate a story of his own, such as might be metaleptically supplied from Ps 115.

More seriously, it might be thought not to require Christ to speak at all, so that his role as the quotation's subject is in doubt. But this is not a necessary conclusion. Although Christ is nowhere an active subject in the preceding verses, he figures nonetheless (as Jesus) in the narrative of Paul's apostolic experience, where he is the agency in whom Paul's own agency takes effect.<sup>32</sup> As such, he conforms to the

---

<sup>31</sup> Stegman focuses first on the νέκρωσις of Jesus, in which he finds not simply Jesus' death but his dying; or rather, "the putting to death of Jesus". Thus in 4:10a, "Paul aligns his own experience of suffering and endurance of hardships with the *story* of Jesus – specifically, with the graphic image of Jesus being put to death" (2007:728). Note the gradual and largely unwarranted expansions toward story: "death" is relinquished in favour of "dying" – granted, an apt translation of νέκρωσις (Lambrecht 1986) – which introduces process, and therefore the dimension of time, and hence the possibility of plot. "Dying" is then recast as an "image" of "being put to death", which evokes plot, narrative, dramatis personae and mise-en-scène. Stegman expands his claim to narrative by noting πάντοτε and περιφέροντες in 4:10a, which mark Paul's bearing as current and ongoing. "[T]his insistence on ongoing experience strongly suggests that the phrase "the putting to death of Jesus" connotes more than the crucifixion itself. Rather, the apostle's usage indicates that he intends to refer more broadly to Jesus' way of life" (2007:729). But this is an unwarranted inference: a narrative overextension. In a somewhat parallel formulation (Gal 6:17) Paul identifies himself as one who bears (βαστάζω) *on his body* τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ: a clear reference to crucifixion. This he bears in present tense, as in 2 Corinthians. Why must more or other than the crucifixion be figured in 2 Cor 4:10a if not there? The bearing of στίγματα, or equally the bearing about of νέκρωσις, mark Paul πάντοτε as constituted by the cross of Christ, not by "Jesus' way of life," "broadly" construed. Imitation of a Christological subject, understood as agent, is not straightforwardly in view.

Stegman finds further narrative in a second lexical association: παραδίδομι in 2 Cor 4:11a. Predicated of Paul, the term evokes, if in minimal terms, the handing over of Jesus; this much we can grant. But Stegman overextends once again: "Paul's connection of Jesus with παραδίδομι in 2 Cor 4:11a evokes not only the latter's being handed over (by God), but also Jesus' giving himself in love for the sake of others" (2007:730). Stegman justifies this extension by foraging in Paul's "hardship catalogues" (cf. Fitzgerald 1988) for signs of active agency (not available in 4:8-9, by Stegman's reckoning, but imported from 2 Cor 6:4-10 (at 6:5b) and 11:23-33 (at 11:27)); mirrored of course in Gal 2:20, where the Son of God delivered himself up (παραδίδομι). But this is elliptical: the passive form in 2 Cor 4:11a echoes similar passives elsewhere (Rom 4:25; 8:32) ahead of Gal 2:20; and the signs of Paul's active agency in self-giving are missing from the catalogue local to the verse in question, where God's agency is entirely the point. We have no reason to figure Jesus' self-giving in terms narrow or broad, but rather his being handed over by God, as Paul is handed over by God, now for the sake of Jesus. For this reason, Stegman's attempt to read διὰ Ἰησοῦν in 4:11a to "connote 'because of Jesus' in the sense that the apostle emulates the example of Jesus" (2007:730) is not only barely parseable, but quite ungrounded. Though it is for the sake of Jesus (διὰ Ἰησοῦν) that Paul is handed over, he is not demonstrably aligned with a detailed "story" of Jesus, but a structurally parallel act of divine volition.

<sup>32</sup> Paul and Jesus alike are agency, not agent. Note the verbs which characterise the subject in 4:10-12 in particular: the subject "carries about" (περιφέρω) the dying of Jesus – the participle (4:10a) is

paradigm laid out in 2 Cor 1:4-7,<sup>33</sup> in which the divine agent is supreme. Installation as subject in 2 Cor 4:13 would represent an “upgrade” for the Jesus of earlier verses – scarcely inappropriate for the one proclaimed κύριος in 4:5 – but not the introduction of an unheralded character.

### 6.2.2.3 Schenck: the faith of Jesus warrants the trust of the believer

In a slightly more recent article,<sup>34</sup> Kenneth Schenck has also argued for Christ as the quotation’s subject. Schenck depends heavily on messianic construals of Pss 114 and 115, to be discussed later, but not solely on these. In particular, he contends that if Jesus is heard in 2 Cor 4:13 to declare his faith that God would raise him from the dead, certain discontinuities in 2 Cor 4 imposed by the conventional account (in which an anonymous suffering psalmist speaks) disappear.

Schenck begins by asserting, without tendering proof, that the logic of 2 Cor 4:7-15 “seems to reflect a theology ... that moves from Jesus’ faith to believer’s [*sic*] faith.”<sup>35</sup> Notwithstanding, “Almost without thinking, most interpreters have assumed that Paul is referring to the faith of the anonymous suffering psalmist as the faith he aims to imitate.”<sup>36</sup> Against such unthinking scholarship, Schenck believes that “Paul aims to imitate *Jesus*’ faith that God would raise him from the dead.”<sup>37</sup>

Schenck faults the conventional view for being “loose”. In particular, since the psalmist of Ps 115 is not speaking of resurrection, “only of *deliverance from trial*”,<sup>38</sup> whereas Paul thinks of deliverance from death, an alignment of the two is therefore “imprecise”. In this Schenck betrays a failure of imagination (can any analogy be precise?),<sup>39</sup> and misconstrues the subjectivity of death which hangs over the subject

---

active; but is in fact “handed over” (παραδίδωμι; passive) to [that] death (4:11a, taking these two objects to converge on the same subjective experience). The consequences of these actions show the subject grammatically passive once again, as the life of Jesus is manifested (φανερόω) in our body (4:10b) and in our mortal flesh (4:11b); death and life are active subjects in 4:12; the sufferer altogether hidden. In these verses Jesus is invoked in terms of his life (4:10, 11) and dying (4:10; see 4:11); not an agent in his own story, but an agency in the divine story played out in Paul’s experience.

<sup>33</sup> See 5.2.

<sup>34</sup> Schenck 2008.

<sup>35</sup> Schenck 2008:526.

<sup>36</sup> Schenck 2008:527.

<sup>37</sup> Schenck 2008:527, italics original.

<sup>38</sup> Schenck 2008:527, italics original.

<sup>39</sup> No less impoverished are attempts to align Paul more straitly with the psalmist, such that he expects deliverance from “current mission trials”; e.g. Murphy O’Connor 1988.

of Ps 114 (which he adduces in support)<sup>40</sup> until he is delivered: this psalmist (if not the psalmist of Ps 115) is delivered not from trial but from a subjective experience of death. It is not for the reason Schenck adduces that these psalmists must be abandoned in favour of Christ.<sup>41</sup>

More interestingly, Schenck finds a disjunction between 4:13 and 4:14 (reproduced below) on the conventional account, such that a reference to Jesus' resurrection is unexpected.

<sup>4:13</sup> Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα, καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν,<sup>14</sup> εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ ἐγείρας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς σὺν Ἰησοῦ ἐγερεῖ καὶ παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν.

By contrast, if Jesus is heard to speak his belief concerning his resurrection (4:13a),<sup>42</sup> the actuality of that resurrection is appropriately offered as grounds for confidence in 4:14, and closely motivates the imitation of 4:13b. In fact, as God appears elsewhere in Paul as the one who raised Christ from the dead, precisely so as to certify the resurrection of those in Christ, and does so without a Christological advance, such a criticism is less telling than it might seem; so foundational a datum as Christ's resurrection needs no advance preparation.<sup>43</sup>

It is questionable, too, whether so precise and specific a belief must be predicated of the psalmist, or even of his imitator; a meaningful imitation does not require it. Certainly, it is possible to construe the logic of vv.13-14 without requiring of either psalmist or imitator a belief in the prospect of resurrection. It is sufficient that the psalmist trust in God, and that the psalmist be Christ. The Christological psalmist's general trust is worthy of imitation, because it has been vindicated specifically in Christ's resurrection; and the imitator's trust will be vindicated in the same way.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Schenck wishes to enlist Ps 114 in support of a Christological reading (see 6.6), and so must contend with its psalmist. Its handling of death notwithstanding, we will find Ps 114 inhospitable to a Christological subject for other reasons.

<sup>41</sup> See 6.4-6.6 for better reasons.

<sup>42</sup> Campbell (2009:344 n.16) insists on a cognitive reading of πιστεύω in 2 Cor 4:13: "believe", rather than "trust" or "is faithful"; this on the grounds that knowledge (4:14) is closely coordinated with it. Co-ordination does not, however, require the verbs to occupy the same semantic space. Indeed, to eliminate the risk of tautology, it is better to argue a personal object for πιστεύω and a propositional one for οἶδα.

<sup>43</sup> See e.g. Rom 8:10-11, cast in Pneumatic terms; 1 Cor 6:14, as if from left field.

<sup>44</sup> See 6.7.2, where this argument is refined.

Notwithstanding these objections, Schenck's construal of these verses yields an elegant reading, and should not be altogether dismissed. It constitutes a modest endorsement for a Christological psalmist, confirming the "fit" of Christ as subject of the quotation, and has the merit of depending on local, integral and visible context.

Schenck adduces useful support from Rom 10:9-10:

Rom 10:9 ὅτι ἐὰν ὁμολογήσης ἐν τῷ στόματί σου κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ.<sup>10</sup> καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογείται εἰς σωτηρίαν.

If read symmetrically with 2 Cor 4:13, these Roman verses could be taken to suggest in the Corinthian case a non-Christological subject – a believer in God's resurrection of Jesus, whose (logically consequent) confession is that he is Lord. Satisfying though it might be to imitate such a subject, the fit might be thought a little too convenient. Indeed, as one in Christ, the psalmic subject of the quotation is not represented at all,<sup>45</sup> but altogether reinscribed. Schenck's correlation of the two passages, though not finally satisfying,<sup>46</sup> does at least grant to the quotation's subject acts of believing and speaking which are generically appropriate to psalmody: a hope of resurrection, and confession of the same. Thus: 2 Cor 4:13-14 "is confession and faith in Paul's own resurrection. ... Rom 10:9 is confession and faith in the resurrection of Jesus, which Paul links to faith in his own resurrection. Thus ... Paul assumes an instrumental and soteriological link between Christ's resurrection and that of believers."<sup>47</sup>

#### 6.2.2.4 Campbell: participation in the faith of Jesus

The most recent contribution to the debate, at time of writing, is from Douglas Campbell.<sup>48</sup> As with those before him, his interest in 2 Cor 4:13 is piqued by its potential yield for a subjective reading of πίστις Χριστοῦ. But Campbell is after more than a Christological subject for πιστεύω: equally important to him is a strongly participatory, rather than mimetic, construal of Paul's relationship with the psalmist, which a Christological subject alone might offer. Evidence of

---

<sup>45</sup> As we shall see (6.3.2), representation is precisely in view.

<sup>46</sup> See reservations lodged above against the need for such specific acts of believing and speaking.

<sup>47</sup> Schenck 2008:529.

<sup>48</sup> Campbell 2009.

participation, particularly in verses closely tied to 4:13, might enforce a claim for Christ as speaking subject in the quotation.

Campbell's article is somewhat closely argued and will occupy us at various points during this chapter. Here we can observe that, with regard to the quotation's context in 2 Cor 4, Campbell finds a participatory reading richly supported, as against "mere" mimesis.<sup>49</sup> In practice, however, Campbell alternates between the language of participation and that of paradigm,<sup>50</sup> which requires only imitation, albeit one brought about by the divine agent. Though he is able to find participation in 2 Cor 4:11-12, he fails to do so in respect of v.14, which would otherwise have promoted a Christological claim in v.13,<sup>51</sup> inasmuch as the two verses are closely integrated on any reading.<sup>52</sup> In his more cursory discussion of the wider context of 2 Cor 4, Campbell is similarly content to presume the logic of participation without grounding it in language which requires it.<sup>53</sup>

In sum, Campbell is unable to rely on the context of 2 Cor 4 to ground a Christological subject for the quotation, hampered by the need to enforce a participatory reading over a rich account of imitation. But then, Campbell is of all

---

<sup>49</sup> Campbell opposes his reading to "a more conventional, anthropocentric approach presupposing mere copying" (2009:349), a contrast which serves to enhance the appeal and clarity of his participatory reading. One may wonder whether mimesis need be anthropocentric, however, not least in 2 Corinthians, where Paul's appeal to divine agency and purpose is thoroughgoing; see 5.2.3 on 2 Cor 1.

<sup>50</sup> Campbell observes that Paul, his auditors, and the psalmist – speaking as Christ – "[a]ll ... believe in the midst of suffering, speak, and ultimately are vindicated" (2009:349). He continues: "Hence, this dynamic is ultimately underpinned by the paradigmatic narrative of Christ's passion, Easter Friday being followed inexorably by Easter Sunday. It makes perfect sense, then, for Paul to go on to suggest in v. 14 that the knowledge in question in the case of himself and his auditors, which has just been spoken of in v. 13, is grounded in that explicit narrative." Setting aside the issue of whether "knowledge" has been spoken of in v.13, we can observe Campbell's choice of terms: thus far the language of "grounding" and "underpinning", for which a Christological narrative is paradigmatic. Divinely enforced mimesis – not "mere copying" (2009:349) – is consistent with such language, which does not yet require participation. But Campbell does not blink: "Because Christ has spoken and has been resurrected and glorified, those who *participate in* his steadfast believing and speaking now are guaranteed that resurrection in the future, and this should fill them with hope" (2009:349; italics mine). For an equally "thick" account of how Christ's experience is made paradigmatic for Paul – but without requiring participation – see Kraftchick 1993.

<sup>51</sup> Campbell's claim in respect of v.13 is insistently tied to metalepsis; on this, see 6.5.1.

<sup>52</sup> Indeed, they constitute a single sentence.

<sup>53</sup> Thus, regarding the sweep of Paul's argument from 4:1 to 4:15, he finds that "Paul's sufferings are evidence of the fundamental dynamic of Christ being played out in his life and the lives of his communities, thereby guaranteeing at some future time the glory of resurrection. Moreover, this dynamic informs his ministry – his proclamation of this glorious, if temporarily hidden, reality in a "vessel of clay"" (2009:351). Suffering as "evidence"; a Christological dynamic which "informs" his ministry, or which is "played out" in his life: Campbell's categories are not such as to require the thoroughgoing, comprehensive participation he asserts.

those surveyed the most insistent in grounding that subject in metalepsis of Ps 115; the ultimate viability of his argument must await our discussion of that psalm (6.5).

#### **6.2.2.5 Arguments from 2 Cor 4 for a Christological subject: reprise**

What do we make of the arguments so far adduced? Claims of a Christological narrative underpinning Paul's own have not proved overly rewarding, sketched too schematically (Hays), too allusively (Campbell), or too imprecisely (Stegman) to convince. Indeed, talk of "story" (Stegman) or "paradigmatic narrative" (Campbell) is worryingly vague;<sup>54</sup> such categories appear self-justifying, disinterested in detailed proofs, even as they claim explanatory adequacy.

This is not to say that Paul is not significantly conformed to Christ; just that notice of that conformation is found not in hinted narrative categories in 2 Cor 4, but in the explicit imbrication of Jesus' νέκρωσις with the body's suffering (4:10, explored in the catalogue of 4:8-9), itself underwritten by the co-option of θλίψις to Christological παθήματα in 2 Cor 1:3-11, as we saw in the previous Chapter (5.2.2). The subject of the earlier passage is associated with its counterpart in 2 Cor 4 by its dramatised move to trust in "God who raises the dead" (1:9), a trust Christocentrically focussed in 4:14. The reader who calls the earlier Corinthian passage to mind, stimulated by such associations, may be prepared to recognise Christ in the quotation, given local incentive to do so. Though he may find Christ's assertion as subject in 2 Cor 4:13 a notable "step up" from the agency role he plays in preceding verses, as equally in 2 Cor 1, he will recall that Paul has proclaimed Jesus Christ as κύριος just a little earlier still (4:5), who might well be expected to speak.

Local incentive has been the focus of Schenck's argument from the immediate context of 2 Cor 4:13, such that if we hear in the quotation a reference to Christ's hope of resurrection, the known actuality of that resurrection (4:14a) neatly grounds the imitator's belief (4:13b).<sup>55</sup> These are, in fact, modest if promising grounds to consider the quotation predicable of Christ, at least, if not spoken by him, and they are not made contingent on narrative or other structures figured beneath or behind

---

<sup>54</sup> See 1.2.4 on the logic, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6 for evidence.

<sup>55</sup> The others surveyed here also value the improved logic of these verses, though Schenck emphasises them in particular.

the text or, via metalepsis, from the psalms. We will return to them in 6.7.1 below. But we will require more than this to secure a Christological subject, and to demonstrate its plausibility not only for the reader but for Paul himself. Is support available elsewhere in the apostle's letters?

### **6.2.3 Christ as believing, speaking subject elsewhere in Paul**

#### **6.2.3.1 False leads to a believing, speaking Christ**

In search of a “believing” Christ, those who find for a subjective reading of the πίστις Χριστοῦ formulations (notwithstanding their much debated status<sup>56</sup>) may of course install Christ directly as subject of the cognate πιστεύω, and will certainly wish to do so. Yet this is not easily justified. The move from predication (“Christ had faith/trusted/believed”) to self-predication (“I [Christ] believed”) is not problematic, at least where first person utterances are involved,<sup>57</sup> but the formulations in which πίστις Χριστοῦ appears are not predicative, and Christ is never clearly a subject. Absent clearer motivation, it is not clear why Paul would be inclined to make him one.

The problem is compounded, in fact, for the psalmist does not believe only, but also speaks; and the conjunction of the two is precisely what Paul seizes on. The soteriological focus of the πίστις Χριστοῦ formulations is not evident here, and is displaced in the close pairing of πιστεύω with a verb of speaking; not an obvious supplement on a subjective reading. Nor would Christological speech follow logically from a declaration of the subject's (saving?) faithfulness (“I was faithful, therefore I spoke”); a reading in terms of trust or conviction offers a better logic, as we shall later confirm (6.7.2). In short, 2 Cor 4:13 has rather less to do with the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate than might be thought.

The question that must be asked is, how significant elsewhere in Paul is the notion of Christ as one who speaks? In particular, where Christ is figured as speaker, in what way is this made contingent on belief? Could we discern them, clear echoes of dominical logia in Paul might be thought evidence, if not of believing speech, then

---

<sup>56</sup> There is not space to review the debate here. Though many contributions have followed, the early exchange between Dunn (1997) and Hays (1997) remains a useful point of reference.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Rom 15:3, where the challenge lies in predication; attribution follows straightforwardly once predicative problems are resolved (cf. 3.2.2).

at least of Christ as speaker. Better still would be quotations in which the Lord himself delivers his teaching; but of these there are but two clearly retained in Paul.<sup>58</sup>

### 6.2.3.2 The Christological psalmist in Romans: believing and speaking

Not inappropriately, it is in quotations from the psalms elsewhere in Paul that we find the clearest instances of Christological speech. For these we must return to Romans, where we found Christ installed as speaker in more than one psalm, whose significance to Pauline rhetoric and argument lay precisely in its articulation by Christ. What we gain from these intertextual moments, at a minimum, is confirmation that Paul is willing to take Christ to be a speaker *precisely* of words drawn from biblical psalmody. Indeed, the absence of other moments of direct Christological speech in Paul's letters may suggest that he regards psalmody as offering the only, or at least the most salient, discursive environment for Christ to emerge as speaker. Insofar as we have in 2 Cor 4:13 a quotation from a psalm whose opening distich, at least, was well known to Paul (6.4.1), the possibility that he would offer Christ as subject knowing, and perhaps on the basis of, its provenance, must be granted.

It is significant that the speaking Christ is offered at both sites in Rom 15 as a subject for imitation, a fact which demonstrates the affinity of these with 2 Cor 4:13, where imitation is explicitly enacted. Recall, too, how the imitation of Christ as speaker effected the repristination of human speech, elsewhere silenced, circumscribed or overturned (see 3.6). With this in mind, Paul's concern to distinguish false speech from true in 2 Cor 4 (vv.2, 5) lends support to the idea that a Christological psalmist might be offered once again for imitation, precisely in his acts of speech.

