1

An Introduction to the
Grand Thematic Narrative

Paul wrote letters, not narratives, and yet the apostle regularly refers to stories in his letters. He narrates his own story, especially in Galatians 1–2. He reflects on the story of God's creation of the world in passages like Romans 5–8. The history of the people of Israel is a narrative to which the Jewish apostle frequently refers and alludes. Ultimately, Paul is relaying the significance of Jesus Christ, still another story that underlies the discursive reasoning of his epistles. In 1983 Richard Hays, who would become a preeminent New Testament interpreter, wrote a groundbreaking dissertation on the narrative *sub*structure of Paul's thought.[1] Hays raised the question of the extent to which Paul's letters and thought are "the product of an underlying narrative bedrock."[2]

In an essay in *The Forgotten God*, the Paul J. Achtemeier festschrift,

---

1. Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1 – 4:11*, 2nd ed., Biblical Resource Series (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002).
2. Bruce W. Longenecker, "Narrative Interest in the Study of Paul: Retrospective and Prospective," in *Narrative Dynamics in Paul: A Critical Assessment*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 3.

Hays labored to outline the story Paul openly sketches in his letters to the Galatians and Romans.[3] That narrative begins some two millennia before with Abraham, who received the promises of God, especially the promise that all the gentiles would be blessed in him (Gal. 3:9).[4] God made a covenant with the patriarch to guarantee those promises (Gal. 3:17). Roughly four centuries later, God revealed the Law to Moses. The Law was not opposed to the gracious promises of old (Gal. 3:21) but rather served as a harsh disciplinarian so that there might be no escape except through the fulfillment of the ancient promises (Gal. 3:23-26). God sent forth the Son, born of a woman and born under the Law, to redeem (ἐξαγοράζω) those under the Law (Gal. 4:4-5). Paul describes this "rescue" operation (ἐξαιρέω; Gal. 1:4) with the same verb for the rescue of the Israelites from their slavery in Egypt (Exod. 3:8 LXX). So the story of God's deliverance of the gentile Galatians begins with Israel's ancestor Abraham and culminates with the dawn of a new era of salvation in Jesus Christ, with a future judgment just over the horizon.

Hays maintained that that central story functions as a constraint on Paul's reasoning, which would otherwise be unintelligible.[5] Where Adam failed, the story's faithful protagonist, Jesus Christ, was obedient even to the point of death in order to free humanity from the power of sin in the midst of this present evil age.[6] The believer is justified by *participating* in the crucified, justified Messiah "whose destiny embodies theirs."[7] In short, the believer joins the story![8]

The well-known New Testament scholar N. T. Wright built on Hays's work. Since narratives stand at the heart of people's worldviews,

---

3. Richard B. Hays, "The God of Mercy Who Rescues Us from the Present Evil Age: Romans and Galatians," in *The Forgotten God: Perspectives in Biblical Theology*, ed. A. Andrew Das and Frank J. Matera (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 123–42, here 126–31.
4. Throughout this work "gentile" is in lowercase since, unlike "Jew," the word "gentile" is not a proper name referring to a particular ethnic group but is rather a Jewish designation for the non-Jewish world; Christopher D. Stanley, "'Neither Jew Nor Greek': Ethnic Conflict in Graeco-Roman Society," *JSNT* 64 (1996): 101–24.
5. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 21–22.
6. Ibid., 210–11.
7. Ibid., 211–12.
8. Ibid., 213–15.

Wright described "a larger implicit narrative" behind Paul's letters, a "story-world" and the "symbolic universe that accompanies it."[9] The answers to humanity's identity, situation, and destiny are embedded in the stories that serve as foundational supports for beliefs and convictions.[10] Paul narrates God, Israel, and the world all compressed into the single story of Jesus, as the Creator intervenes to restore a fallen human race.[11]

Hays and Wright have hardly been alone in their appreciation of the narratival substructure of Paul's thought.[12] In tracing the central, overarching story explicitly mentioned across Paul's pages, Hays and Wright have offered one way of approaching the narratival logic of the corpus.[13] This study, however, addresses a different type of narrative.