What do we learn in detail about Christological speech as found in Rom 15:3 and 15:9? The former is speech directed towards God, in the first instance, and in the second, through the "strong" reader's identification with Christ in the quotation,

---

<sup>58</sup> Thus 1 Cor 7:10 and 9:14. Neither represents an instance of direct Christological speech. In the first, Paul commands (παραγγέλλω), then checks himself – οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος – suggesting either a dominical origin for the command (cf. 1 Cor 11:23-25), or (less likely) Christological coinherence in Paul's apostolic speech (see 6.2.3.3 for clearer instances). In 1 Cor 9:14 the κύριος is represented as having commanded (διατάσσω). Cf. Dunn 2003:181-84.

toward the “weak” other.<sup>59</sup> In its Roman context, it is speech in which Christ’s agency is paradoxically disposed for the other in claiming a share in reproach (3.4.1.5).

In the case of Rom 15:9, Christ’s speech is itself a declaration of the intention to speak: to “confess” (ἐξομολογέω) God among the Gentiles. The parallel with 2 Cor 4:13 is notable: in Romans, Christ declares that he *will* speak; in 2 Corinthians, that he has done so. Christ not only speaks, but figures himself as a speaker, using a verb which encompasses public profession, and even worship.<sup>60</sup> This is a striking instance of self-predication, where the Christological psalmist characterises himself as such: one who publicly confesses God in praise. But inasmuch as Christ’s profession takes place among the Gentiles, it carries the aspect of witness or proclamation, for “the nations” (τὰ ἔθνη) do not otherwise know God.

As an instance of Christological self-awareness as psalmist, this verse offers to underwrite Christ’s self-predication as one who speaks in 2 Cor 4:13. Insofar as it is retailed in Paul, it indicates the apostle’s willingness to allow Christ to construe himself as speaker, if in Romans, perhaps also here. And as Christ characterises his speech as a confession of God among (Gentile) others, Rom 15:9 offers an intriguing endorsement of his speech as something to be joined, perhaps even imitated; nor is it simply an act of praise, but one of proclamation.

The net contribution of these two texts is considerable. Not only do they encourage us to hear Christ in Paul’s quotation in 2 Cor 4:13, but they give shape to his subjectivity, as an agency for the other; as one to be joined in proclaiming God among the nations. Rom 15:9 even suggests the content, if not of believing, certainly of speech: the proclamation of God himself.

In neither instance is Christ’s speech marked explicitly as emerging from belief. Yet the utterance “I believed therefore I spoke” might be said to encode the fundamental acts of a psalmist (6.3.2), so that Christ’s installation as a speaking psalmist (as in Rom 15) may suffice to motivate Paul to construct him as one whose speech proceeds from belief. Further, the speech acts of public confession and/or

---

<sup>59</sup> See 3.4.2.1.

<sup>60</sup> BDAG q.v.

praise in which Christ engages in Rom 15:9, and the subjectivity of Christ in a metaleptic reading of Ps 68, imply a Christological psalmist of strong conviction and deep trust, from which his speech emerges. It is not unintuitive to think of this psalmist where πιστεύω and λαλέω are paired.<sup>61</sup>

### 6.2.3.3 Christ speaking in Paul and in the believer

The coinherence of Christ and Paul as agencies, which we observed in 2 Cor 1:4-7 and in 2 Cor 4 prior to the quotation, and the close imitation required of the Pauline subject with that of the quotation, invite us to consider also speech acts in which both Christ and another are implicated. There are two clear instances.<sup>62</sup> The first, in which Christological speech in Paul is explicit, is found in 2 Cor 13:3-4:

<sup>3</sup> ἐπεὶ δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἄσθενεῖ ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.<sup>4</sup> καὶ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῆ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ. καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ ζήσομεν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς.

In 2 Cor 13:3 Paul observes a Corinthian desire for proof “of Christ speaking in me”. As he does throughout 2 Cor 10-13, with few exceptions, Paul constructs himself as a powerful agent, rather than an agency: an “I” whose speech acts are uniformly effective. In 13:2 Paul draws explicit attention to such speech acts: he “spoke before” and “speaks now” (προεῖρηκα καὶ προλέγω) in the form of a threat: he “will not spare” (οὐ φείσομαι). But these powerful speech acts are not really Paul’s. Instead, they constitute proof of Christ speaking in Paul (13:3a), as acts which require not a weak agent (ἡμεῖς ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ; 13:4), but a strong; here, Christ ὃς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἄσθενεῖ, ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν (13:3b).<sup>63</sup>

These verses figure Christ as an effective speaker in no uncertain terms, capable of promise or threat. While he speaks “in” Paul, the apostle foregrounds the agency of

---

<sup>61</sup> Hays finds a close analogy to the present case – outside Paul – in Heb 2:13a, which features a quotation of the last clause of Isa 8:17 (2005:108 n.24): καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ ἔσομαι πεποιθὼς ἐπ’ αὐτῷ. The Son’s intention to trust is coordinated with, but does not engender, an intention to proclaim (ἀπαγγεῶ) the divine name to his brothers, and sing praises (ὑμνέω) in the congregation (in the preceding verse, Heb 2:12). The collocation of trust and profession is suggestive, but the one does not issue in the other.

<sup>62</sup> See also 6.2.3.2 n.58 on 1 Cor 7:10.

<sup>63</sup> Even Christ’s figuration as a strong agent is circumscribed by the power of God which raised him, and which is “for you” (εἰς ὑμᾶς; 13:4). The status of the divine agent, so much to the fore in 2 Cor 1 (5.2.3.1; 5.4.2.3), is retained here.

Christ in speech, rather than his own. The apostle, it appears, is not only willing to assign speech acts to Christ, but concerned to do so.

A second instance of Christological speech in another is found in the “Abba” cry of Gal 4:6 and Rom 8:15. The Galatian case is relatively straightforward:

<sup>46</sup> Ὅτι δέ ἐστε υἱοί, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν κρᾶζον· αββα ὁ πατήρ.

Here, it is the Spirit of God’s Son which cries out in our hearts. The Roman case is a little more indirect, but Christological nonetheless.<sup>64</sup> Although κρᾶζω is not necessarily linguistic,<sup>65</sup> it certainly is so in these two utterances, and meaningfully so, insofar as what is said is evidential for what follows (Gal 4:7) or precedes (Rom 8:14-15a), which has to do with the subject’s beliefs: in that cry, we learn that we are sons and heirs. In this way, believing and speaking are coordinated in the speech acts of (the Spirit of) Christ in the believer.<sup>66</sup> The cry itself is the spoken language of intimate and confident<sup>67</sup> relationship, entirely appropriate to the Christological psalmist in 2 Cor 4:13.<sup>68</sup>

### 6.2.3.4 Conclusions

To the modest grounds we have discerned in 2 Cor 4 to find for a Christological psalmist, we can now add suggestive corroboration from mediated or “shared” Christological speech in 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans, and substantial reinforcement from Christological psalmody elsewhere in Paul. To invoke the latter

---

<sup>64</sup> In Romans “our” Abba cry (8:15) is coordinated with “that same Spirit” (αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα; 8:16), whose closest antecedent is the “spirit of adoption” (πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας; 8:15a). Insofar as the Spirit has been variously characterised in preceding verses as God’s Spirit (8:9; 8:11) and the “Spirit of Christ” (πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ; Rom 8:9), the spirit of adoption (i.e. the spirit which indicates adoption; see Byrne 1996:252) is not exclusively identifiable with either. But Christ is the Son, whose indwelling (8:10a) makes him a logical candidate for the witness of 8:16. In this respect, note the functional equivalence made in 8:9b-10a, where the one who does not have the “Spirit of Christ” (πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ; 8:9b) is contrasted with one in whom is Christ (8:10a): to speak of the Spirit of Christ, at least here, is to speak of the indwelling Christ. If the Spirit of Christ bears witness in the cry, it is Christ himself who does so.

<sup>65</sup> BDAG q.v.

<sup>66</sup> It is true that in both cases the cry precedes, or is evidential for, the conviction of sonship for the human subject; but this does not require that the speaking subject (the Spirit of the Son/of Christ) follow the same trajectory.

<sup>67</sup> See Byrne 1996:252.

<sup>68</sup> The risen Christ is in view, as indicated by the Pneumatological characterisation in both texts. These cases of strictly Christological speech cannot be taken directly to reinforce a finding for “the historical Jesus” as a speaking subject in Paul, though conformity of the speech of Jesus with that of the risen Christ should be granted.

is by no means a circular gesture; Christ has been installed on local grounds in Rom 15:3 and 15:9, and so may be safely adduced to support the Corinthian case, at least in respect of Paul's willingness to find him there. The reader will require local context, however; or at the very least, context which might be adduced from the site of quotation.

Such context might be transmuted by metalepsis from the psalm(s) which yielded the quotation. Accordingly, we will shortly ask whether our arguments for a Christological subject can be reinforced by metaleptic appeal, as all those surveyed claim; this is the topic of 6.4-6.6. In the meantime, we can turn from the broader context of Paul's quotation to a narrower; specifically, the complex and intriguing means by which it is introduced. There, as we shall now learn, the groundwork is laid for a prestigious and authoritative subject able to represent the fullness of psalmic testimony in the quotation.

### 6.3 The written subject of psalmody, which is the spirit of faith

**2 Cor 4:13** Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα, καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν,

Paul's quotation is introduced in a most complex way. Two elements precede the quotation. The first is a claim that "we have the same spirit of faith" which, by virtue of the participle ἔχοντες, offers condition or cause to what "we" subsequently do, namely "believe and also speak" (2 Cor 4:13b), and which, in the claim to identity (τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα), offers to characterise the quotation in some way. The second is the distinctive formula κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον which immediately introduces the quotation. Both of these elements foreground the question of the identity of the quotation's subject;<sup>69</sup> but how exactly do they relate to each other? And how do they characterise the quotation's voice?

---

<sup>69</sup> Thrall (1994:340) contends "the identity of the speaker in the psalm is of no interest." Quite to the contrary; but not only because "Paul shares 'the same spirit of fidelity' with him (2 Cor 4:13)" (Campbell 2009:342 n.12). Paul's unusual choice of quotation formula foregrounds the subject equally, as we shall see.

### 6.3.1 By way of introduction: a formula for quotation and its entailments

In introducing his quotation from Ps 115:1 in 2 Cor 4:13, Paul does not use his customary formula;<sup>70</sup> rather, the quoted voice is introduced as *κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον*, a *hapax legomenon* in his letters. *Hapax* also is *καθάπερ γέγραπται*, which leads in Rom 3:4, in which Ps 115:2 figures.<sup>71</sup> But though unique in Paul, these formulae can fruitfully be related with others preferred by him. Second Corinthians is not rich in citation formulae, but the standard – that is, most common in Paul – *καθὼς γέγραπται* appears twice, at 8:15 and 9:9; the second of these introduces a quotation from Psalm 111. *καθὼς γέγραπται* is twice attested in 1 Corinthians;<sup>72</sup> more frequently in Romans.<sup>73</sup> What does this formula signify, and what might this mean for 2 Cor 4:13?

#### 6.3.1.1 Distinctive features of the “standard formula”: *καθὼς γέγραπται*

In his important study of Pauline hermeneutics, Francis Watson has argued that this “standard formula”, as he calls it, is distinctive in three ways. First, it introduces citations anonymously. As Watson argues,

Anonymous citation does not confer any greater or lesser authority on a text, but it does affect the nature of the authority ascribed to it. If attribution to a specific author highlights the text’s individuality and distinctiveness, anonymous citation emphasises its representative character.<sup>74</sup>

Hence, for a citation introduced with this formula, “It is scripture as a whole that speaks in [its] words.”<sup>75</sup> In the case of psalmody, the link between anonymity and representation is qualified by the availability of David (and potentially Christ) as presumptive speakers, who – unless named as speakers, in which case it is their voice which is to be heard – serve to represent the voice not of “scripture” but of psalmody, at least where quotations from the psalms are in view. Indeed, they may be said to constitute, not merely represent, the univocity of psalmody.<sup>76</sup> No other genre within biblical literature is so constituted, or granted particular representation

---

<sup>70</sup> On the variety of formulae used by Paul, see Koch 1986:25-32.

<sup>71</sup> See 6.3.1.2 n.82.

<sup>72</sup> 1 Cor 1:31; 2:9; *γέγραπται* functions similarly seven further times, though without *καθὼς*.

<sup>73</sup> Rom 1:17; 2:24; 3:10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13, 33; 10:15; 11:8, 26; 15:3, 9, 21.

<sup>74</sup> Watson 2004:45.

<sup>75</sup> Watson 2004:45.

<sup>76</sup> On David’s authorial function see 2.2.2 and 2.6.

in quite this way.<sup>77</sup> In effect, where “as it is written” introduces an anonymous quotation from a psalm, its “representative character” is – in potential – that of psalmody, rather than of scripture: it is the voice of psalmody which speaks.<sup>78</sup> We will return to this point in connection with 2 Cor 4:13 below.

Second, the standard formula “emphasises the written character of the text cited”, and so “presents a citation as a completed utterance that is definitive and permanently valid.” Watson finds here a contrast with alternative formulae, which typically introduce a text as spoken, and this in present tense. “If speech connotes immediacy,” he concludes, “writing connotes normativity.”<sup>79</sup>

Finally, Watson suggests that *καθὼς γέγραπται* implies a certain redundancy: “[A] citation introduced by the standard formula will not be integral to the discourse, however important it may be for the argument.”<sup>80</sup> This is because “the ‘as’ of the standard formula implies a correspondence between citation and antecedent that entails a degree of repetition.”<sup>81</sup> This repetition in turn has the effect of increasing the rhetorical and argumentative force of quotations it introduces.

---

<sup>77</sup> A partial exception is Moses, who may be thought to signify the voice of Torah. Unlike David or Christ, however, Moses is a specifically literary agent in Paul: he writes (Rom 10:5), and is read (2 Cor 3:15).

<sup>78</sup> In any event, as an agent in Paul’s writings, scripture is largely the author not of writing but of speech. *ἡ γραφή* appears as a subject seven times in Paul; it speaks (*λέγω*) four times in Romans (4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2) and once in Galatians (4:30), where it also foresees (*προοράω*, 3:8) and imprisons (*συγκλείω*, 3:22).

<sup>79</sup> Watson 2004:45. For a general treatment of Paul and “writing”, indebted to Derrida, see Given 2008.

<sup>80</sup> Watson 2004:45-6.

<sup>81</sup> Watson 2004:46.

### 6.3.1.2 The distinctiveness of the formula *κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον*<sup>82</sup>

Watson's claims for *καθὼς γέγραπται*, insofar as they are generalisations, can certainly be qualified.<sup>83</sup> Yet they do provide a basis for assessing the formal distinctiveness of *κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον*, which shares with the standard formula perfective aspect and the lexeme *γράφω*. Like *καθὼς γέγραπται*, the formula in 2 Cor 4:13 appears to confirm the normativity of the quote to follow. If anything, it does this with greater force, aided by its formal, slightly elevated tone,<sup>84</sup> the more striking for being made to serve so slight a quotation; the speaking subject is one with permanent and normative authority. Structurally, *κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον* not only emphasises the writtenness of the voice which follows, but suggests for it a particular written identity,<sup>85</sup> lending support to the idea that it is not scripture in general which is represented, but psalmody in particular.

This is no incoherent, unidentifiable subject; in the late Second Temple period,<sup>86</sup> psalmic discourse is unified under the authorial sign of David, and so may be characterised as particular (if not necessarily personal). “That which stands written” (*τὸ γεγραμμένον*) is thus the unified, authoritative voice of psalmody, declared normative by its assertion as writing. According to – and not merely in accordance with – the unified (written) voice of psalmody then, “I believed therefore I spoke.”<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> The variation which serves to introduce Ps 50:6b in Rom 3:4 deserves attention also, juxtaposed as it is with a phrase from Ps 115:2. *καθάπερ γέγραπται* is formally similar to *καθὼς γέγραπται*, but has a touch of antiquity about it: a “thoroughly Attic expression” (Cranfield 1975:182; BDAG q.v.) which lends a literary air to the ensuing quotation and, we may suggest, to what immediately precedes it in 3:4. It is a hapax legomenon in Paul, found only here between two citations from the psalms. (Manuscript evidence variously favours *καθὼς* and *καθάπερ* in Rom 3:4, with neither clearly superior. NA<sup>27</sup> prefers to read *καθὼς* here, as elsewhere in Romans. However, as a *hapax legomenon* *καθάπερ* represents the *lectio difficilior*, and benefits from slightly stronger witnesses: notably, *καθὼς* is lacking in p<sup>46</sup>. On balance, *καθάπερ* is to be preferred.) In its literary effect, it offers to do for its citations what the formality of *κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον* promises in 2 Cor 4:13: establish the quoted voice as normative. But it is its singular appearance that is noteworthy here. Might we not suggest that the evocation of Ps 115:2 stirs Paul to a literary turn of phrase as he introduces Ps 50? And if so, perhaps a similar dynamic is at work (among others) in 2 Cor 4:13: the voice of the psalmic subject has a literary texture which colours the language around it.

<sup>83</sup> Watson's assessment of the standard formula is made in the context of an exegesis of Rom. 1:17, and certainly serves his reading. Yet later, he is happy to concur with Wilckens (1980:226) on the apparent interchangeability of writing and speaking terminology throughout citations in Romans 9 and 10 (Watson 2004:331 n.34). Has Paul rethought his rhetorical categories?

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Thrall 1994:340.

<sup>85</sup> The nominalisation *τὸ γεγραμμένον* does not merely characterise the words as written, but the voice as a written voice.

<sup>86</sup> See 2.2.2 n.15.

<sup>87</sup> The formula has a further role, of course. By asserting the quotation's subject as other than himself, Paul makes possible the claims to identity which precede and follow; for identification requires two parties. By the same token, a voice which is another's is a voice that might say more than is written; here then is an invitation, however subtle, to metalepsis.

Paul's choice of formula is striking in 2 Corinthians, because *the letter* has already been set in opposition to the life-giving spirit in 2 Cor 3:6 (τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτένει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ); while the ministry of death has been engraved *in letters* on stone in 3:7 (ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις). Lexically, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον stands yet closer to the vilified γράμμα than καθὼς γέγραπται; the quotation it introduces threatens to fall with it. If Paul is aware of the association or its irony, he gives no sign. Doubtless the reasons for his choice are local. In it we may see a desire to guarantee the claims of the quotation it introduces, as we have just discussed: for writing connotes normativity. Yet the motive for such a desire can be traced to the problem of asserting identity across the verse. Characterised by “the same spirit of faith” and enacted in the replicated pattern of believing and speaking, Paul's identification depends upon the quoted subject, and so calls for a “strong” formula capable of stabilising – “writing” – that subject's voice.

Duly stabilised, that voice comes to enhance the rhetorical force of Paul's argument, but – granting Watson's argument concerning the redundancy of material introduced by such a formula – it contributes no supplement. Paul could forge for his readers an association between believing and speaking without the aid of the psalm: indeed he does just this in 4:13b, so that the quotation appears materially redundant, if rhetorically useful. Such a result tells against the necessity of metalepsis,<sup>88</sup> though not against its possibility; though as we shall see (6.4-6.6), no conventional claim for metalepsis in 2 Cor 4:13 is successful.

### 6.3.2 The representative subject of psalmody and the spirit of faith

The achievements of Paul's unusual formula in 2 Cor 4:13 are subtle, but significant, as we have seen. By an assertion of writtenness, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον certifies the voice of the quotation as normative and authoritative. Preserving anonymity, the same formula guarantees the representative, pan-psalmonic character of the quotation: however it may derive from a particular psalm or psalm fragment, the testimony of

---

<sup>88</sup> Indeed it runs quite against Campbell's insistence that unless the “entire narrative” of Ps 115 is invoked, the logic of Paul's quotation will be found invalid (2009:341-42). The flaws in Campbell's logic are discussed in 6.5.1 below.

this voice is seen to represent psalmody as a whole. But the formula is not alone in establishing the quotation's subject. Equally significant is Paul's earlier characterisation of the psalmic voice – which “we” share – as the spirit of faith (πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως).<sup>89</sup>

The complexity of Paul's prelude to quotation is less a matter of syntax than of rhetorical force, for the introductory formula and the spirit of faith are dialectically posed with respect to the quotation's subject. As we have just seen, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον certifies that subject as anonymous yet coherent and normative, and thus, by implication, generic or global rather than particular. The designation πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, on the other hand, characterises the same subject as having, or exhibiting, a spirit of faith. So characterised, the subject is granted a particular disposition with affective and cognitive dimensions which transcend the provisions of writtenness; the anonymity of the formula is thereby challenged. It is the first, but not the only, cue given by the text to install a personal speaking subject, so long as that subject carries the normative authority the formula demands.

But if the πνεῦμα and τὸ γεγραμμένον bear diversely upon the subject, the fusion of the two is nonetheless potent. The subject of Paul's quotation gives voice not to what is particular in psalmody, but to what is representative – thus τὸ γεγραμμένον; but in a richly dimensioned and personal voice – thus πνεῦμα. The utterance of this subject is at once deeply personal and wholly representative; such then is “I believed, therefore I spoke”.

In effect, Paul's quotation reflects upon psalmody even as it brings it to voice. This is a conclusion of some theological richness. Believing and speaking are the quintessential coordinated acts of psalmody in the first-person genres of lament and thanksgiving. The subject believes that God will hear him and respond; accordingly he speaks his praise, his thanksgiving, his contrition, his complaint. These acts are characterised by the spirit of faith, in which the fundamental turn to God in prayer

---

<sup>89</sup> Against this, some argue that “the same spirit of faith” is shared not between the psalmist and the plural subject, but simply by that subject construed as Paul together with his readers. The logic appears to be that since Paul has distinguished his experience from that of the Corinthians in v.12, he now wishes to stress their common faith; so e.g. Baumert 1973:84-83; Strachan 1935:96. But as Harris points out (2005:351), “the preceding context contains no reference to the πίστεως of the Corinthians, and it is arbitrary to equate πίστεως with ζωή (v.12b).”

is made, and which gives rise to specific acts of belief and contingent speech. It is scarcely possible to imagine how the disposition and acts of psalmody might otherwise be encoded in summary form.

Insofar as “we” share *this* subject’s spirit of faith – a subject which distils all psalmic subjects in its representation – the referential range of the first person plural subject is hardly to be restricted to Paul, or to the category of apostle.<sup>90</sup> All in Christ are hailed by Paul’s discourse, and will be subject to the ensuing claim of imitation.

A normative, authoritative, representative voice; a personal subject. Who is sufficient for these things? As we shall learn, Christ alone is adequate; but he will not be read from the psalm which yielded the quotation. Indeed, Paul’s careful preliminaries discourage us from seeking a psalmist locally domiciled. The means of his installation lie ahead in the Pauline text (see 6.7), but the incentive to install him begins here as we have seen, where the stakes are raised. Notwithstanding, many claim Christ via metalepsis. The problematics of such a venture will occupy us in the next three sections (6.4-6.6), and will refine our view of the trope and of its deployment in exegetical debate.

## **6.4 The quotation in its literary context: Ps 115:1-2 (Ps 116:10-11 MT)**

What is undeniably striking in metaleptic appeals in support of a Christological psalmist in 2 Cor 4:13 is a failure to reckon seriously with the immediate context of the quoted words in Ps 115.<sup>91</sup> Most arguments for metalepsis combine a global claim for the salience of a whole psalm with a cheerful selectivity; once a psalm is designated Christologically suitable, it remains only to pick and choose those elements which fit the designation, and omit to mention those which do not.<sup>92</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup> *Contra* Belleville 1991: 275-76, 296.

<sup>91</sup> So also Stanley 2008b:147 n.62, though his reading of Ps 115:1-2 is scarcely more satisfactory than that offered by Abasciano (2007:173-77, 181), in reply to whom it is offered. Abasciano depends more than he realises on construing Ps 115 as “a psalm of thanksgiving which does indeed breathe a spirit of praise and joy” (2007:174), which allows him to finesse the difficult logic of its opening verses. We hope to offer a more judicious reading in the present section.

<sup>92</sup> We shall later see how this strategy plays out in respect of Ps 115 (6.5) and Pss 114 and Ps 116 MT (6.6). For the underlying logic, see 1.2.3 and 1.2.4.

This is doubtful and circular methodology, and inexcusable in relation to Ps 115; for the first two verses of this psalm constitute a subject apart, not easily made to cohere with the psalm's remainder; yet they are in themselves a tightly woven distich, evidently known to Paul. Quotation from one element of the distich constitutes a (*prima facie*) strong invitation to metalepsis of the remainder; yet this possibility is rarely considered, and never in any detail.<sup>93</sup> Before we consider Ps 115 more broadly, then, we must begin with its opening verses.

#### 6.4.1 Paul knows the opening distich of Ps 115

Though we can never be certain, a case can be made that Paul knows the opening two verses of Ps 115 well. The last hemistich is, if anything, more memorable than the first; and we find it, quite unremarked, in Romans. Thus Ps 115:2b (*italics*) in Rom 3:4: “Let God be proved true, and *every one false* (πάς δὲ ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης),” writes Paul, introducing a substantial quotation from Ps 51: “as it is written, so that you may be justified in your words, and prevail in your judging.” The three word quotation (δέ is Paul's addition) is brief and punchy; were it formally introduced it might have the air of a slogan (as some claim for Ps 115:1a in 2 Cor 4:13): another happy maxim called to mind, from Ps 115 only incidentally.

In fact, precisely because Paul's quotation from Ps 115:2 is unmarked, it betokens the extent to which the apostle has internalised these verses of the psalm (the distich 115:1-2). This should not surprise us. We have already argued that, in the case of biblical poetry, the distich is a primary domain for metalepsis, upon which literary and discursive factors converge (1.3.1.1); as we shall now see, this is particularly true in Ps 115, where the psalmist's opening words require supplement if their meaning is to be decided.

It is plausible to suggest, then, that Paul may have had these two verses “in mind” when he wrote, if indeed he had any in mind at all. How do they bear upon his quotation and its speaking subject?

---

<sup>93</sup> Schenck is typically vague. Without obvious motivation, he suggests that the content of faith expressed in Ps 115:1 “would be something like the faith that Jesus expressed in 114:1” (2008:532), on the assumption that Ps 114 is to be read messianically also. The “humbling” of Ps 115:1 he considers analogous to that of Phil 2:8: a humbling unto death.

#### 6.4.2 The psalmist's first words depend upon the remainder of the distich

An answer to the question just posed requires a good reading of Ps 115:1-2 as a poetic distich. A good reading of these difficult verses is one which respects their coherence, and discovers in them some form of the parallelism ubiquitous in psalmody. In particular, the pressing questions posed by the quoted hemistich (v.1a) might be thought to find a prompt answer in its immediate sequel (v.1b), while the first stich as a whole (v.1) finds in the second (v.2) some form of expansion, extension or intensification.

Variety in translation well illustrates the hermeneutical dependence of the psalm's opening words on their complement in vv.1b-2; but this dependence plays out differently in the Hebrew text than the Greek. Paul's quotation is a perfect match with the first three words of Ps 115:<sup>94</sup> ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα. The Greek phrase represents a limiting interpretation of Ps 116:10 MT; διὸ is a tighter connective than the polysemous כִּי of the Hebrew verse, which makes the act of speaking directly contingent on the act of believing:<sup>95</sup> the psalmist “believed (*that ...*, or *in someone*), *therefore* spoke (or said ...)”. The Hebrew כִּי, on the other hand, need only admit occasion, not contingency (though the latter is possible too).<sup>96</sup> The Greek verbs are aspectually tighter than their Hebrew counterparts. Thus the aorists ἐπίστευσα and ἐλάλησα might be taken perfectly (as in Brenton's translation below),<sup>97</sup> but would ordinarily denote singular, if repeatable, acts of believing and speaking: I believed ... I spoke.<sup>98</sup> Otherwise, in respect of their verbs, the two texts offer similar interpretive options. The verb אָמַן, when in *hiphil* form, encompasses a similar range to πιστεύω;<sup>99</sup> דַּבֵּר (in *piel*) and λαλέω alike denote an act of speech, with or without an object: to say or to speak.

---

<sup>94</sup> Barring the introductory ἀλλήλουα, on which see 6.5.2 nn.133 and 134.

<sup>95</sup> We cannot resolve the question whether Paul has quoted from a Greek text and/or translated from the Hebrew. There is no reason to challenge the assumed priority of the Greek for Paul; but neither is there cause to dismiss the Hebrew text from his view; see 6.5.3.

<sup>96</sup> HALOT q.v.

<sup>97</sup> Brenton 1986, henceforth Brenton.

<sup>98</sup> As in Pietersma's translation for the New English Translation of the Septuagint project (2000a:116-17); henceforth NETS.

<sup>99</sup> HALOT אָמַן q.v., which prefers a cognitive reading: the psalmist “believes [or: thinks] (that sth.)”. On πιστεύω BDAG q.v. favours a relational reading: the psalmist “believes in” God or Christ, as one able to save. Whatever its merits, the grounds for BDAG's classification are extrinsic: there is nothing in the objectless form of the verb in 2 Cor 4:13 to prefer a relational emphasis.

In light of these possibilities, one must look to the rest of the distich for context, in the hope that this will supply predicates to the verbs and disclose the logic of the whole. A quick sampling of ETs, whose dependence on MT increases the options still further, illustrates the uncertainty, and the way in which the interpretation of other elements in the stanza nourishes translation of the quoted clause. It also affords striking testimony not only to the productivity of the text but the difficulty of reading it coherently. The verses, and two translations of the Greek text, are represented below.

**Psalm 115:1** αλληλουια ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα ἐγὼ δὲ ἐταπεινώθημ σφόδρα <sup>2</sup>  
ἐγὼ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης

**Psalm 116:10** הַאֲמַנְתִּי כִּי אֲדַבֵּר אֲנִי עֲנִיתִי מֵאֵד: <sup>11</sup> אֲנִי אֶמְרָתִי בְּחַפְזִי  
כָּל־הָאָדָם כֹּזֵב:

**NETS Psalm 115:1** I believed, and so I spoke; but I was brought very low. I said in my alarm, “Every person is a liar.”

**BRENTON Psalm 115:1** I believed, wherefore I have spoken: but I was greatly afflicted. <sup>2</sup>And I said in mine amazement, Every man is a liar.

In translating the Hebrew, all three terms in Paul’s quotation vary significantly in translation. The psalmist believes,<sup>100</sup> keeps faith,<sup>101</sup> or simply has faith;<sup>102</sup> his speech issues from faith,<sup>103</sup> is contemporary with faith,<sup>104</sup> is in apparent contradiction with faith,<sup>105</sup> or even engenders faith.<sup>106</sup> Speaking and believing alike may take place in the past,<sup>107</sup> present,<sup>108</sup> or future.<sup>109</sup> The second hemistich אֲנִי עֲנִיתִי מֵאֵד (Ps 116:10b MT) may embody the psalmist’s speech (so most), or his state of mind when speaking.<sup>110</sup> Is it possible to decide for one reading among so many possible?

<sup>100</sup> NIV, ERV, NLT, ASV, Brenton, NETS.

<sup>101</sup> NRSV, NASB, CJB.

<sup>102</sup> NET.

<sup>103</sup> NIV, BRENTON, NLT, NETS.

<sup>104</sup> NET.

<sup>105</sup> NRSV, NASB, CJB.

<sup>106</sup> ERV, ASV.

<sup>107</sup> NRSV, NASB, NIV, NET, NLT, BRENTON, NETS.

<sup>108</sup> CJB.

<sup>109</sup> ERV, ASV.

<sup>110</sup> Brenton, ASV, ERV; HALOT q.v. The ambivalence is represented in the ASV and ERV: the colon may introduce the psalmist’s speech or simply juxtapose it.

### 6.4.3 A narrative subject for Ps 115:1-2

An optimal reading is available, at least of the Greek verses, one which will supply a satisfying and coherent narrative to the subject of the quotation and of the distich as a whole. Whether that narrative is appropriate to the receiving text of 2 Cor 4 is another matter, pursued below (6.4.4).

A clue to the logic of the first stich may be found in the second clause of Ps 115:1, where the Greek text supplies δέ, not represented in MT. This might be taken either adversatively, implying qualification; or consecutively, implying consequence; in either case, it indicates that the second clause is not reported speech.<sup>111</sup> Adversative δέ would locate in the second clause not the content of speech – as though the psalmist “said, ‘But I was sorely afflicted’ ” – but the conditions of speech, such that the psalmist “spoke; *but* I was sorely afflicted” (as in Brenton and NETS). As usually understood, the psalmist’s afflictions qualify his discourse by specifying a troubled context for speech, an idea that leads some interpreters to explain the dissonance of Ps 115:2b with conventional moral judgment on the grounds that it was uttered *in extremis*.<sup>112</sup> On this reading, the second line expresses the content of the speech act in the first: in great distress (115:1b), indeed ἐν ... ἔκστασει (115:2a), the psalmist declared the moral failure of all humanity (115:2b). We may wonder why the psalmist’s suffering is aoristic (ἐταπεινώθη) rather than imperfect, if it provides the ongoing background to other acts. But the decisive problem for this reading lies in how to correlate belief with such speech on the terms demanded by δῖό. What kind of belief would issue in such a proclamation?<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> The effect of δέ would be to render the psalmist’s first reported utterance – if it were such – a reply; but this seems most unlikely: cf. “I said, ‘But I was sorely afflicted’ ”; or “I said, ‘And I was sorely afflicted’ ”. To what does this utterance respond?

<sup>112</sup> So e.g. Booi 1995:392.

<sup>113</sup> The problem is no less severe in MT, in which the absence of a qualifying conjunction encourages the possibility that the psalmist reports his speech act in Ps 116:10b. But again, what kind of belief issues directly in the testimony of affliction? A belief that God will deliver may account for it (as in NLT), perhaps, nourished by the testimony of earlier verses; though this is much to supply by ellipsis. And even if granted, the cost to the parallel structure of the stanza is considerable: the juxtaposition of believing speech and speech from ἔκστασις, whose content seems similar in tone, is perversely antithetical (so also Booi 1995:391). Booi prefers to take יִתְקַוֶּה as a modal imperfect, expressing “not ... faith in God, but rather the confidence that something is true.” He translates accordingly, “I trusted that I could speak: I am under great oppression. I said in my consternation: All men are liars.” A logically prior trust in God is implied even here, of course; and in any event, this is not an option available to the Greek text.

A less problematic approach is to take  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  consecutively,<sup>114</sup> and so to invite the reader to infer development, perhaps even consequence. The psalmist then declares: “I believed, therefore I spoke; *and* [so] I was sorely afflicted.” This affliction is a distinct development, not a pre-existing state, and so is aoristically marked. Ps 115:2 then supplies a second instance of speech,<sup>115</sup> now uttered from the subjectivity of the afflicted: the speech of one  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota$  who, in his moral declaration, discerns the root of his trouble. As neither speech nor belief is antithetical to the psalmist’s suffering, this declaration may be taken as subjectively valid and true; indeed, it carries propositional weight with Paul in Rom 3:4.<sup>116</sup> On this reading, the object of speech in Ps 115:1 must be inferred from elsewhere, else taken absolutely.

A consecutive reading has the advantage of establishing a coherent structure for the distich, freed of disjunction, and marked by narrative development; it thus exhibits one mode of the parallelism pervasive in psalmody (see 1.3.1.1). It implies a self-consistent subject for both believing and speaking throughout the stanza, though it cannot supply the content of these acts in Ps 115:1. By virtue of this, it leaves the first clause free to be taken in absolute terms, or otherwise abstracted in quotation, as Paul has done, without material loss. And lastly, this reading makes of these two verses a coherent beginning to a psalm, which otherwise is hard to ascertain.<sup>117</sup>

A problem of context persists, however, even on this reading: Ps 115:1-2 remains – now as a whole – underdetermined. We now have a fix on the narrative logic of these verses; but we are yet to discover what this subject believed or said.<sup>118</sup>

For this reason, we may usefully consider one further reading. As in the first case,  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  is permitted adversative force; but the psalmist’s suffering is not the context for his first acts of believing and speaking. Instead, the psalmist is sorely inflicted *in*

---

<sup>114</sup> BDAG  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  q.v.

<sup>115</sup> In this way the second line supplies a narrative augmentation to the first, conforming to the expectations of parallelism (see 1.3.1.1).

<sup>116</sup> *Contra* Booi (1995:392), the psalmist’s exclamation is indeed “a well-considered judgment” able to assert the culpability of the psalmist no less than of his unnamed enemies (cf.  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , Ps 115:2b). Booi thinks the psalmist’s distress has made him exaggerate the role of others in his misery, the first cause of which is (he argues) his own moral simplicity as one among the  $\text{פְּתוּחֵי־פִי}$ . But  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  (MT  $\text{כָּל}$ ) encompasses self and others without exception: a comprehensive indicator of cause.

<sup>117</sup> See 6.5 on the psalm proper.

<sup>118</sup> Whether such discovery is necessary is yet to be argued, of course. As we shall see, discovery is compelled by the exigencies of hearing the psalmist’s words under the terms of identification made in 2 Cor 4:13.

*spite of* his acts of belief and speech. Amid this affliction, ἐν ἐκστάσει, he reflects upon this narrative and concludes: πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης. This reading, which has all the advantages of other consecutive readings, also enables us to fill some of the remaining holes in the narrative. What kind of believing and speaking might lead to an expectation of suffering's end, which here was denied? The likeliest is belief and speech directed toward God who, in the expectation of psalmody, alone can end suffering. Thus the psalmist, believing that he will be rescued, speaks out to God in appeal; but (δέ) he (continues to) suffer. Amid this suffering, he concludes that *all* are false, where πᾶς includes the psalmist himself; or why else would his petition have failed?<sup>119</sup>

The optimal reading of the distich, as just developed, may be set out as follows:

I believed (that God would rescue me) therefore I spoke (in petition to God);  
 But (instead) I was greatly afflicted.  
 I said in my amazement,  
 “Everyone (including myself) is false!”

#### 6.4.4 A subject ill-suited to mimesis

In light of this reading, the subject of the distich as a whole achieves – on its own terms, though not in sympathy with 2 Cor 4:13ff. or with Ps 115<sup>120</sup> – a suggestive fit with the subject of 2 Cor 1:8-9a, whose narrative displays lexical affinities with the same complex of psalms.<sup>121</sup> If permitted to speak from within the narrative described in the earlier passage, the psalmist would give expression to the sentence of death and that which occasioned it. Believing he will be rescued from his encounter with death, he speaks out to God on his own behalf. Not rescued, he is instead brought exceedingly low (ἐταπεινώθη σφόδρα) – perhaps by appeal denied? In his extremity he discovers that all – including his very self – are false; so the sentence of death is received. Deliverance ensues, but not predicated on his appeal; a development reflected in the unusual disjunction between Ps 115:2 and 115:3, where the psalmist ponders repayment for deliverance unheralded yet accomplished.

---

<sup>119</sup> This subject has discovered empirically what Paul affirms in Rom 3:4 as a matter of theological principle: that all humankind, without exception, is false. There is no reason to deny the qualifier πᾶς its comprehensive reach were Paul to have these verses in mind here; accordingly, a veiled allusion to the “falsehood” of Paul’s opponents in Corinth is most unlikely.

<sup>120</sup> The disjunctive quality of these verses is well recognised; see 6.5.2.

<sup>121</sup> On the lexical affinities between Pss 114 and 115 and 2 Cor 1 see Stegman 2007:739.

Though sympathetic to 2 Cor 1:8-9, the psalmist's tale is less satisfactory in 2 Cor 4:13f., where believing and speaking are not the acts of a subject in need of reformation, but of one altogether exemplary.<sup>122</sup> This result is salutary: it shows that metaleptic extension to the distich, readily invited by the psalmic text, is unsympathetic to Paul's argument in the later passage. As we shall now learn, these verses stand at a critical juncture in Ps 115. To secure a Christological subject for the quotation – or indeed, any subject appropriate to imitation – interpreters are obliged to set them aside in favour of other material in Ps 115.

Just such a move is commonly made, in fact; but the cost of doing so is not usually recognised. By abandoning a claim to the immediate context of the quoted words, in which they are closely embedded, and which is known to Paul, we are relinquishing the strongest, most intuitive metaleptic option. In particular, readings which call for the “entire narrative” of Ps 115 to be brought into play must already be selective (as in practice they are; vv.1-2 are never co-opted to the Christological cause), and risk arbitrariness. It is time to consider the psalm, and those who appeal to it, in more depth.

## 6.5 Beyond the distich: metaleptic invocation of Ps 115

### 6.5.1 The logic of metaleptic appeals to Ps 115

Of those who ground a Christological subject through metalepsis, only Campbell has argued that such a grounding is essential. His starting point is Paul's repeated stress on the link between believing and speaking (twice in 2 Cor 4:13). “This sequence and possible causality are, strictly speaking, invalid unless the entire narrative of the suffering and vindicated psalmist is also in play,” he writes, “because Paul claims in v. 13a to have only the same spirit of belief as the psalmist. It does not follow from this shared *believing* that the psalmist's ensuing *speech* should *also* figure forth necessarily in Paul's life as well; they share only their belief.”<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup> Evidence is decisive on either side of the quotation: the psalmist is characterised as exhibiting a “spirit of faith” (4:13a); and “we” (who have the same spirit) behave identically with the psalmist (4:13b). Further afield in 2 Cor 4, we find that “we” are not false but true in speech and action (4:2); and that “we” perceive truly (4:6), unlike the veiled (4:3-4). Nothing less could be expected of the imitated psalmist.

<sup>123</sup> Campbell 2009:341.

In this analysis Campbell is incorrect. The flaw in his logic lies in separating the noun πίστις from its genitive phrase (τὸ ... πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως) and identifying it strictly with its cognate in the quotation (πιστεύω). Thus “faith” is made to correspond to “believing”, while “speaking”, and the logic by which speaking follows from believing, are supplements without warrant. But no such correspondence presents itself. πίστις is to be taken as embedded in its genitive phrase; and as we saw in 6.3.2, the phrase τὸ ... πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως characterises the voice of the quotation’s subject in all its dimensions. Put otherwise, the spirit of faith is precisely that spirit which believes and therefore speaks.<sup>124</sup>

In this light, Campbell’s insistence on calling “the entire narrative” of Ps 115 into play is groundless. It is also revealing, insofar as his notion of “the entire narrative of the suffering and vindicated psalmist” betrays three unexamined but commonly held assumptions concerning metalepsis: first, that a narrative whole is somehow deducible from this (or any) psalm; second, that such a whole (rather than some part) is required to certify Paul’s logic; and third – inferentially – that a bare sequence of suffering and vindication might suffice to name the psalmist’s narrative.<sup>125</sup>

Though it betrays a set of dubious methodological assumptions, the strategy of calling for “the entire narrative”<sup>126</sup> is well designed to conceal those assumptions, and so to facilitate metaleptic appeals of an undisciplined and arbitrary kind. Fragmentary evidence of suffering and vindication, drawn from diverse points in the psalm, comes to signify a larger<sup>127</sup> narrative structure which is never described in detail. Indeed, the narrative is known only by the categories which signify it; but “suffering” and “vindication” are endemic to first-person biblical psalmody, and derivable from almost every experience represented in a given psalm of thanksgiving or lament.

---

<sup>124</sup> One might say, then, that one who believes but does not therefore speak does not evince the spirit of faith; cf. Rom 10:9-10 (6.2.2.3 above).

<sup>125</sup> On the undernourished model of narrative behind these assumptions, see 1.2.4.

<sup>126</sup> Cf. Stegman, who claims “that Paul intends the Corinthians to recall *the entire story* of Psalms 114-115 LXX” (2007:732; italics mine). Hays is typically more circumspect; see 6.5.4.

<sup>127</sup> That is, an “entire” narrative structure: one which is comprehensive, without troubling remainder.

We will see these assumptions, and the metaleptic strategies which they licence, at work shortly (6.5.4). First, however, we need to take account of the peculiar literary situation of Ps 115 and its closest canonical relatives.

### 6.5.2 The literary location of Paul's quotation

For reasons nowhere explicit, the earliest translators of Ps 116 MT found warrant to divide it in two: Ps 114 represents Ps 116:1-9 MT, and Ps 115 verses 10-19<sup>128</sup> from the same Hebrew psalm.<sup>129</sup> Our quotation stands thus at the beginning of a Greek psalm, and at the midpoint of its Hebrew counterpart.

Whatever else it may be, the translators' decision is a decision about disjunction. Either v.9 of the Hebrew psalm was seen to constitute a natural end to a psalm, or v.10 to demand a definite break; or indeed, both together.<sup>130</sup> Such a conclusion is readily borne out. Where Ps 116 MT may claim – with some awkwardness – to constitute a coherent narrative subject, it does so primarily on the basis of its first nine verses, conventional in narrative and rich in affectivity, represented in Greek as Ps 114. In turn, Ps 114 is a somewhat conventional psalm of individual thanksgiving, which requires no supplement.<sup>131</sup> The same cannot be said, however, for Ps 115, a psalm whose opening verses, though tightly woven as we saw, fail to indicate its generic affiliations (below); a psalm which, outside those verses, lacks either the affective richness or narrative progression which would unify its subject.<sup>132</sup> The psalmist of Ps 115 would in fact profit from assimilation to his predecessor, and suffers in isolation.

However the decision was made, its result makes for a decidedly odd beginning to a psalm. That it is intended to function as one is clear enough, particularly if the psalm is construed with others in the “Hallel” collection, whose diagnostic is a

---

<sup>128</sup> V.5, which duplicates v.9, is omitted by the translators.

<sup>129</sup> The historical priority of the form represented in Ps 116 MT is generally assumed.

<sup>130</sup> In this they are followed by some interpreters (cf. Barré 1990:63) but not by all (cf. Prinsloo 1993:82).

<sup>131</sup> Does not require, yet would profit; on the value of Ps 115 to Ps 114, see 6.6.

<sup>132</sup> The exception that proves the rule: 115:7, where the psalmist declares himself υἱὸς τῆς παιδείας σου.

prefatory ἀλληλουῖα.<sup>133</sup> This exclamation is of limited value in orientating the reader or performer,<sup>134</sup> so that it falls to Paul’s quoted words – ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα – to declare the psalm’s generic affiliations, and to establish its subject. Yet we learned earlier how, failing either to supply objects to its opening verbs, or equally to declare an addressee for its testimony, the first hemistich offers little to its subject; and while the remainder of the distich supplies for it a suggestive narrative, it does not yield a morally upright (“righteous”) subject apt to Christological suture.<sup>135</sup> If the distich is set aside, we must learn from elsewhere what kind of psalmist we have. But to which psalm do we look?

Decisive here are two questions: first, whether a Hebrew or a Greek text is Paul’s “source”; second, if a Greek text is the “source”, whether we grant to Paul a familiarity with the Hebrew sufficient to include both psalms which represent it in Greek – 114 *and* 115 – in his hermeneutical frame.<sup>136</sup> The impact of possible answers may be briefly summarised. If we agree to derive Paul’s quotation from the midpoint of Ps 116 MT, suggesting that the apostle has translated the Hebrew in the service of quotation, we open the whole of that psalm to the possibility of a Christological subject. Yet in that psalm we discover a sufferer of uncertain righteousness: a morally weak subject not easily commended to Christological identity.

---

<sup>133</sup> The prefatory exclamation, unusually brief within the Greek psalter as a whole, fronts each of Pss 110-118, and so constitutes them as individual psalms. Placed at the head of Pss 114 and Ps 115, it overwrites the history of these psalms as once unified in Ps 116 MT.

<sup>134</sup> The orientation it offers is ambivalent. In its illocutionary force, the exclamation ἀλληλουῖά is an act of praising, clearly directed at YHWH. Yet the perlocutionary effect of the term, particularly at the head of a psalm prominent in ritual usage (i.e. the Hallelis), is not simply upon God as nominal addressee, but equally upon others. ἀλληλουῖά is a summons to join in the praise of YHWH, as much as it is an instance of it. Accordingly, as deployed here it cannot resolve the problem of addressivity noted earlier, so that we remain unsure at the psalm’s outset whether God or the congregation is being addressed. Nor does the term help to identify the generic disposition of the psalm. Such an explanation might precede a psalm of any genre, as in the diverse collection of the Hallelis: lament or praise, certainly; but equally, didactic psalms or historical confessions, enthronement psalms or much else. All psalmody, after all, is uttered in praise of YHWH.

<sup>135</sup> The patristic distinction between Christ’s praying *generaliter* and *personaliter* (see Linton 1961), were it not anachronistic for Paul, might license a morally problematic subject position to Christ. He would then pray *generaliter*, as with the penitential psalms. In a sense, the representative role Christ comes to assume in the quotation presages the later framework, though it is not a particular psalm he speaks (see 6.7).

<sup>136</sup> Though a common enough assumption among interpreters, a scenario in which Hebrew and Greek traditions are both brought to bear is not entirely coherent. In particular, it begs the question as to whether individual psalms constitute discursive wholes or not. On this reading, Paul quotes from the Greek psalm to an audience whose Psalter was doubtless Greek, yet “has in mind” the Hebrew psalm Ps 116 MT, which is then taken to inform his quotation (perhaps via Ps 114). Are the borders of Greek psalms so readily evacuated of force, while those of their Hebrew counterparts are firm?

If we conclude that Paul's source is the Greek Ps 115, but that his familiarity with the Hebrew tradition, and in particular Ps 116 MT, licenses a wider textual frame, then Ps 114 is brought into play. But this will not help us to discern a Christological psalmist. This is because the morally limited sufferer of Ps 116 MT is established in its first nine verses, whose Greek counterpart is Ps 114, so that to adduce Ps 114 is to undermine the moral adequacy of the psalmist of Ps 115, however richly he may profit in other respects from this association. In fact, as we shall see, the Greek psalm defines the moral inadequacy of its subject yet more comprehensively than the Hebrew.<sup>137</sup>

On the other hand, if we imagine that Paul has quoted directly from a Greek source, and disregard the Hebrew tradition, we bring Ps 115 alone to view. Although our discussion of its first two verses failed to yield a Christological subject, there are other elements which might be read sympathetically. As a whole, however, this is an equivocal psalm, generically awkward and narratively difficult, which offers itself to Christ only at the cost of a high degree of abstraction, a price many interpreters cheerfully pay.

Such are the scenarios open to us, depending on our assessment of source. To this we turn next.

### **6.5.3 A quotation from Greek or translation from Hebrew?**

As will be recalled, while *ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα* reproduces (in extract) Ps 115:1 exactly, it might equally be a free translation from Ps 116:10 MT. We must admit at the outset that the question of source cannot be decided absolutely. Paul's knowledge of the Hebrew tradition, and his familiarity with it in the worship of the synagogue, is a reasonable assumption; its influence on Paul here cannot be excluded.

Yet there are reasons to doubt the primacy of the Hebrew text at this point. The apostle's acknowledged preference for the Greek tradition should be borne in

---

<sup>137</sup> These distinctions are largely missed by those who claim a richly informative role for psalmody in 2 Cor 4; for these, the two traditions are regarded as univocal.

mind.<sup>138</sup> The coincidence of Paul's translation with that of the OG betokens a kinship of interpretive line by no means compelled by the MT, as varied ETs amply show (see 6.4.2); accordingly, if Paul does have the MT "in mind" at the time he writes, it is likely enough the OG which conditions his translation. Moreover, for those who figure historical audience competence when considering intertextual claims,<sup>139</sup> the idea that a largely Gentile Corinthian audience knows, much less prefers, a Hebrew Psalter is difficult to sustain. And for those who place much store by authorial intention, the notion is untenable that metalepsis, construed as the act of an intending author alert to the habits and limits of his audience (as here), would be made to depend on a textual corpus outside or on the margins of that audience's competence.

Such arguments confirm Ps 115 as the most important text for our purposes, but warrant attention to Ps 114 also, with occasional extension to Ps 116 MT. The quoted clause in its immediate context – the distich of 115:1-2 – we have already discussed. The analysis below takes these verses within Ps 115 as a whole (6.5.4), before examining the relevant backstory offered in Ps 114 (6.6).

## 6.5.4 Psalm 115 as Christological psalmody

### 6.5.4.1 Fragments of Ps 115 applied to Christ

Unlike Ps 114 (reviewed below), Ps 115 does not offer a richly detailed narrative, so that the rich affectivity evident in both psalms<sup>140</sup> is without a biographical anchor.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Long established, especially by the work of Emil Kautzsch (1869); see Stanley 1992, esp. ch. 3.

<sup>139</sup> As do Hays and those influenced by him; see 1.1.3.

<sup>140</sup> Ps 114 begins with a protestation of love almost unique in biblical psalmody (though cf. Ps 17:1); though overstated, Mays (1994:370-71) takes the whole song (Ps 116 MT) to be a declaration of love. Booij acknowledges the "psychological quality" of vv. 10-11, but points beyond it to an "emotional disposition" revealed in vv. 1, 4-5, 11-12; to the frequent invocation of the divine name; to intensifiers and expostulations; to the posture of servanthood; and to other features besides. He concludes: "An easily moved and affectionate human being seems to be speaking" (1995:395).

<sup>141</sup> In his assessment of Ps 116 MT, followed by many, Gunkel designated the psalm an individual thanksgiving, but only with reluctance. While he found most of the requisite generic elements present, he could find no sign of logical structure or sequence: "Der Psalm enthält die verschiedenartigsten Bestandteile ... scheinbar ohne jede Ordnung" (1926:500). Mays claims "The heart of the song is a narrative of salvation" (1994:368); its elements include, for Mays, past predicament of life-threatening trouble (3, 10, 11); prayer made (4); YHWH heard and helped (1, 2, 6, 8, 16); vows "of sacrifice and praise" made in the prayer; psalmist comes to the temple bringing sacrifice (13-14, 17-19) and singing song of thanksgiving (8,16) and offering testimony about YHWH's goodness (5, 6, 9, 15) to his people. Unfortunately, the elements of this narrative are so widely distributed that the structural integrity of the whole remains doubtful. Mays finds a particular concentration of these in the first section of the psalm (as he regards it): vv. 1-7. Accordingly, he

This does not deter some from claiming the psalm as distinctly suited to Christological habitation.<sup>142</sup> Hays, for example, finds two features of the psalm which “might encourage Paul to interpret it christologically”:<sup>143</sup> “(1) the ‘plot’ of the psalm is the typical lament movement from abasement to praise ... and (2) the language of verses 4-6 could readily be construed as a prefiguration of the Lord’s Supper as a means of proclaiming the Lord’s death.”<sup>144</sup>

Hays does well to enclose “plot” in quote marks, for the narrative development evidential for plot is barely discernible in Ps 115.<sup>145</sup> Verses 4 and 6 of the psalm, on the other hand, do offer language suggestive of the Eucharist.<sup>146</sup> If pressed in this direction, however, they construct as subject not the Christ whose death is commemorated therein, but a worshipper after the fact, who contemplates the Eucharistic story and its significance. The evaluative note in v.6 is anomalous within the psalm, in which death does not otherwise figure; in this psalm, the speaker’s deliverance from death, not his experience of it (as might be thought of Christ), is presumed.<sup>147</sup> In any event, it is one thing to take the latter verse in relation to the death of Christ, as might be done; quite another to take the psalm *in toto* (and thus its first verse) as uttered by Christ. The one who gives first-person testimony to the value or cost of the death of Christ is unlikely to be Christ himself. Ps 115:6 may signify that the psalm is *about* Christ in some way, but not that it is

---

thinks this section structurally critical for the whole; if correct, Ps 115 is left, once again, without structural anchor.

<sup>142</sup> Hanson 1963:11-13; Hays 2005:108-9; Campbell 2009.

<sup>143</sup> Hays 2005:108.

<sup>144</sup> Hays 2005:108-09. The sequence implied by “verses 4-6” is less substantial than might be thought: in the Greek psalm, v.5 is blank. See 6.5.4.1 n.146 below.

<sup>145</sup> All narrative development is concentrated in the first two verses of the psalm which, as we have argued (6.4.3), tell the elliptical story of an unknown psalmist’s entry into suffering. There is no appeal to God, nor sign of deliverance. Across a narrative divide the subject of Ps 115:3-10 takes up a static position: he speaks throughout as one delivered, contemplating (repeatedly) a vow of thanksgiving.

<sup>146</sup> V.5 is not present in the OG, doubtless omitted as a duplicate of the later v.9, as reflected in MT (Ps 116:14 cf. v.18). In 115:4 the psalmist pledges to “lift the cup of salvation” (ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήψομαι), while in 115:6, in an intriguing and difficult phrase, he remarks that “precious before the Lord is the death of his holy ones” (τίμιος ἐναντίου κυρίου ὁ θάνατος τῶν ὁσίων αὐτοῦ). MT is more ambiguous at this point (see Emerton 1983).

<sup>147</sup> Accordingly, in Ps 115 at least, the note about death is not biographical but ruminative and speculative, as befits the contemplative disposition of the psalmist from the outset (see on Ps 115:1-3 at various points above). Otherwise Ps 114 (or Ps 116 MT), whose psalmists have had a genuine subjective encounter with death (Ps 114:3; 116:3 MT) which might later be “costed” or “valued” (Ps 115:6; 116:15 MT); but this only on the assumption that the psalmist is among “the righteous” (ὅσιος; Heb. יְדֵי יְדֵי) – a claim we have found unable to secure from Ps 115 itself.

spoken by him; and under its influence, the eucharistic language of v.4 is seen to be uttered by one who commemorates Christ's death, but not – as Christ – his own.

The distinction is worth emphasising: an element of a psalm may be taken to be “about” Christ without the psalm being spoken by him. The act of predication made in the first gesture may lead to the attribution of the second, but the step is highly consequential and by no means automatic. It is possible to abstract an element of a psalm for predication without implying the whole; in construing a speaking subject for that element, however, the invitation is made to take the psalm *in extenso* as that speaker's utterance.<sup>148</sup>

In Rom 15:3 we saw just such a process at work. There, a challenge to predication provoked an act of metalepsis on the part of the reader, by means of which Christ was installed as subject of the quotation and the distich from which it was drawn (3.4.1). Once installed, a modest invitation was made to the reader to extend the range of that subject's experience and the reach of its voice (3.4.2.2). In Rom 15:9, predication was possible without recourse to Ps 17 (4.2.3); nonetheless, the metaleptic extension of Christ's voice within the Davidic psalm was invited by an association with the root of Jesse, brokered by Isaiah in Rom 15:12 (4.5). In an act of metaleptic subversion, Christ's trajectory in the quotation and the ensuing catena was found to be profoundly at odds with the quotation's psalmic context (4.2.2).

The present case bears useful comparison. In support of a Christological reading, Hays offers elements of Ps 115 which stand at some remove from the quotation (Ps 115:1a). In the cases just reviewed, metaleptic extension beyond the immediate context of the quotation (the contributing distich in the case of Rom 15:3) was contingent on having installed Christ as speaker in the quotation itself. But if the immediate psalmic context of the quotation in Rom 15:3 affirmed Christ as speaker, the same cannot be said of Ps 115:1b-2 (see 6.4.4). Without such support, the motivation to seek elsewhere in the psalm for a Christological subject is lacking. In any event, the elements offered by Hays might be Christological in the sense of

---

<sup>148</sup> On this dynamic, see 3.2.2.

being “about” Christ, but they do not construct a Christological subject, so much as a subject which reflects on Christology.<sup>149</sup>

#### 6.5.4.2 “The story” of Ps 115 applied to Christ

Not all constrain themselves to suggestive moments in Ps 115 when reading for Christ. For those who invoke the phantom category of “entire narrative” or “entire story”, the need to ground metaleptic claims in particular texts is diminished.

Salutary is Stegman’s claim: “More important than the allusive echoes is the *story* told in Psalms 114-115 LXX”,<sup>150</sup> which Paul intends the Corinthians to recall in its entirety. Why? “Because, according to the apostle, *these psalms tell the story of Jesus.*”<sup>151</sup> Stegman requires Ps 114 to supply much of the story (see 6.6 below), and the parallels he adduces from Ps 115 are not persuasive.<sup>152</sup>

Campbell does not require Ps 114; he observes serenely (and without notice of particular verses), that Ps 115

[r]eads beautifully as a text that speaks of Christ’s vindication after a period of rejection and suffering. Almost every line can be construed to evoke some aspect of the passion or its consequences. Hence, if Paul is assuming an early Christian reading of this psalm with reference in the first instance to Christ himself, then it speaks of Christ’s ministry; his speech in spite of his impending death; his deep convictions about God; his suffering, death, and subsequent resurrection; and perhaps even his testimony to his community assembled in Jerusalem—in short, it fits that narrative very nicely indeed.<sup>153</sup>

Campbell elides the distinction between predication and attribution: the psalm “speaks of Christ’s ministry” (application); it equally offers “his speech ... his testimony” (attribution). Attribution is in fact what Campbell desires: a Christological speaker for the whole psalm. But without further argument, he gets

---

<sup>149</sup> At some stage in the history of reception, of course, the psalm did indeed come to be taken as an utterance of Christ (at least by the stage of Augustine’s *Enarrationes*, with its principle of *Christus totus*; cf. Linton 1961:155-56); it is entirely possible that the later verses were adduced in support. But as a strategy of reading, such a move has nothing to do with metalepsis, as a synchronic trope located in the act of reading. Rather, it implies a hermeneutical strategy dictated by requirements extrinsic to the reading of the psalm: a strategy capable of passing over such narrative discontinuities and moral ambiguities (see 6.6) as the psalm presents.

<sup>150</sup> Stegman 2007:732, italics original.

<sup>151</sup> Stegman 2007:732, italics original.

<sup>152</sup> Stegman links *πατήριον* in 1 Cor 11:25 with the same in Ps 115:4a, an association we have touched on already (6.5.4.1). To strengthen this, he draws from 1 Cor 11:23, where Jesus is “handed over”; in an extraordinary move, he takes this to be parallel to Ps 115:1b “brought exceedingly low” (2007:732).

<sup>153</sup> Campbell 2009:347-48.

no further than a casually drawn list of predicates. One might have wished for anchor points in the text of the psalm; without them, even these vaguely specified claims for “the entire narrative” of Ps 115 simply float away.

#### **6.5.4.3 Reinforcement? Traces of the psalmist in the Christology of 2 Cor 4**

We might rescue Ps 115 for Paul’s Christology if we could find explicit traces of its psalmist in the Corinthian text. Despite the attempts of these scholars to show otherwise, however, traces of the psalmist of Ps 115 or of Ps 114 in 2 Cor 4 are few and not compelling. The payment of a vow, which is the dominant theme of Ps 115,<sup>154</sup> has no obvious reflex here. The suggestively eucharistic language of Ps 115:4a (ποτήριον σωτηρίου λήψομαι), isolated within the psalm, is without verbal or thematic echo in 2 Cor 4; nor is the eucharist a topic of discourse here. The psalmist styles himself forcefully as the Lord’s servant,<sup>155</sup> a term of significance in Paul, but no less apt to describe the apostle, or all those in Christ, than Christ himself; and attached here only to Paul (2 Cor 4:5). The dramatic self-designation of the psalmist as υἱὸς τῆς παιδείας σου has no trace in 2 Corinthians. And though the dying (νέκρωσις) of Jesus is clearly figured in Paul’s text (as that which we carry about in the body, 4:10), the value or cost of the death (θάνατος) of the Lord’s righteous, strikingly marked in the psalm (Ps 115:6), is unattested in 2 Cor 4. Resurrection is not the experience of the psalmist of Ps 115, who has not encountered death;<sup>156</sup> nor is it held out as a clear prospect, as it is in Paul (2 Cor 4:14).

Thus, there is nothing compelling to suggest Christ as the speaker of the quotation, either in the particularities of its speech, or in the psalm(s) from which it is drawn, or in traces of the psalmist in the Pauline text. Christ may be installed as speaking subject nonetheless; but far better grounds to do so exist in the Pauline text, as we learned earlier (6.2.2.5), than are available in the psalm.

---

<sup>154</sup> Particularly in MT; see 116:14, 18. In Ps 115 it is more *primus inter pares*, insofar as the OG does not render 116:14 MT. Nonetheless, as the psalm draws to its close in Ps 115:9-10, the psalmist offers his first and only answer to the question of 115:3; as signaled in his choice of verb (italicised), it is his vows which shall be repaid: τὰς εὐχὰς μου τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποδώσω. The inclusio created by this language ensures the preeminence of the vow in the psalmist’s intentions. Other candidates are more varied: the psalmist will take the “cup of salvation” (ποτήριον σωτηρίου, 115:4a) and call upon the Lord (115:4b); he will “sacrifice sacrifices” (θύσω θυσίαν, 115:8).

<sup>155</sup> Ps 115:7a: ὦ κύριε ἐγὼ δοῦλος σός ἐγὼ δοῦλος σός.

<sup>156</sup> Resurrection from a subjective experience of death is in view in Pss 114 and 116 MT, as we observed earlier (6.5.4.1 n.147).

## 6.6 Ps 114 (Ps 116:1-9 MT) and the morally simple subject

But what if Ps 115 were reinforced? Others who lay claim to Christological psalmody “behind” Paul’s quotation look to Ps 116 MT, or to Ps 114, which translates its first nine verses. Might it be that Ps 115 came to be thought a Christological psalm on the basis of Ps 116 MT? In which case, its claim requires its pairing with Ps 114.<sup>157</sup>

Certainly, Ps 114 offers to supply a great deal of “backstory” that might enrich the subject of Ps 115; taken together, these psalms better articulate the plot which Hays thinks apt to Christological association. The Hebrew psalm is generically complex, but more-or-less follows the conventions of thanksgiving in its first nine verses. Key to this is a narrative of affliction and deliverance, played out in Ps 116:2-8 MT, and framed by two imperfect verbs that constitute this narrative as aspectually past. In v.1, the declaration of love signifies response to a deliverance already complete, and *וַיִּשְׁמַע* confirms it: YHWH has heard, as the tale to follow will tell. In v.9, capping the story, *וַיִּהְיֶה* signifies a logical future, now realised: the one set free (v.8) shall indeed walk in the land of the living. This psalmist could be said to have experienced a hoped-for resurrection; for those seeking metaleptic support for a Christological psalmist, this is an important point.

Ps 114 does not require Ps 115, though it profits from association with it, and particularly from its later verses. The psalmic subject is a social subject, whose journey of deliverance can only end in community; and the “rest” of Ps 114:7 may well take place in the temple (see Ps 115:9-10). For its part, Ps 114 promises to its

---

<sup>157</sup> Although Stegman requires both Greek psalms to tell Christ’s “story”, it is Schenck (2008) who works hardest to secure Ps 114 as a messianic psalm. Noting the possibility that Paul knew “the shape of the Hebrew Psalter” as well as the Greek tradition, Schenck thinks Ps 114 a plausible candidate for a messianic reading, alongside Ps 115. He observes, “The structure and content of these two psalms are in any case, similar enough to suggest a possible association even if Paul knew them only in their Greek form” (2008:530). In fact, the two psalms are distinct and complementary, and not at all similar; see discussion.

To ground a messianic reading of Ps 114 in early Christianity, Schenck looks to Heb 5:7. There he finds a great “density of echoes to Psalm 114 LXX” (2008:532). In practice, these consist of nothing more than common lexis appearing in both: *εἰσακούω* and *δέησις* in Heb 5:7 and in Ps 114:1-2. Other echoes are fainter: the “precise words” of Ps 114:3-4 “are not echoed in Hebrews, but the meaning is parallel” (2008:531). Similarly vague hand-waving ensues, and the net is not impressive.

sequel a narrative template for suffering and deliverance, and for the performance of belief and of speech; and these, particularly the latter, are just what might be useful at the outset of Ps 115. A full narrative trajectory is traced for the earlier psalmist, in which speech and belief both are richly figured. From the encircling grip of death (Ps 114:3), the psalmist emerges to the land of the living (v.9). Along the way, he has explicitly called on (v.4), or pledged to call on (v.2), the Lord (ἐπικαλέω); yet the narrative is shot through with speech acts.<sup>158</sup> Belief is implicit in the speech acts which frame the psalm: in love's protestation which attends God's anticipated "hearing" in v.1, and in the prospective declaration of moral virtue in v.9. Speech and belief are readily co-figured: believing in God who condescended to him (vv.1-2), the psalmist calls on him (vv.2, 4); calling the soul to rest (v.7), the psalmist proclaims his belief in the soul's moral prospects (v.9).

If permitted to characterise the believing, speaking subject of Ps 115:1-2, the earlier psalm might be thought to endorse a Christological subject. But a close reading of Ps 114 suggests otherwise. In a notable translation move, the OG has substituted a term denoting moral performance (εὐαρεστέω, Ps 114:9) for the morally less specific notion of "walking before the Lord" (הלך, Ps 116:9 MT). In doing so, the Greek text characterises the psalmist's redemption in terms of its moral significance. The translation is not incoherent: one who walks before the Lord does so in moral terms pleasing to him; neither is it without precedent.<sup>159</sup> Yet elsewhere in the psalms, the Hebrew is rendered with πορεύομαι,<sup>160</sup> indicating that the rich connotations of הלך within the phrase may be preserved in Greek without recourse to a different metaphor. Eschewing metaphor, the translation in Ps 114:9 prefers to emphasise the moral expectation laid upon the psalmist. It is not the subject's redeemed life which is in primary view ("walk ... in the land of the living") but what he is to do there under the divine gaze ("be pleasing before the Lord").

If moral uprightness is the outcome of the narrative laid out in the psalm, as v.9 suggests, then it is natural to infer that, prior to redemption, the psalmist is morally

---

<sup>158</sup> Psalms are quintessentially speech, of course, so that every word is implicated in some sort of speech act. Notable in this psalm are the praise of vv.5-6 and the command of v.7 (addressed to the psalmist's soul).

<sup>159</sup> For example, Enoch's walking with God in Gen. 5:22 and 24, which is translated with the same verb.

<sup>160</sup> Ps 43:2; cf. Ps 100:6, in which "walking" is given ethical specification.

deficient in some way. It is thus significant to find the psalmist extolling God's salvation of the  $\nu\eta\pi\iota\alpha$  (114:6a) in the same verse in which his own salvation is summarised (114:6b). The designation  $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$  – the only label offered as self-designation in the psalm – translates the Hebrew  $\text{פְּתִי}$ . This term is drawn from the discourse of wisdom; it suggests someone who is morally deficient, in need of instruction. The waywardness of the  $\text{פְּתִי}$  is often stressed, and sometimes his youth; the  $\text{פְּתָאִים}$  are not simply the  $\text{עֲנָיִים}$  or  $\text{עֲנָיִים}$ , humbly dependent on divine help, but lack the discretion for even such a moral virtue as humility.<sup>161</sup>

It is as  $\text{פְּתִי}$ , or equally as  $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , that the psalmist is delivered. Saved from the low estate to which he was brought, not least (we may infer) by his simplicity (Ps 114:6b), the psalmist no longer stumbles (v.8c); his soul is delivered from death (v.8a); and his tears of suffering are stilled (v.8b). He has been relocated, escaping the realm of  $\alpha\delta\eta\varsigma$  (v.3) so as to be “well-pleasing before the Lord in the land of the living” (v.9).

Such a tale lends a different quality to the acts of believing and speaking we have found variously figured in the psalm, since they emanate from a morally limited subject. This is problematic for the contribution of Ps 114 to the subjectivity of Ps 115, if the latter is to be understood as a Christological psalm; for the  $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is not a righteous sufferer, so much as one who might be made so. Crucially, this subject is

---

<sup>161</sup> In the canonical psalms it appears three times, each translated by  $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ . In Ps 19:8 MT, the law of YHWH makes wise the  $\text{פְּתִי}$ ; in Ps 119:130 MT, the unfolding ( $\text{פְּתַח}$ ) of divine words gives to the  $\text{פְּתָאִים}$  light and understanding. In both cases we may infer that the  $\text{פְּתִי}$  is deficient in moral understanding, not merely humble or abased (as with the  $\text{עֲנָיִים}$  and the  $\text{עֲנָיִים}$  respectively); so also the psalmist of Ps 116 MT (here, v.6). This in turn suggests that the psalmist's salvation (116:6b) consisted in a new moral orientation: in the acquisition of wisdom. Pss 19 MT (vv. 8-12) and 119 MT are focussed on Torah, generically other than Ps 116 MT, but help to identify  $\text{פְּתִי}$  as a term at home in wisdom literature. Not surprisingly, then, all other references to  $\text{פְּתָאִים}$  save one (Ezek 45:20) are found in Proverbs where, however, the term is translated only once by  $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , at 1:32. Here the wayward action ( $\alpha\delta\upsilon\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ ) of the  $\nu\eta\pi\iota\omicron\varsigma$  is noted: his simplicity makes him susceptible to error. Elsewhere in Proverbs this judgement is confirmed and extended, with a consequent variety in the terms used to translate the Hebrew. Sometimes error is stressed, sometimes teachability; occasionally the  $\text{פְּתִי}$  is associated with youthfulness. Cf. Prov 1:4, 22; 7:7; 8:5; 9:4, 6, 16; 14:15, 18; 19:25; 21:11; 22:3; 27:12. Booij (1995:389) offers a useful summary: “He is a human being who by his lack of experience, his credulity and rashness may easily go astray (Ezek 45:20; Prov 7:7ff.) and run into serious problems (Prov 1:32; 7:22-27). Characteristic statements about him are: ‘The  $\text{פְּתִי}$  believes every word’ (Prov 14:15), and: ‘A prudent man sees the danger and hides himself, but the  $\text{פְּתָאִים}$  go on and suffer for it’ (Prov 22:3). So, the  $\text{פְּתִי}$  is not a ‘simple’ person, likely to know that he needs help, but an ‘unsuspecting’ one, likely to be foolish and frivolous as well.” With this characterisation the Pauline author of Ephesians (4:14) is in full sympathy.

not one whose belief and speech (Ps 115:1a) may be thought unimpeachably “true”, such that they enact the “spirit of faith” to which Paul enjoins the Corinthians.<sup>162</sup>

It appears that Ps 114 does not enhance the potential of Ps 115 as a Christological psalm. The earlier psalmist is not one whose “spirit of faith” commends itself for emulation – except in the most general terms – nor whose anticipated deliverance fits the career of Christ who, in Paul’s account at least,<sup>163</sup> needed no moral transformation to be “well-pleasing before the Lord”.

The implications of this are significant for those, like Hafemann, who favour Ps 116 MT as a metaleptic environment for Paul’s quotation, and who find in it a righteous sufferer; for the tale we have told of the Greek psalmist applies *mutatis mutandis* to the Hebrew, where the texts which tell this tale are unified into a singular psalm. Put bluntly, the Hebrew psalm does not invite a Christological subject; or only at a high level of abstraction to which the particular subjectivity of the psalm, and the moral disposition of the psalmist, is irrelevant. Such also may be said of the Greek psalms which translate it.

Are there traces in 2 Cor 4, nonetheless, of the psalmist of Ps 114, representing Ps 116:1-9 MT? As we have seen, this psalm disposes a morally unstable subject (νήπιος); but one whose encounter with death is richly described, as also his

---

<sup>162</sup> In this connection, consider the way Paul uses the term νήπιος elsewhere. There are 10 instances of the term in the acknowledged Paulines, of which five appear in 1 Cor 13:11. The remainder are found in Rom 2:20; 1 Cor 3:1; Gal 4:1; Gal 4:3; and 1 Thess 2:7. At no point does νήπιος connote moral innocence. This is simply not at issue in 1 Thess 2:7, where the metaphor of a mother’s care abstracts the term from a moral frame. But consider Rom 2:20, where Paul poses the nominal Jew, qua teacher, as teacher of children: he is διδάσκαλον νηπίων, in a list which figures “children” in parallel with the foolish (ἄφρων, 2:20a), and alongside the blind (τυφλός, 2:19a), and those in the dark (ἐν σκότει, 2:19b). Further, it is in the role of teacher that the challenge first comes in Rom 2:21: σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκεις; Paul asks, as though “the Jews” were themselves children, and morally deficient, as subsequent challenges prove (Rom 2:21-24). The νήπιος of Gal 4:1-3 is no different from a slave (δοῦλος, 4:1); indeed, as children “we were enslaved” (ἡμεῖς ... ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι, 4:3) to the infamous στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. Most damning of all is 1 Cor 3:1, where to be a child – though in Christ – is to be fleshly (σαρκικός; cf. 3:3), a term rich with moral implication in Paul, especially where contrasted, as here, with “spiritual” (πνευματικός, 3:1a). Such are the Corinthians, addressees also of the present letter, who would surely understand the need to “abolish” (καταργέω) the things of a child (τὰ τοῦ νηπίου, 1 Cor 13:11) in similarly moral terms. The writer to the Ephesians is thus true to Pauline usage, and to the characterisation of the ἡῖ above, when he describes the susceptibility of the νήπιος to being led astray (4:14).

<sup>163</sup> Cf. the perfecting of the Son in Heb 5:7-9: though a son, Jesus learned obedience through what he suffered (ἐμαθεν, Heb 5:8), and so became (morally?) perfect (τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο, Heb 5:9). Yet it is questionable whether, even for the author of Hebrews, the Son might be numbered among the מִצְוָה before obedience was learned.

restoration to the land of the living: a potential metaphor for resurrection. Are there signs of such a subject in 2 Cor 4? None are straightforwardly traceable. A superficial parallel may be drawn between the motifs of death and life as equally present in Paul's text and the psalm; but the interplay of life and death in the two is quite distinct. The psalmist's journey from death to life, grammatical complexities notwithstanding, is a linear, sequential affair. The psalmist encounters death (Ps 114:3); he receives mercy among the *νήπια* (v.6); he is made alive (vv.8-9). The plural subject of 2 Cor 4, in contrast, encounters the agency of death as an ongoing experience; one which gives rise to life in others (4:12), and in "our body", even as it continues in "us" (4:10-11). Resurrection is prospective, to be sure; but anchored clearly to the career of Christ (4:14), who is no *νήπιος*. In sum, the traces are few of this psalmist in 2 Cor 4, vitiated by moral incommensurability.

## **6.7 The Christological psalmist and the limits of metalepsis**

### **6.7.1 Installing the Christological psalmist**

#### **6.7.1.1 A cumulative case for Christ as the quotation's subject**

We have examined, at length, the candidacy of Christ as speaking subject of Paul's enigmatic quotation in 2 Cor 4:13. Our examination has been wide-ranging, encompassing multiple kinds of evidence from various textual and intertextual domains. Our most profitable domain has been the broader Pauline corpus, largely beyond 2 Corinthians. Acknowledging the logical possibility of a singular identification of Christ as a believing, speaking subject, we have found nonetheless extensive evidence of Paul's willingness to figure Christ as a speaker, above all in quotations of psalmody. Although we have not found any figuration of Christ as one who believed, outside the disputed *πίστις Χριστοῦ* formulations, we have seen that his speech acts imply in many cases a deep-seated belief or trust which might give rise to speech. Thus, the apparent singularity of 2 Cor 4:13 is qualified; Paul makes explicit a connection which elsewhere is implicit, awaiting inference.

Not the least incentive for Paul to install Christ as speaker, rather than a subject less prestigious, are his multiple calls for identification with a Christological psalmist (in Rom 15), and enactment of the same (in 2 Cor 1). Insofar as such identification is mimetic in its entailments, the assertion of a Christological psalmist and his imitator in 2 Cor 4:13 is entirely plausible. In light of such arguments, 2 Cor 4:13 is neither novel nor aberrant, but represents an extension or development of Paul's appropriation of Christological psalmody. It is fitting, indeed, to learn that the repristination of speech, foreclosed in David (2.6), is found in the imitation of Christ, who speaks true.

Notwithstanding, we have cast doubt on many, but not all, arguments for a Christological subject from clues in 2 Cor 4. In particular, though we have found Jesus richly implicated as a co-agency in Paul's apostolic narrative, just as our reading of 2 Cor 1 would lead us to discover, we have not been able to commend attempts to secure Jesus as the subject of his own sub-structural narrative evoked by Paul's account. At first blush, this makes Christ's entry on the rhetorical stage at 4:13 something of a surprise. Yet if not a subject, Christ is at least figured as a co-agency in Paul's account prior to quotation; and just a little further back in 4:5, Jesus Christ is proclaimed as κύριος, an act by which his candidacy, authority and desirability as a speaking subject are clearly secured.

The immediate environment of the quotation offered us particular signs of hospitality to Christ. In the logic of imitation, and the grounds offered for it in 4:14, we saw further reasons to promote Christ as the quotation's subject. In particular, we saw that if Christ is he who believed and spoke, the fact of his resurrection closely motivates the imitation of 4:13b, and provides the surest grounds for the confident declaration of 4:14. While not conclusive, the improved reading confirms the fit of Christ as subject in 4:13.

On the nearer side of the quotation, as we saw, Paul's elaborate setup prepares the reader to expect a normative, authoritative, representative psalmist: the personal embodiment of the spirit of faith. Such a role is, we argued, well-suited to Christ, and a plausible extension of the role he has assumed in other Pauline quotations. In Romans he has shown himself a masterful, if particular, psalmist; here, in 2 Cor

4:13, the mastery displayed in such particular moments is formally recognised in his general installation as the representative psalmist.

This is not a role which expects a particular psalmist drawn from a particular psalm. Yet of all the domains plundered by others to support Christ as psalmist in 2 Cor 4:13, the psalm, or psalms, from which Paul's quotation is drawn is pre-eminent. We have accordingly devoted a good deal of energy to exploring the metaleptic potential of three candidate psalms, and have obtained a significantly negative result. The only closely motivated metaleptic account, which depends on material local to the site of quotation, fails to yield a subject suited to imitation, which Paul clearly requires. Other metaleptic accounts have proven ill-motivated; yet if pursued, they either yield a morally inadequate subject likewise unsuited to imitation (Pss 114 and 116 MT) or simply fail to install a Christological subject (Ps 115), worthy of imitation though he be.

#### **6.7.1.2 A rhetorical strategy for installation**

Ours has been a complex, cumulative case for Christ as the subject of Paul's quotation. Given our focus throughout this study on the rhetorical dimension of Paul's text, in which the reader is involved in installation of a quotation's subject, and in exploring metaleptic options, we must ask how much of the case we have mounted is discernible to the reader of 2 Corinthians. The question is acute because the most compelling evidence we have found lies *outside* 2 Corinthians.

There is no question that the quotation presents greater ambiguity for a reader without access to other Pauline material, than to a reader in our position.

Nonetheless, the Christological psalmist enters upon a stage well prepared for his entry. Five distinct rhetorical movements have been involved, which may be ordered in terms of the reader's experience.

The first is the key notice of proclamation in 2 Cor 4:5, by which "Jesus Christ" is hailed as a subject well capable of authoritative speech. "Jesus" is then figured throughout Paul's narrative of death and life (4:7-12) as a co-agency, recalling his similar roles in the programmatic opening to the letter. Though not a subject in these verses, the reader is alert to the significance of Jesus, and is willing to hear from the κύριος.

The second movement, discussed in 6.3, is a formal circumscription of the psalmist's voice by the assertion of writtenness and the personalising claims of the spirit of faith. The rhetorical effect of these complex gestures is to establish the quoted subject as the personal representative not of a particular psalm but of all psalmody, able to state its normative testimony with full authority. For the reader, this might be the Christ proclaimed in 4:5, but no clear sign is given.

In keeping with that effect, the quotation itself is found to be underdetermined (6.2.1), suited to abstraction, apt therefore to encode the broad-ranging declaration of a representative subject, yet inviting the reader to adduce contexts in the service of predication.

In the search for context we saw the successive failure of metaleptic options to yield an imitable, much less a Christological, subject (6.4-6.6). Though dissatisfying for accounts which insist on metaleptic reinforcement, this rhetorical denial of context satisfies the text's desire for a representative, not a particular, psalmist, and for an unconstrained testimony.

Finally (6.2.2.3), in a retrospective gesture, the firm datum of the resurrection invoked in 4:14 supplies a warrant for the imitator's belief, and so confirms Christ for the quotation; yet it does not particularise his speech, or demand so specific a belief as to overcome the representative potential of his role as the subject of psalmody. This is a striking result: Christ is now revealed to the reader as the psalmic "spirit of faith"; the act of imitation, already read, is seen to be no less than the *imitatio Christi*, figured precisely as an imitation of psalmody's definitive subject in its testimony.

Whether Paul intends it or not, the rhetorical payoff of the text's strategy is significant. By means of an elaborate setup, the reader is led to expect an authoritative personal subject able to represent the fullness of psalmic testimony; a Christological candidate is available in the background, but does not step forward to claim the role. What the reader gets in quotation is enigma: an indeterminate subject offered strongly and precisely for imitation, but unfigurable (should the

reader attempt it) from its domicile in particular psalms. It is notice of the resurrection which brings closure, and confirms the prestigious subject long desired.

### **6.7.2 What does the psalmist believe and therefore speak?**

Christ is the speaking subject of Paul's quotation in 2 Cor 4:13, whose testimony of believing and speaking represents the spirit of faith characteristic of biblical psalmody. Is it possible to give more precision to his testimony than its spare form offers? Can we say what Christ the psalmist believed, and what he therefore said?

The evidence we drew from the form of imitation (4:13b) and its warrant in 4:14 implies a close correlation between an imitator, who believes in the prospect of resurrection, and the psalmist. But it does not require absolute identity between every act of the two. In this connection, note the repetition of *καί* in 4:13b (*καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν*). Where the first is needed to denote the correspondence, the second draws attention to a formal imitation in terms of structure or logic, rather than (necessarily) of content. What signifies is not identity between predicates, but the link between belief and speech.

For this reason, it is not necessary to suggest that Christ believed in the prospect of his resurrection. Reviewing the speech of Christ elsewhere in Paul, and the disposition of belief that might have given rise to it, we have seen evidence of deep-seated trust in God, whether as Father (Gal 4:6-7, Rom 8:15); as the rightful object of worship and public profession (Rom 15:9); or as one intimately disposed toward the subject, such that the experience of reproach may be shared (Rom 15:3). Taken together, such evidence could suggest a range of predicates, but privilege none. If pressed, it favours a reading of *πιστεύω* in terms of trust in an intimate Father, rather than of particular propositional beliefs.

This is, in fact, what we should prefer for a subject expected to represent the fullness of psalmic testimony: not a propositional belief, but an all-encompassing trust in God the Father, whose Son Christ is.<sup>164</sup> In the same way, we do not need to

---

<sup>164</sup> The logic of imitation therefore runs: Christ trusted in God and therefore spoke; also we trust in God and therefore speak; for we know (particularising trust) that the God who raised Jesus from the dead will also raise us with him, etc. Christ's trust in his Father, vindicated by his resurrection, is what we imitate, knowing that we also shall be raised.

attach specific predicates to Christ's speech; it is enough for imitation to say that Christ's trust in his Father empowered him to speak freely – allowing for the full range of such speech, all of it bold, that we have discerned elsewhere in Paul. This speech is appropriate to psalmody's generic representative.

It is in the imitator's speech, likewise issuing from trust, that speaking gains specific predicates. Represented as speaking (λαλέω) only in direct imitation of the psalmist (4:13b), "we" who imitate are nonetheless verbal actors in 2 Cor 4, whose defining activity is proclamation (κηρύσσω, 4:5). Proclamation is the last named of "our" acts before affliction is detailed (4:8-9), and thus the best available candidate for the content of speaking in 4:13b. Thus the imitating subject, emboldened<sup>165</sup> by trust in God the Father – imitating Christ's trust, knowing the vindication of that trust in Christ's resurrection – proclaims Christ as risen Lord, and himself as the servant of others (2 Cor 4:5).

## 6.8 Conclusions

With Christ's installation as the voice of psalmody, and Paul's insistent imitation, the themes we have been developing throughout our study come to striking fruition. Paul here declares his identification with Christ as psalmist, and so enacts the suture implied in 2 Cor 1 and urged in Rom 15.

This is no ordinary psalmist. In what amounts to the apotheosis of the psalmic subject, Christ himself assumes the role of its authoritative representative, and distills the speech of the psalmist, as the "spirit of faith", to that which arises from trust in God the Father. That speech we have seen elsewhere in Paul, orientated to God, voiced among and for the other.

If Christ is the psalmist, then to imitate him is also to speak by way of proclamation (4:5). Thus the imitator trusts also in God the Father, and proclaims Jesus Christ as Lord, and himself as the servant of others for the sake of Jesus. The *imitatio Christi* is thereby shown to be not a slavish replication of Christ's acts, but an extension of

---

<sup>165</sup> Such a subject will not "lose heart" (ἐγκακέω); see 4:16; 4:1.

them, characterised by the same spirit of faith, orientated to God, voiced among and for the other. The proclamation of the self as servant confirms the other-orientation of Christ's speech, just as we have seen elsewhere.

As we have noted elsewhere in our study,<sup>166</sup> the imitation of Christ the psalmist is the foundation of hope; here, nurtured in trust of God the Father, and grounded in resurrection past and future. Equally, the imitation of Christ entails the re-orientation of speech. No longer is every mouth silenced (Rom 3:19);<sup>167</sup> instead, the mouth is opened to speak in praise and proclamation.

Strikingly, the psalm or psalms from which the quotation is drawn have failed to contribute anything of significance to the quotation's subject. Metalepsis, invited by an underdetermined subject, yields a negative result. Rom 15:9 presented a somewhat similar scenario. In both cases, we have learned that Paul stands under no obligation to install Christ in sympathetic environments, though he is entirely capable of doing so (as in Rom 15:3). Yet the reasons for deploying unsympathetic intertexts are distinct in each case; for in Romans, Paul appears concerned to limit Christ's debt to a Davidic subject, while here, he requires a generic subject that cannot be co-opted to any particular psalm.

With these discoveries, our explorations in Christological psalmody come to an end. It is time to draw the threads together.

---

<sup>166</sup> See 3.5.3, 5.2.4.2.

<sup>167</sup> See Gaventa 2008 on the redemption of human speech.

# 7. In conclusion: metalepsis and the Christological revision of psalmody in Paul

---

## 7.1 Introduction

What have we learned from our study of Christological psalmody in Paul? Ours has been a complex and multi-threaded study pursued across a range of complex texts. Although we reviewed our discoveries at the end of each chapter,<sup>1</sup> with an eye to their cumulative import, there is merit in pursuing a synthetic account, lest we lose the wood for the trees. That account is duly offered here.

Though our examination of David and of Christ as speaking subjects has encompassed a large proportion of acknowledged quotations of the psalms in Paul, it remains a modest textual sample. Wider conclusions about Pauline intertextuality must be considered provisional; the more so when the workings of metalepsis, critical to our account, have proved so variable in effect. Notwithstanding, some clear and significant patterns may be discerned.

Our concluding observations accordingly address four areas: 1) Christ as a subject in psalmic quotations; 2) the Christological psalmist and his deployment in Paul; 3) the workings of metalepsis in psalm quotations, and methodological issues arising; and 4) Paul and the hermeneutics of Christological psalmody.

---

<sup>1</sup> See 2.6, 4.6 (encompassing Chapter 3), 5.5, 6.8.

## 7.2 The Christological subject

### 7.2.1 How the Christological subject is installed

#### **Paul's rhetorical strategy for offering a Christological subject to psalmody is consistently indirect**

At no point does Christ introduce his own speech with λέγω or γράφω. Such indirection may reflect the relative novelty of a Christological hermeneutic for psalmody. David, long accustomed to representing psalmody as its speaking subject, is named twice for quotations in Paul.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, Paul's treatment of Christ is, in formal terms, predicative: an utterance drawn from psalmody "applies" to Christ in some way. The installation of Christ as speaker is not formally required, however it may be invited; it may be that the convention which licenses such an inference was not yet so well established as to encourage Paul to make that inference explicit.

#### **The reader must predicate each quotation of Christ, then attribute it to him**

Faced with authorial indirection, the reader's rhetorical labour is considerable. A preliminary task of predication is posed, in which the content of the psalmist's utterance must be "applied" to Christ. Once achieved, a logically straightforward step ensues by which Christ is installed as a self-predicating subject; in other words, as speaker. This step, encouraged by the text in each instance we have reviewed, is highly significant, for the one who takes up the role of speaker may say more than is given him to say; he may become a psalmist, not merely the subject of a quoted utterance.

The steps of predication and installation have taken various forms in the quotations we have studied. In Rom 15:3 predication was a particular challenge, one which involved a metaleptic appeal to the quotation's immediate context in Ps 68, and which demanded a subject for its various referents to be decided (3.2.2). In Rom 15:9 the preceding verses were sufficient to predicate a quotation of Christ, and to install him as speaker (4.2.1.2), though only in Isaiah's declaration in Rom 15:12 was his identity secured (4.5). In 2 Cor

---

<sup>2</sup> See 2.2.

4:13 the work of predication was retrospective. Encouraged by Paul's elaborate setup to name a prestigious personal speaker (6.3.2), the reader does so only as notice of the resurrection of Jesus in 2 Cor 4:14 brings Christ to the fore (6.7.1.2), a subject figured clearly in 2 Cor 4:5 (as "Jesus Christ") but only as co-agency thereafter (6.2.2.5). Massively underdetermined, the quotation can scarcely be "applied", strongly inviting a speaking subject to enrich its speech; hence, the reader awards the role to Christ.

### **The reader's hermeneutical labour ensures investment in the Christological subject toward the prospect of imitation**

By virtue of her labours in the service of the Christological psalmist, Paul's reader becomes significantly invested in his subjectivity. One fruit of this investment is an impulse to metaleptic extension (3.4.2.2), as the Christological subject hard won is invited to extend his claim. A second fruit is the possibility of suture to the trajectory offered by this subject, whether within the psalm (3.4.2.2), across multiple psalms (4.2.3), or throughout psalmic discourse (6.7.1). By these means Paul positions the Christological psalmist in terms suited to imitation.

## **7.2.2 The rhetorical achievements of the Christological subject**

### **Christ's rhetorical achievements stand in contrast with David's**

The voices of Christ and of David are by no means "virtually interchangeable"<sup>3</sup> in Paul. To the contrary: we observed a striking contrast between them, specifically in the agency of their voices. Unlike Christ, David is named twice as speaker; yet his voice was closely circumscribed, as we saw at length in Chapter 2. In particular, David's installation as speaker does not license the metaleptic extension of his voice. In the sole instance where his testimony is prolonged (Rom 3:10-18), he is not named; rather, his speech is co-opted to the voice of Law, which brings all speech to nought (2.4). Elsewhere, he is pre-empted by Paul (2.3), and even his explicit testimony corrected (2.5).

---

<sup>3</sup> Hays 2005:108 n.22.

## **Christ's rhetorical achievements are shown in varied intertextual agency**

The intertextual agency of Christ's voice is quite different. Revealed in Rom 15:3 as a fitting subject for a quotation from Ps 68, Christ is found able to bring it to clear and forceful speech, apt to the social realities faced by Paul's Roman readers (3.4.2). In Rom 15:4 Christ's inhabitation of the psalm is now shown to engender hope, beyond the capacity of the psalm to provide (3.5.3). Vividly installed as subject at the outset of the catena in Rom 15:9-12, Christ is revealed as a strong director, able to align the diverse witness of scripture with his gaze. When metalepsis finds him in conflict with the Davidic or Mosaic testimony near the site of quotation, it is Christ's perspective, amply reinforced in its Roman context, which prevails (4.2.3, 4.3.2). In 2 Cor 4:13, finally, Christ transcends the conventional possibilities of metalepsis to distil and articulate the testimony of a representative biblical psalmist (6.3.2, 6.7.1). These results make it clear that, as a rhetorical subject, Christ does not require metaleptic reinforcement to bolster or validate his presence or his claims (further, 7.5.1).

In sum, the rhetorical effect of Paul's strategies is to constitute Christ as one who supplants David as the representative subject of psalmic speech. Where David is disempowered as a rhetorical agent, Christ is altogether empowered, not least at David's expense (further, 7.5).

## **7.3 The Christological psalmist**

### **7.3.1 Invested in ecclesiology, and to theocentric ends**

The Christological psalmist is an agency for the other, under the aegis of the divine agent, and for his glory, in an arrangement expressed schematically in 2 Cor 1:4-7 (5.2). Indeed, whether as psalmist, or equally as rhetorical agent, Christ is closely invested in ecclesiology, and always to a theocentric end. Thus in Rom 15:3 the metaleptic invocation of "your house" poses a problem of reference for a Christological subject, which is resolved when the people of God, and not the temple, are read (3.4.1.5). It is Christ, therefore, who brings the church into focus. Yet by insisting that reproach shared proximately with others is in fact a sharing in *divine* reproach, Christ confers on the spoken subject an identity figured in theocentric terms (3.4.1.6). In Rom 15:4-6 the

corporate process of conformation to Christ as psalmist leads to the unification of praise, whose unambiguous object is God (3.6). In Rom 15:7-12 the rhetorical agency of Christ as the one whose gaze is represented in the catena is grounded in an eschatological act of welcome (Rom 15:7) – already coordinated with God’s own (Rom 14:3) – which constitutes the life of the church for the glory of God (4.2.3). That life is figured above all in corporate worship, to which the agency of Christ is devoted, and which consists in the confession of God (Rom 15:9). The pattern continues in 2 Cor 4, in which the imitation of the Christological psalmist (4:13) is made proximately to serve the church (τὰ γὰρ πάντα δι’ ὑμᾶς; 4:15a), but is ultimately εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (4:15b).

### **7.3.2 Christological psalmody in the formation of character**

#### **Paul deploys every instance of Christological psalmody toward imitation**

Paul offers the Christological psalmist for imitation, in a gesture marked explicitly for Rom 15:3 in 15:4; warranted for Rom 15:9 in 15:7; derived via the logic of participation in 2 Cor 1:4-7; and transparently enacted in 2 Cor 4:13. Although the sample is small, this consistent finding is significant, signalling Paul’s recognition that Christological acts appropriately rendered in the speech of a psalmist are appropriate also for imitation. In one stroke, Paul invites his readers to conform to Christ, and lends a strong endorsement to the truth value of psalmic speech in Christ – a value declared null by Law when in the mouth of David (2.4.1).

What specific acts does Christ perform, that we should imitate them? In Rom 15:3, Christ – not “pleasing himself” – displays zeal for God’s οἶκος, and so comes to share in the reproach of those who constitute that οἶκος, which is itself the reproach of God (3.4.1.6). In Rom 15:9 he performs the role of psalmist, confessing and worshipping God among the welcomed Gentiles (4.2-4.4). In 2 Cor 4:13 he represents all of psalmody in a declaration of intimate trust and the speech which it engenders. To imitate this psalmist is to proclaim the Lordship of the one imitated and the servanthood of the imitator (2 Cor 4:5, 13b; 6.7.2); as such, to dispose one’s agency for the other (Rom 15:3), and to enact the welcome of Christ (Rom 15:7) in the common

praise of God (Rom 15:9ff). This last act renders the imitator himself a performer of psalmody.

### **Paul's text invites the reader – and all readers – to suture with the Christological psalmist**

By virtue of its rhetorical indirection, the invitation of Paul's text to the reader has not been just to imitate the acts of the psalmist disclosed in speech, but also, through her labours in predication, attribution and metaleptic extension, to invest in the subjectivity of the psalmist, a possibility to which psalmody, as first-person discourse, is particularly apt (1.3.2.3). The rhetorical work of the text at each site of quotation has varied in form but been consistent in effect. Thus in Rom 15:3, the reader is enjoined to extend Christ's speech throughout the quoted verse (3.4.1.4), and even beyond it (3.4.2.2); in Rom 15:9, to entrain her gaze to Christ's own throughout the ensuing catena (4.1.2); in 2 Cor 4:13, to recognise and prize the newly installed psalmist as psalmody's true and authoritative representative (6.7.1). In each case the Christological subject is made ever more potent and desirable through the reader's engagement. Just as the psalmist is apt for imitation, so this subject is apt for suture.

Paul confirms this aptitude in the dramatic death and reconstitution of the subject in 2 Cor 1:8-11. In that transformed subject we find the expected form of imitation richly represented: agency not for the self but for the other (5.4.2.2); profound trust in the divine agent (5.4); the manifold performance of thankful praise (5.4.2.1).

At various points we have noted how Paul's text extends the reach of his invitation beyond specific addressees, or narrowly defined first-person subjects, to a broader group comprising all in Christ. Thus, incorporative categories ensure that more than the strong are addressed in Rom 15:3 (3.3.4). The ever-widening gaze of Christ, to which the reader is entrained, ensures the broadest possible subject for the worshipful imitation of Christ (4.4). Under the modal influence of psalmody, the first person plural subject of 2 Cor 1 is relentlessly incorporative (5.3.3.4), while the representative subject of 2 Cor 4:13, particular to no psalm, invites any and all to join its declaration (6.3.2).

## **Paul is alert to the formative potential of Christological psalmody**

The consistency of these effects gives the impression that Paul is alert to the power of Christological psalmody to shape the one who performs it, knowing whose speech she enacts. This we have found specifically endorsed (3.5.2), and illustrated in Paul's willingness to specify the outcomes of conformation with the psalmist, in deed and in speech. Endurance (ὑπομονή) and hope (ἐλπίς) are explicit (Rom 15:4; 2 Cor 1:6-7) and implicit, severally and together, the two mutually implicated (2 Cor 1:6-7; 5.2.4.2).

It is specifically *Christological* psalmody that functions this way. As we saw in Rom 15:3-4, it fell to Christ to bring to his occupation of Ps 68 a hope only briefly signalled there (3.5.3). That which anchors hope lies beyond the psalmist's native prospects, in a prospective resurrection with Christ (2 Cor 4:14). For his part, David serves more often to bring judgment (Rom 3:10-18; Rom 11:9-10) than to articulate a basis for hope (Rom 4:6-7).

## **Underwritten by a logic of participation, suture with the Christological psalmist reconstitutes the agency of the self**

The reader's investment in Christological subjectivity is not only engendered at sites of quotation, but required explicitly in the logic of participation set out in 2 Cor 1:4-7 (5.2). By that logic the one who participates in the Christological psalmist experiences a thoroughgoing revision of the self in relation to God and to the community of faith. The reconfiguration of agency is at the heart of this revision.

Negatively, we saw in Paul's pre-emptive gloss of David's testimony in Rom 4:6-7 a denial of agency of the self for itself in respect of penitence (2.3.2, 2.6). Positively, in Rom 15:3, Christ is offered explicitly as one who did not please himself. In Rom 15:9, modelling the welcome of 15:7, he enters into communal worship among the very nations whom David, in Ps 17, cruelly subordinates (4.2.2). In 2 Cor 4:13 the imitation of Christ entails a proclamation which includes the self's service to others for the sake of Christ (2 Cor 4:5). The structure of agency for the other is laid out in 2 Cor 1:4-7 (5.2.3), and demonstrated in the death of the self for itself, and life as co-agency for the other, in the drama of reciprocity in 2 Cor 1:8-11 (5.3.3.7, 5.4).

## 7.4 Psalmody and the workings of metalepsis

### 7.4.1 Metalepsis is notionally simple, but complex in rhetorical life

Our account of metalepsis in Paul has taken it to be a species of rhetorical trope properly centred in the act of reading (1.2). Inclined to construe authorial intention, a competent reader interprets signals in the text as inviting or discouraging metaleptic extension beyond the site of quotation. The reader pursues such extension with the object of completing the figure. Conflicting signals may be taken to license metalepsis, but encourage the reader to construe a subversive intention on the part of the author. An unsympathetic reader may of course pursue metalepsis even where all textual signals converge on negative intent.

Such an account does not privilege a particular image of the author, save in one respect only, that he is well versed in the scriptural texts from which he quotes (1.1.3). Otherwise, he is not presumed to be interested in metalepsis in any or every case; nor, when metaleptically interested, is he presumed to require a sympathetic fit between what appears in quotation and such material as is likely to be transumed (1.2.3). Not least for this reason, he is not presumed always cognisant of which contexts would serve to *complete* a given metaleptic figure; it is the reader who constructs the author as so cognisant.

Characterised in this way, the figure of metalepsis may be expected to enjoy a varied rhetorical life; and so we have found. In the guise of competent reader, we have encountered a range of textual strategies to encourage or discourage metalepsis. We have found it to be required in the service of predication (Rom 15:3; 3.4.1.4); licensed toward subversion (Rom 15:9; 4.2.3); sublimated in a call for representative, not particular, context (2 Cor 4:13; 6.3.2, 6.7.1.1). In cases of Davidic testimony, we have found metalepsis foreclosed (Rom 4:6; 2.3.1); generically excluded (Rom 3:10-18; 2.4.2); even contradicted (Rom 11:9-10; 2.5.2). The variety is considerable, and entirely to be expected; but significant generalisations can be made; cf. 7.4.2.

## 7.4.2 Metaleptic domains in psalmody

The quotations we have focussed on, which represent a significant subset of Pauline quotations from the psalms, have yielded two primary domains for metalepsis. The first has been local to the site of quotation, defined minimally by the syntactic unit from which a given quotation is drawn, and maximally by the parallel distich, a rhetorical unit ubiquitous in biblical psalmody. The second has been an encyclopaedic domain un beholden to any particular psalm.

### **Paul's rhetorical strategies demonstrate the coherence of the poetic distich for metalepsis**

We saw many examples of the first domain. Thus, in Rom 15:3 Paul quotes the second half of Ps 68:10; but the ensuing problem of predication calls for the first half of that verse. That half is quoted by John (2:17), indirectly confirming the integrity of the distich (3.4.1.4). In 2 Cor 4:13 an underdetermined quotation (Ps 115:1a) can be resolved by metaleptic extension to the limits of a distich (Ps 115:1-2; 6.4), which is clearly known to Paul (6.4.1); though the subject figured thereby cannot be offered for imitation (6.4.4). In Rom 4:7 Paul leaves the parallel structure of Ps 31:2 incomplete, for reasons which, as we learned (2.3.2), betoken his awareness of how the verse concludes, and his desire to avoid its transumption. Negatively, in Rom 15:9 Paul quotes the entirety of a distich in Ps 17:50, requiring no specific metaleptic complement; similarly in Rom 11:9-10 (2.5), examples which suggest the rhetorical integrity of such units.

### **Christ's status as representative psalmist licenses an encyclopaedic metalepsis**

The second domain we saw strikingly invoked in 2 Cor 4:13. Constructed in part on the ruins of metaleptic appeal to Ps 115 (6.4, 6.5), and in particular to its distinctive opening distich (6.4), the Christological subject of Paul's quotation was instead shown to be the representative of psalmody in general (6.3.2). As such, it constituted as a domain for extension the full range of psalmody; not, to be sure, along literary lines, as though to encompass Pss 1-150; but rather discursive, such that any and all biblical psalmody might be invoked, construed as the believing speech of the spirit of faith. Such a

domain is encyclopaedic in Eco's sense (1.3.1.2), both in its potential range (unlimited), and in the way a reader might discover metaleptic connections within it.

### **7.4.3 Psalmody, metalepsis, and the flaws of Haysian methodology**

Our assessments of metaleptic possibility have been meticulous in their attention to local context, neutral with respect to authorial interest, and sufficiently careful as to challenge the prospect of metaleptic "success" as often as to approve it. In evaluating alternative metaleptic accounts, we noted a frequent failure of methodological constraint at just these points, confirming the assumptions we observed in 1.2.4.

#### **Presuming sympathy, metaleptic accounts select intertexts arbitrarily**

On several occasions we encountered metaleptic claims which involved the selection of multiple sympathetic intertexts, while ignoring unsympathetic texts more salient to metaleptic view; cf. 2 Cor 4:13 (6.4.4); Rom 15:3 (3.4.1.3); Rom 15:9 (4.2.2). These claims we judged arbitrary, insofar as they discount the question of metaleptic domain (1.3.1.3). Underwriting the arbitrary practice of such accounts we found the unexamined presumption of authorial sympathy – or of the author's desire for readers' sympathy – with textual precursors, and of the text as patent of wide metaleptic extension on the part of readers.

#### **Appeals to abstract narrative schemas undermine the particularity of psalms as domains for metalepsis**

In a related strategy, we saw a tendency to abandon the requirement for detailed correspondences between said and unsaid in favour of narrative schemas to which entire psalms might be co-opted, given a sufficiently high level of abstraction; cf. Ps 68 in Rom 15:3 (3.4.1.2); Ps 115 in 2 Cor 4:13 (6.5.4.2). The coherence of such claims was compromised both by the schematic abstraction involved and by the generic conventionality of psalmody (1.3.1.3), such that not the donor psalm only but entire genres of psalmody might qualify as salient. As a result, claims for the salience of the donor psalm in particular, under a given narrative schema, were evacuated of real force.

### **A careless reader and an unsympathetic text**

The net effect of these methodological failures is to construct an unflattering image of Paul as a careless reader, one content either to read generically, without close attention to textual particulars, or to read with an eye to particularity, but in arbitrarily selective fashion; in both respects, in imitation of his modern readers. In turn, the text constructed for such a reader is broadly unsympathetic: not patent of narrative exposition except at a high level of abstraction, but offering selective, fragmentary sympathy with authorial discourse. This is not the image of Paul or of his text desired by the Haysian project.

## **7.5 Paul and the hermeneutics of Christological psalmody**

### **A close reader who does not always require a sympathetic text**

A different tale of author and text is offered by our study, which has, we may hope, avoided the pitfalls of other readings sketched above. The author suggested by our study is a sophisticated and competent reader, genuinely alert to the contexts of his quoted speech; but he is not one who imagines or requires those contexts to be always sympathetic. Nor, necessarily, is he inclined himself to endorse every subject he invokes. Accordingly, while he appears concerned variously to empower or disempower metaleptic activity, it is not simply on the basis of whether metaleptically transumed context is thought ill-suited. The truth is a little more complex.

Paul's treatment of Davidic speech reveals an author willing at times to foreclose against metalepsis where this would qualify the force of quoted speech (2.4), or else to use the Davidic signifier to distance his own discourse from the further testimony of the psalmist (2.3, 2.5). This second, aggressive use of "David" suggests a contrarian author willing to assert the novelty of his readings, a picture confirmed in the installation of Christ within Davidic psalmody, and particularly in Paul's misprision of Ps 17:50 at Rom 15:9 (4.2.2). Such evidence argues that, whatever his nominal claims, Paul's interest in Davidic messianism as a substantive source for Christological reflection is either negligible, or negative.

Only once does Christ's installation within psalmody invite sympathetic extension by metalepsis; indeed, as we saw, Rom 15:3 *required* it in the service of interpretation (3.4.1). But this appears to be exceptional. Elsewhere, Christ commands the voice of psalmody without requiring metaleptic support. Indeed, more than once he is in conflict with the narrative context of his quoted speech (at Rom 15:9, 4.2.2; at 2 Cor 4:13, 6.4.3). But where Christ is subject, Paul does not trouble to defend his speech against metaleptic incursion.

### **Heuristic or dialectic? Paul's approach to Christological and Davidic psalmody**

At the beginning of our study we agreed with Hays that the way in which Paul's tropes "worked" in his texts had much to say about his scriptural hermeneutic (1.1.2). We have examined a modest but significant selection of quotations in Paul, and sought to determine the workings of metalepsis in relation to each. Though we have found in Paul a thoughtful, careful reader of the texts he quotes, we have not, for the most part, found scripture dialectically voiced. In his appropriation of Davidic discourse, whether in David's name, or in the name of Law, or in Christ's, Paul has acted heuristically, reconfiguring psalmic language and conceptuality into his own symbolic world,<sup>4</sup> at times drawing attention, via metalepsis, to his audacious reading. Nowhere is this clearer than in 2 Cor 4:13, where Christ assumes the role typically accorded David, dissociating himself from the particularities of local psalmic context in order to co-opt all psalmody to his voice.

Paul is not reading heuristically at every point, however. A dialectical quality subsists in Paul's evocation of Ps 68 at Rom 15:3, though it falls to Christ to constitute the psalm as an instrument of hope, revealing who holds sway in the dialectic (3.5.3). Of all the passages we have considered, however, it is in 2 Cor 1, where there is no quotation, and no clear stimulus to metalepsis, that Paul's hermeneutic in respect of psalmody is most richly displayed. In an environment "thick" with psalmic categories, the co-option of *θλιψις* to the *παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is dialectical in structure; but it is the Christological category which is decisive. As if dramatising this very truth, Paul describes the death and remaking of the psalmist in his own biography, whose result is a fundamental and far-reaching revision of the psalmic self in its agency. Is Paul "reading" dialectically

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Hays 2005:175.

here? Yes: for this is a richly figured psalmist, who brings to Paul's discourse the classic categories of suffering and of hope. But the psalmist is not merely "reconfigured"<sup>5</sup> in the Christological environment of Paul's discourse; he is brought beyond despair to death, and only thence to life. The psalmist is silenced before he enters into praise.

The voice of David is stilled; the voice of Christ will be heard. Hail Christ the psalmist! Christ in whom the psalmist is remade: in whose voice is the renewal of song.

---

<sup>5</sup> Hays 2005:5.

## Coda: Psalm 152 (apocryphal)

*Of David*

You have stilled my voice, O Lord

You have stilled my tongue

My lips move but there is no sound

There is neither sound nor echo

I open my mouth to cry out to you

To call for your salvation

To declare my sin

But you have stopped my mouth

And I am mute, a dumb beast before you

*Selah*

I will let others speak on my behalf

They will call to you, and be found by you

They will say, "O Lord, rescue!"

They will cry out, "O Lord, save your servant!"

For with you is salvation, and with you is hope

You are my hope and my salvation

You are their God, and will hear them,

You will answer from heaven

And will save your servant

Therefore will I trust you

And therefore will I speak

Therefore will I confess you

And therefore will I sing

Therefore will I be zealous for your house, O Lord!

## Bibliography

- Abasciano, Brian J. "Diamonds in the rough: a reply to Christopher Stanley concerning the reader competency of Paul's original audiences." *Novum Testamentum* 49/2 (2007): 153-83.
- Alexander, W M. "St. Paul's Infirmary." *Expository Times* 10 (1904): 469-73, 545-48.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Psalms 101-50*. Revised ed. Vol. 21 of Word Biblical Commentary. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2002.
- Allo, E Bernard. *Saint Paul, Seconde épître aux Corinthiens*. Études Bibliques. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1956.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1981.
- Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1985.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Giving Voice to Jesus: Use of the Psalms in the New Testament." Pages 101-112 in *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical, and Artistic Traditions*. Edited by Harold W Attridge and Margot E Fassler. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Bakhtin, M M. "Discourse in the Novel." Pages 259-422 in *The Dialogic Imagination*. Edited by M Holquist. Austin, TX: The University of Texas Press, 1981.
- Bakhtin, M M. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Translated by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Barclay, John M G. "'Do we undermine the Law?' A Study of Romans 14.1-15.6." Pages 287-308 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by J D G Dunn. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament*, 89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Barclay, John M G. "Paul's Story: Theology as Testimony." Pages 133-56 in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Edited by Bruce Longenecker. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Barclay, John M G. Introduction to *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M G Barclay and Simon Gathercole. London: T&T Clark Continuum, 2008a.
- Barclay, John M G. "'By the Grace of God I am what I am': Grace and Agency in Philo and Paul." Pages 140-57 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M G Barclay and Simon Gathercole. London: T&T Clark Continuum, 2008b.
- Barclay, John M G. "Manna and the Circulation of Grace: A Study of 2 Corinthians 8:1-15." Pages 409-26 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard Hays*. Edited by J. Ross Wagner, A. Katherine Grieb, and C. Kavin Rowe. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008c.

- Barclay, John M G and Simon Gathercole, eds. *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Environment*. London: T&T Clark Continuum, 2008.
- Barré, M L. "Psalm 116: Its Structure and Its Enigmas." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 61-78.
- Barrett, C K. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black New Testament Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1973.
- Barrett, C K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2d ed. Black New Testament Commentary. London: Black, 1991.
- Bauckham, Richard, ed. *The Gospels for all Christians: rethinking the Gospel audiences*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Baumert, N. *Täglich Sterben und Auferstehen. Der Literalsinn von 2 Kor 4,12-5,10*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments 34. Munich: Kösel, 1973.
- Bautch, Richard J. *Developments in genre between post-exilic penitential prayers and the psalms of communal lament*. Academia Biblica 7. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Bazin, André, Hugh Gray, Jean Renoir, and François Truffaut. *What is cinema?* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2005.
- Becker, Joachim. *Israel deutet seine Psalmen. Urform und Neuinterpretation in den Psalmen*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 18. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966.
- Bell, Richard H. *Provoked to jealousy: the origin and purpose of the jealousy motif in Romans 9 - 11*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Belleville, L L. *Reflections of Glory: Paul's Polemical Use of the Moses-Doxa Tradition in 2 Corinthians 3.1-18*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 52. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Ben-Porat, Ziva. "The Poetics of Literary Allusion." *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 1 (1976): 105-28.
- Benveniste, Emile. *Problems in General Linguistics*. Translated by Mary Elizabeth Meek. Miami Linguistics Series 8. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami, 1971.
- Berlin, Adele. *The dynamics of biblical parallelism*. Revised and expanded ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Bieringer, R. "Teilungshypothesen zum 2. Korintherbrief. Ein Forschungsüberblick." Pages 67-105 in *Studies on 2 Corinthians*. Edited by R Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994a.
- Bieringer, R. "Der 2. Korintherbrief als ursprüngliche Einheit. Ein Forschungsüberblick." Pages 107-130 in *Studies on 2 Corinthians*. Edited by R Bieringer and Jan Lambrecht. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 112. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994b.

- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1973.
- Bloom, Harold. *A map of misreading*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Bockmuehl, M. "The Conversion of Desire in St. Paul's Hermeneutics." Pages 498-513 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard Hays*. Edited by J. Ross Wagner, A. Katherine Grieb, and C. Kavin Rowe. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Bonner, S F. *Education in Ancient Rome. From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1977.
- Booij, Th. "Psalm 116, 10-11: The Account of an Inner Crisis." *Biblica* 76 (1995): 388-95.
- Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986.
- Brodie, Thomas L, Dennis R MacDonald, and Stanley E Porter, eds. *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. New Testament Monographs 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1996.
- Brooke, George J. "The Psalms in Early Jewish Literature in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 5-24 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J J Menken. London and New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Brown, William P. *Seeing the Psalms: A Theology of Metaphor*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Bruce, Frederick Fyvie. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: an introduction and commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *The message of the Psalms: a theological commentary*. Augsburg Old Testament studies. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1984.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: testimony, dispute, advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1997.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Translated by Erich Dinkler. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1985.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A grammar of motives*. New York, NY: Prentice-Hall, 1945.
- Burtchaell, James Tunstead. *From Synagogue to Church: Public services and offices in the earliest Christian communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. Sacra Pagina 6. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996.
- Campbell, Douglas A. "2 Corinthians 4:13: Evidence in Paul That Christ Believes." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128/2 (2009): 337-56.

- Carr, David. *Time, Narrative, and History*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986.
- Carr, David McLain. *Writing on the tablet of the heart: origins of Scripture and literature*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Carrez, M. "Le 'Nous' en 2 Corinthiens." *New Testament Studies* 26 (1980): 474-86.
- Castelli, E A. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- Childs, Brevard S. "Psalm Titles and Midrashic Exegesis." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 16/2 (1971): 137-50.
- Childs, Brevard S. *The church's guide for reading Paul: the canonical shaping of the Pauline Corpus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Ciampa, Roy E. "Scriptural Language and Ideas." Pages 41-57 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Collange, Jean-François. "Enigmes de la deuxième Epître de Paul aux Corinthiens: Etude Exégétique de 2 Cor. 2,14 – 7,4." Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Cooper, Alan M. "The Life and Times of King David According to the Book of Psalms." Pages 143-55 in *The Poet and the Historian: Essays in Literary and Historical Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Richard Elliott Friedman. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Crafton, Jeffrey A. *The agency of the Apostle*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 51. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1-50*. Word Biblical Commentary 19. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983.
- Cranfield, C E B. "Changes of Person and Number in Paul's Epistles." Pages 280-89 in *Paul and Paulinism: Essays in Honour of C. K. Barrett*. Edited by M D Hooker and S G Wilson. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1982.
- Cranfield, C E B. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975-1979.
- Creach, Jerome F D. *Yahweh as Refuge and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 217. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Crenshaw, James L. *Education in ancient Israel: across the deadening silence*. The Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1998.
- Culler, Jonathan. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. London, Melbourne and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.
- Culley, Robert C. *Oral formulaic language in the biblical psalms*. Near and Middle East Series 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Dabelstein, R. *Die Beurteilung der 'Heiden' bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 14. Frankfurt: Lang, 1981.

Dahl, Nils Alstrup. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977.

Daley, Brian E. "Is Patristic Exegesis Still Usable? Some Reflections on Early Christian Interpretation of the Psalms." Pages 69-88 in *The Art of Reading Scripture*. Edited by Ellen F Davis and Richard B Hays. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003a.

Daley, Brian E. "Finding the Right Key: The Aims and Strategies of Early Christian Interpretation of the Psalms." Pages 189-205 in *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical, and Artistic Traditions*. Edited by Harold W Attridge and Margot E Fassler. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003b.

Daly-Denton, Margaret. *David in the fourth gospel: the Johannine reception of the Psalms*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2000.

De Beaugrande, Robert and Wolfgang U Dressler. *Introduction to text linguistics*. Longman Linguistics Library 26. London and New York: Longman, 1981.

de Roo, J C R. "David's Deeds in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 6 (1999): 44-65.

de Sousa, Ronald. "Twelve varieties of subjectivity: Dividing in hopes of conquest." Pages 135-51 in *Language, Knowledge, and Representation*. Edited by J M Larrazabal and L A Perez Miranda. *Philosophical Studies Series*. Amsterdam: Kluwer, 2004.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Rhizome: introduction*. Paris: Minuit, 1976.

Derrida, Jacques. "The Law of Genre." *Glyph* 7 (1980): 202-13.

Derrida, Jacques. *Limited Inc*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1988.

Di Vito, Robert A. "Old Testament Anthropology and the Construction of Personal Identity." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61 (1999): 217-38.

Dick, K. *Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus*. Halle: Niemeyer, 1900.

Doble, P. "Luke 24.26, 44 – Songs of God's Servant: David and his Psalms in Luke–Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28/3 (2006): 267-283.

Dodd, C H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.

Dodd, C H. *New Testament Studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953.

Doty, William G. *Letters in primitive Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1973.

Dunn, James D G. "Jesus - Flesh and Spirit: An Exposition of Romans 1.3-4." *Journal of Theological Studies* 24/1 (1973): 40-68.

- Dunn, James D G. *Romans*. 2 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 38A, 38B. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1988.
- Dunn, James D G. "Jesus Tradition in Paul." Pages 155-78 in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research*. Edited by B Chilton and Craig A Evans. New Testament Tools and Studies 19. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Dunn, James D G. "Once More, PISTIS CHRISTOU." Pages 61-81 in *Pauline Theology* 4. Edited by David M Hay and E E Johnson. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Dunn, James D G. *The theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Dunn, James D G. *Jesus Remembered*. Christianity in the Making 1. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Eco, Umberto. *Semiotics and the philosophy of language*. Advances in Semiotics. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Emerton, J A. "How Does the Lord Regard the Death of His Servants in Psalm cxvi. 15?" *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983): 146-56.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. "Self-Sufficiency and Power: Divine and Human Agency in Epictetus and Paul." Pages 117-139 in *Divine and Human Agency in Paul and his Cultural Environment*. Edited by John M G Barclay and Simon Gathercole. London: T&T Clark Continuum, 2008.
- Evans, Craig A. "David in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 183-197 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Craig A Evans. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Evans, Craig A. "Praise and Prophecy in the Psalter and in the New Testament." Pages 490-527 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Patrick D Miller and Peter W Flint. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 99. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Evans, Craig A and James A Sanders eds. *Paul and the scriptures of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Fernández-Marcos, Natalio. "David the Adolescent: On Psalm 151." Pages 229-247 in *The old Greek psalter: studies in honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J V Hiebert, Claude E Cox, and Peter J Gentry. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Fisch, Harold. *Poetry with a Purpose: Biblical Poetics and Interpretation*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Fisk, Bruce N. "Synagogue Influence and Scriptural Knowledge among the Christians of Rome." Pages 157-85 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Fitzgerald, J T. *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans: a new translation with introduction and commentary*. Anchor Bible 33. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1993.

Flint, Peter W. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the book of Psalms*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an author?" Pages 118-33 in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Edited by Donald F Bouchard. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Frei, Hans. *The Identity of Jesus Christ: The Hermeneutical Bases of Dogmatic Theology*. Philadelphia, PA: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1975.

Furnish, Victor Paul. *II Corinthians*. Anchor Bible 32A. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1984.

Gaventa, B R. "From Toxic Speech to the Redemption of Doxology in Paul's Letter to the Romans." Pages 392-408 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard Hays*. Edited by J Ross Wagner, A Katherine Grieb, and C Kevin Rowe. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

Gibbs, Raymond W. *Intentions in the Experience of Meaning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Given, Mark D. "Paul and Writing." Pages 237-59 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Godet, Frédéric. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1977.

Goudge, H L. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Methuen, 1927.

Goulder, Michael D. *The Prayers of David: Psalms 51-72*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 102. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Green, William S. "Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture." Pages 58-63 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A Evans and James A Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

- Greene, Thomas M. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Die Psalmen*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1926.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Einleitung in die Psalmen: die Gattungen der religiösen Lyrik Israels*. Completed by Joachim Begrich. Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1933.
- Gunkel, Hermann and Joachim Begrich. *Introduction to Psalms: the genres of the religious lyric of Israel*. Mercer Library of Biblical Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *Suffering and Ministry in the Spirit*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Hafemann, Scott J. "Paul's Use of the Old Testament in 2 Corinthians." *Interpretation* 52/3 (1998): 246-257.
- Hafemann, Scott J. *2 Corinthians*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2000.
- Hall, Stuart. "Introduction: Who Needs 'Identity'?" Pages 1-17 in *Questions of Cultural Identity*. Edited by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay. London: Sage Publications, 1996.
- Hanson, Anthony T. *Paul's Understanding of Jesus*. Hull: University of Hull Publications, 1963.
- Hanson, Anthony T. *The Paradox of the Cross in the Thought of St Paul*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 17. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Harder, Günther. *Paulus und das Gebet*. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1936.
- Harmon, Allan M. "Aspects of Paul's Use of the Psalms." *Westminster Theological Journal* 32/1 (1969): 1-23.
- Harris, Murray J. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Harrisville, Roy A. "Paul and the Psalms: A Formal Study." *Word & World* 5/2 (1985): 168-79.
- Harvey, A E. *Renewal Through Suffering*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996.
- Hays, Richard B. "Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99 (1980): 107-15. Repr. pages 50-60 in *The Conversion of the Imagination*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hays, Richard B. "Christ Prays the Psalms: Paul's Use of Early Christian Exegetical Convention." Pages 122-36 in *The Future of Christology*. Edited by Abraham J Malherbe and Wayne A Meeks. Philadelphia, PA: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1993a. Repr. pages 101-18 in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Hays, Richard B. "On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul." Pages 70-96 in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A Evans and James A Sanders. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 83. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993b. Repr. pages 163-89 in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Hays, Richard B. "PISTIS and Pauline Christology: What Is at Stake?" Pages 35-60 in *Pauline Theology 4*. Edited by David M Hay and E E Johnson. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1997.

Hays, Richard B. "'Who Has Believed Our Message?' Paul's Reading of Isaiah." Pages 205-25 in *SBL Seminar Papers*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998. Repr. pages 25-49 in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Hays, Richard B. "The conversion of the Imagination: Scripture and Eschatology in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 391-412. Repr. pages 1-24 in *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Hays, Richard B. *The faith of Jesus Christ: the narrative substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. 2d ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Hays, Richard B. "Is Paul's gospel narratable?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 27/2 (2004): 217-39.

Hays, Richard B. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

Hays, Richard B. Foreword to English edition of *Reading the Bible intertextually*. Edited by Richard B Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy Andrew Huizenga. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Hays, Richard B, Stefan Alkier and Leroy A Huizenga, eds. *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Heckel, Ulrich. *Der Segen im Neuen Testament: Begriff, Formeln, Gesten; mit einem praktisch-theologischen Ausblick*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.150. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Hemer, Colin J. "A Note on 2 Corinthians 1:9." *Tyndale Bulletin* 23 (1972): 103-7.

Hollander, John. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1981.

Holmberg, Bengt. *Paul and power: the structure of authority in the primitive church as reflected in the Pauline epistles*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

- Horrell, David G. "Paul's Narratives or Narrative Substructure? The Significance of Paul's Story." Pages 157-71 in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Edited by Bruce Longenecker. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Howard Jr, David M. "Recent Trends in Psalms Study." Pages 329-68 in *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches*. Edited by David W Baker and Bill T Arnold. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1999.
- Hübner, Hans, ed. *Vetus Testamentum in Novo 2, Corpus Paulinum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1997.
- Hughes, P E. *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1962.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: devotion to Jesus in earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: a commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 2007.
- Juel, Donald. *Messianic Exegesis*. Philadelphia, PA: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1988.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey W Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kautzsch, Emil. *De veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo Apostolo allegatis*. Lipsiae: Metzger & Wittig, 1869.
- Keck, L E. "Christology, Soteriology, and the Praise of God (Romans 15:7-13)." Pages 85-97 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul and John: In Honor J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by R T Fortna and B R Gaventa. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1990.
- Keck, L E. "Romans 15:4 - an Interpolation?" Pages 125-36 in *Faith and History: Essays in Honor of Paul W. Meyer*. Edited by J T Carroll, C H Cosgrove, and E E Johnson. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia C. *Paul and His Story: (Re)Interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 181. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia C. "The Psalms in Romans and Galatians." Pages 139-161 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J J Menken. London and New York: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Kelsey, David H. *The uses of Scripture in recent theology*. Philadelphia, PA: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1975.
- Kennedy, George Alexander. *New Testament interpretation through rhetorical criticism*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Kleinknecht, K T. *Der leidende Gerechtfertigte: Die alttestamentlich-jüdische Tradition vom "Leidenden Gerechten" und ihre Rezeption bei Paulus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984.

- Knowles, Melody D. "The Flexible Rhetoric of Retelling: The Choice of David in the Texts of the Psalms." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 67 (2005): 236-249.
- Koch, D-A. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986.
- Kraftchick, Steven J. "Death in Us, Life in You: The Apostolic Medium." Pages 156-181 in *Pauline Theology*. Edited by David M Hay. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1993.
- Kraftchick, Steven J. "Death's Parsing: Experience as a Mode of Theology in Paul." Pages 144-66 in *Pauline Conversations in Context: Essays in Honor of Calvin J. Roetzel*. Edited by Janice Capel Anderson, Philip Sellev, and Claudia Setzer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim, *Psalmen*. 2 vols. Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms: a commentary*. 2 vols. Translated by Hilton C Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1993.
- Kristeva, Julia. *La révolution du langage poétique: l'avant-garde à la fin du XIXe siècle, Lautréamont et Mallarmé*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1974.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in language: a semiotic approach to literature and art*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1984.
- Kümmel, W G. "Supplementary notes." Pages 165-214 in *An die Korinther I, II*. Edited by H Lietzmann. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1949.
- Kugel, James L. *The idea of biblical poetry: parallelism and its history*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Lagrance, M J. *Saint Paul: Épître aux Romains*. Études bibliques 8. Paris: J Gabalda, 1931.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *More than Cool Reason: A Field Guide to Poetic Metaphor*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "The Nekrôsis of Jesus: Ministry and Suffering in 2 Cor 4:7-15." Pages 120-143 in *L'apôtre Paul: Personnalité, style et conception du ministère*. Edited by A Vanhoye. Leuven: Peeters, 1986.
- Lane-Mercier, Gillian. "Quotation as a Discursive Strategy." *Kodikas* 14 (1991): 199-214.
- Levinson, S C. "A review of Relevance." *Journal of Linguistics* 25 (1989):455-72.

- Levinson, S C. *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2000.
- Linton, O. "Interpretation of the Psalms in the Early Church." *Studia Patristica* 4 (1961): 143-56.
- Longenecker, Bruce, ed. *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Louw, J P and Eugene Albert Nida. *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: based on semantic domains*. New York, NY: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Lowth, Robert. *Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrew*. London: T. Tegg and Son, 1835.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Paul and the popular philosophers*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1989.
- Marcus, Joel. *The Way of the Lord. Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.
- Marrou, H I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by G Lamb. New York, NY: American Library, 1964.
- Marrou, H I. "Education and Rhetoric." Pages 185-201 in *The Legacy of Greece*. Edited by M I Finley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981.
- Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. Word Biblical Commentary 40. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986.
- Martyn, J Louis. *Galatians*. Anchor Bible 33A. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997.
- Mathys, Hans-Peter. *Dichter und Beter: Theologen aus spätalttestamentlicher Zeit*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 132. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994.
- Matlock, R Barry. "The Arrow and the Web: Critical Reflections on a Narrative Approach to Paul." Pages 44-57 in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*. Edited by Bruce Longenecker. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Mays, James Luther. "The David of the Psalms." *Interpretation* 40 (1986): 143-55.
- Mays, James Luther. "A question of identity: the threefold hermeneutic of psalmody." *Asbury Theological Journal* 46/1 (1991): 87-94.
- Mays, James Luther. *Psalms*. Interpretation: a Bible commentary for teaching and preaching. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1994.
- McCann, J Clinton, ed. *The Shape and Shaping of the Psalter*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 159. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- McLay, R Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

- Menn, Esther M. "Sweet Singer of Israel: David and the Psalms in Early Judaism." Pages 61-74 in *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical, and Artistic Traditions*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge and Margot E. Fassler. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Merz, Annette. *Die fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2004.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (Fourth Revised Edition)*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994.
- Meyer, H. A. W. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by J. C. Moore. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1876.
- Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 14th ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Vierte Abteilung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978.
- Millard, Matthias. *Die Komposition des Psalters: ein formgeschichtlicher Ansatz*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Mitchell, Christopher Wright. *The meaning of brk "to bless" in the Old Testament*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Mitchell, David C. *The message of the psalter: an eschatological programme in the books of Psalms*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 252. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Mitchell, M. M. "New Testament Envoys in the Context of Greco-Roman Diplomatic and Epistolary Conventions: The Example of Timothy and Titus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111/4 (1992): 641-62.
- Mitry, Jean. *The aesthetics and psychology of the cinema*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Moody-Smith, D. "The Pauline Literature." Pages 265-91 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Morson, Gary Saul and Caryl Emerson. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An idiom book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Moule, H. C. G. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: Pickering and Inglis, 1962.

- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *Psalmstudien*. 6 vols. Kristiania: J. Dybwad, 1921-1924.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. *The Psalms in Israel's worship*. Translated by D R Ap-Thomas. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Moyise, Steve. "Quotations." Pages 15-28 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008a.
- Moyise, Steve. *Evoking scripture: seeing the Old Testament in the New*. London: T & T Clark, 2008b.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Faith and Resurrection in 2 Cor 4:13-14." *Revue Biblique* 95 (1988): 543-550.
- Nanos, Mark D. *The mystery of Romans: the Jewish context of Paul's letter*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1996.
- Nasuti, Harry P. *Defining the Sacred Songs: Genre, Tradition and the Post-Critical Interpretation of the Psalms*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 218. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Nasuti, Harry P. "The Interpretive Significance of Sequence and Selection in the Book of Psalms." Pages 311-339 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Peter W Flint and Patrick D Miller. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature IV. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Nehamas, A. "What an Author Is." *Journal of Philosophy* 83 (1986): 685-691.
- Newsom, Carol A. *The Book of Job: A Contest of Moral Imaginations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Newsom, Carol A. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Noll, K. L. *The faces of David*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- O'Brien, J M. "Because God Heard My Voice: The Individual Thanksgiving Psalm and Vow-Fulfillment." Pages 281-98 in *The Listening Heart. FS R E Murphy*. Edited by Kenneth G Hoglund. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 58. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- O'Brien, Peter Thomas. *Introductory thanksgivings in the letters of Paul*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 49. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Patte, Daniel. *The Religious dimensions of biblical texts: Greimas's structural semiotics and biblical exegesis*. Semeia studies. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990a.
- Patte, Daniel. *Structural exegesis for New Testament critics*. Guides to biblical scholarship. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1990b.
- Perri, Carmela. "On Alluding." *Poetics* 7 (1978): 289-307.

Perri, Carmela. "Knowing and Playing: The Literary Text and The Trope Allusion." *American Imago* 41 (1984): 117-28.

Pietersma, Albert. "David in the Greek Psalms." *Vetus Testamentum* XXX/2 (1980): 213-226.

Pietersma, Albert. *A new English translation of the Septuagint, and other Greek translations traditionally included under that title: the Psalms*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000a.

Pietersma, Albert. "The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter." Pages 12-32 in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen*. Edited by A Aejmelaeus and U Quast. *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2000b.

Plummer, Alfred. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Second Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1915.

Poirier, J C. "Some Detracting Considerations for Reader-Response Theory." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62/2 (2000): 250-63.

Polaski, Sandra Hack. *Paul and the discourse of power*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Porter, Stanley E. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology." Pages 44-58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A Evans and James A Sanders. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Porter, Stanley E. "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." Pages 98-110 in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. Edited by Thomas L Brodie, Dennis R MacDonald and Stanley E Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2006.

Porter, Stanley E. "Allusions and Echoes." Pages 29-40 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008a.

Porter, Stanley E. "Paul and His Bible: His Education and Access to the Scriptures of Israel." Pages 97-124 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008b.

Porter, Stanley E and Christopher D Stanley, eds. *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Prinsloo, W S. "Psalm 116: Disconnected Text or Symmetrical Whole?" *Biblica* 74 (1993): 71-82.

Pucci, Joseph. *The Full-Knowing Reader: Allusion and the Power of the Reader in the Western Literary Tradition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1998.

- Reasoner, Mark. *The strong and the weak: Romans 14.1-15.13 in context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Reisz, Karel and Gavin Millar. *The techniques of film editing*. 2 ed. Boston, MA: Focal Press, 1989.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *La métaphore vive*. L'Ordre philosophique 23. Paris: Seuil, 1975.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Time and Narrative*. 3 vols. Translated by Kathleen McLaughlin and David Pellauer. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1984-88.
- Ricoeur, Paul. *Oneself as Another*. Translated by Kathleen Blamey. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Robertson, A. T. *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Rosner, Brian. Paul, Scripture and Ethics. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 22. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Rüsen-Weinhold, Ulrich. *Der Septuagintapsalter im Neuen Testament. Eine textgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2004.
- Scarry, Elaine. *The Body in Pain*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Schenck, Kenneth. "2 Corinthians and the PISTIS CHRISTOU Debate." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 70 (2008): 524-37.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. *Der Segen im Neuen Testament: eine begriffsanalytische Studie*. Theologische Arbeiten 25. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1967.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Paulus, der Bote Jesu: eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther*. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1969.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Römerbrief*. Herders theologische Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 6. Freiburg: Herder, 1977.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 2. Teilband. 1 Kor 6,12-11,16*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 7/2. Düsseldorf: Benziger, 1995.
- Schütz, J H. *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 26. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Scott, James M. *Adoption as sons of God: an exegetical investigation into the background of huiothesia in the Pauline corpus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.48. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- Shum, Shiu-Lun. *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.156. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.

Silva, Moisés. "The Greek Psalter in Paul's Letters: A Textual Study." Pages 277-288 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J V Hiebert, Claude E Cox, and Peter J Gentry. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.

Silverman, Kaja. *The Subject of Semiotics*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Skehan, Patrick W. "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumran." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 136 (1954): 12-15.

Slomovic, Elieser. "Toward an Understanding of the Formation of Historical Titles in the Book of Psalms." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 91 (1979): 350-80.

Smith, Mark S. "How to Write a Poem: The Case of Psalm 151A (11QPsa 28.3-12)." Pages 182-208 in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11-14 December 1995*. Edited by T Muraoka and J F Elwolde. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 26. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Soskice, Janet Martin. *Metaphor and Religious Language*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Sperber, D and D Wilson. "Precis of Relevance: Cognition and Context." *Behavioural and Brain Sciences* 10 (1987): 697-754.

Sperber, D and D Wilson. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. 2d ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Stanley, Christopher D. "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method." Pages 44-58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A Evans and James A Sanders. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997a.

Stanley, Christopher D. "The Social Environment of 'Free' Biblical Quotations in the New Testament." Pages 18-27 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A Evans and James A Sanders. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997b.

Stanley, Christopher D. "'Pearls before Swine?' Did Paul's Audiences Understand His Biblical Quotations?" *Novum Testamentum* XLI/2 (1999): 124-44.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. London and New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

Stanley, Christopher D. "Paul and Scripture: Charting the Course." Pages 3-12 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008a.

Stanley, Christopher D. "Paul's 'Use' of Scripture: Why the Audience Matters." Pages 125-56 in *As it is written: studying Paul's use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E Porter and Christopher D Stanley. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008b.

- Stegman, Thomas D. *The character of Jesus: the linchpin to Paul's argument in 2 Corinthians*. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005.
- Stegman, Thomas D. “ἐπίστευσα διὸ ἐλάλησα (2 Corinthians 4:13): Paul’s Christological Reading of Psalm 115:1a LXX.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 69/4 (2007): 725-45.
- Sternberg, Meir. “Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse.” *Poetics Today* 3 (1982): 107-56.
- Strachan, R H. *The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. Moffatt New Testament Commentary 7/2. New York, NY: Harper, 1935.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1922–1961.
- Swancutt, Diana M. “Christian ‘Rock’ Music at Corinth?” Pages 125-143 in *Psalms in Community: Jewish and Christian Textual, Liturgical, and Artistic Traditions*. Edited by Harold W Attridge and Margot E Fassler. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Tanner, Kathryn. *God and creation in Christian theology: tyranny or empowerment*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1988.
- Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51-100*. Word Biblical Commentary 20. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Thompson, Michael B. *Clothed with Christ: the example and teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1 - 15.13*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 59. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- Thrall, Margaret E. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994-2000.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. *Deuteronomy: the traditional Hebrew text with the new JPS translation*. Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.
- Tuckett, C M. “Paul, Scripture and Ethics: Some Reflections.” *New Testament Studies* 46/3 (2000): 403-424.
- Tull, Patricia K. “Bakhtin's confessional self-accounting and psalms of lament.” *Biblical Interpretation* 13/1 (2005): 41.
- Turner, Mark. *The literary mind*. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Vegge, Ivar. *2 Corinthians, a letter about reconciliation: a psychagogical, epistolographical, and rhetorical analysis*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.239. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

- Wagner, J. Ross. "The Christ, Servant of Jew and Gentile: A Fresh Approach to Romans 15:8-9." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1997): 473-85.
- Wagner, J. Ross. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans*. Boston and Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Wanamaker, Charles A. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*. London: T & T Clark, 2004.
- Watson, N M. "'To Make Us Rely Not on Ourselves but on God Who Raises the Dead' - 2 Cor 1,9b as the Heart of Paul's Theology." Pages 384-98 in *Die Mitte des Neuen Testaments (FS Eduard Schweizer)*. Edited by Ulrich Luz and H Weder. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1983.
- Watters, William R. *Formula criticism and the poetry of the Old Testament*. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 138. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1976.
- Watts, James W. *Psalm and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 139. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Watts, James W. "Biblical Psalms Outside the Psalter." Pages 288-309 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Peter W Flint and Patrick D Miller. Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature IV. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms, a commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1962.
- Welborn, L L. "Paul's Appeal to the Emotions in 2 Corinthians 1.1-2.13; 7.5-16." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 82 (2001): 31-60.
- Welborn, L L. *Paul, the fool of Christ: a study of 1 Corinthians 1-4 in the comic-philosophic tradition*. Early Christianity in context. London: T & T Clark International, 2005.
- Westermann, Claus. *Praise and lament in the Psalms*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1981.
- Whitsett, Christopher G. "Son of God, seed of David: Paul's messianic exegesis in Romans 1:3-4." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119/4 (2000): 661-81.
- Whybray, Norman. *Reading the Psalms as a Book*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 222. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Der Brief an Die Römer*. 3 vols. Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-82.
- Wiles, Gordon P. *Paul's intercessory prayers: the significance of the intercessory prayer passages in the letters of St Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Wilk, Florian. Die Bedeutung des Jesajabüches für Paulus. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 179. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1998.

Wilk, Florian. "Paul as User, Interpreter, and Reader of the Book of Isaiah." Pages 83-100 in *Reading the Bible intertextually*. Edited by Richard B Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy Andrew Huizenga. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Williams, H H Drake, III. "The Psalms in 1 and 2 Corinthians." Pages 163-180 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J J Menken. London and New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

Wilson, Gerald H. *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. SBL Dissertation Series. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Windisch, Hans. *Der zweite Korintherbrief*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924.

Witherington, Ben. *Conflict and community in Corinth: a socio-rhetorical commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

Witherington, Ben. *1 and 2 Thessalonians: a socio-rhetorical commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.

Young, Frances and David F Ford. *Meaning and Truth in 2 Corinthians*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1987.

Zenger, Erich. "Psalmenforschung nach Hermann Gunkel und Sigmund Mowinckel." Pages 339-435 in *Congress Volume: Oslo, 1998*. Edited by Andre Lemaire and Magne Saebo. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 80. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Ziesler, John A. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. London: SCM Press, 1989.