The Narratives Paul Inherited

Modern scholars have located many *other* narratives behind the pages of Paul quite apart from the overarching story to which he refers. The apostle Paul boasts that he was circumcised on the eighth day, that he was an Israelite and a member of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews. As to Moses' Law, he was a Pharisee; as to zeal, he was a persecutor of the church; as to righteousness, he was blameless (Phil. 3:5-6). He boasts that he had advanced in Judaism beyond many of his contemporaries (Gal. 1:14). Not surprisingly, as an educated Israelite of the Pharisee sect, Paul draws on the scriptural heritage of Israel as he writes to the churches he had started. He has inherited key narratives as components of his own thought and even of his own central, overarching story. Many of these narratives are extended echoes of major stories or events in the history or scriptural heritage

---

9. N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 405.

10. Ibid., 79.

11. Ibid., 407.

12. See, e.g., Norman R. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul: Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Ben Witherington III, *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994); James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 17–18; Frank J. Matera, *New Testament Christology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 83–88.

13. Hays has continued to write about "Paul's foundational story" or "Paul's gospel story," "the dramatic events of Jesus' death and its immediate consequences" (*Echoes of Scripture*, xxxv, xl).

of Israel. Of course, Paul is a *Diaspora* Jew, and some of these narratives may derive from the Greco-Roman milieu as well.

In what would be yet another seminal work, Richard Hays turned after his dissertation to the apostle's use of the Jewish Scriptures that inform Paul's letters.[14] Hays's milestone *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* showed how the apostle consciously—and even subconsciously—reflects these Scriptures in his own logic as fragments of earlier texts are imbedded within later Pauline passages.[15] *Echoes of Scripture* was not actually addressing the biblical stories behind Paul's letters. Hays was analyzing Paul's appropriation of the Jewish Scriptures more broadly. *Echoes* ignited a discussion that not only identified countless other echoes but also engaged the methodology behind the endeavor. The narratives that Paul shares from the scriptural heritage of Israel are presumably anchored in quotations, allusions, or echoes of those stories. Hays listed criteria for identifying scriptural appropriation that are of value in discerning the narratives that inform Paul's logic. Hays's *Echoes* initiated conversation even over how to define quotation, allusion, and echo.

The Categorization of "Echoes": Quotations, Allusions, and Echoes

Hays popularized the terms *metalepsis* and, to a lesser extent, its synonym *transumption*. Metalepsis is the citation, allusion, or echo of an older text in a newer one thereby drawing a connection between the two texts, a connection that is not merely explicit (in the citation, allusion, or echo itself) but also implicit in creating unstated resonances between the two texts. Hays usually worked with a very broad understanding of an echo, which "functions to suggest to the reader that text B should be understood in light of a broad interplay with text A, encompassing aspects of A beyond those explicitly

---

14. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*.

15. Ibid. See also Hays's response to detractors in "On the Rebound: A Response to Critiques of *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, JSNTSup 83, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 70–96, esp. 79–81.

cited. . . . The poet's imagination seizes a metaphor and explicitly wrings out of it all manner of unforeseeable significations."[16] The linking of texts creates a hermeneutical event with new meanings generated by the correspondences and contrasts between the two texts. Paul laments over his chains in Phil. 1:7, 12-14 but then assures the Philippians in 1:19 that "through your prayers and the help of the Spirit of Jesus Christ this will turn out for my deliverance."[17] Although Paul does not identify his words as a quote, he is using, verbatim, Job 13:16a in the Septuagint: "And this will turn out for me for deliverance" (καὶ τοῦτό μοι ἀποβήσεται εἰς σωτηρίαν; my translation). Hays reviewed the context of Job's language: a man proclaiming his own integrity and trust that God would vindicate him in the end. Paul the prisoner has tacitly assumed the role of the righteous sufferer. While Hays also noticed dissimilarities, he remained impressed by the many parallels and correspondences between Paul and Job that reinforce the connection—thus metalepsis.[18]

When Hays described metalepsis as the citation, allusion, or echo of an older text in a newer one, Stanley Porter noted some imprecision in Hays's categories, especially in Hays's definition of the very "echoes" of his book's title. For Hays (and many others): "intertextuality . . . seems . . . to mean nothing more than an echo or paraphrase, but at other times seems to be nothing less than the invocation of an entire textual universe."[19] The professional literature is filled with popular but often undefined terms such as citation, formal quotation, allusion, paraphrase, echo, intertextuality, and tradition.[20] Some scholars have made finer distinctions than others. Porter criticized the absence of clear definitions.[21] G. K. Beale has similarly complained that many

---

16. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 20.
17. All biblical citations are from the NRSV unless otherwise noted, except for the letter to the Galatians, in which case the translations are my own.
18. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 21–24.
19. Stanley E. Porter, "Further Comments on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*, New Testament Monographs 16, ed. Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2007), 98–110, here 99.
20. Porter's non-exhaustive list of terms ("Further Comments," 99) also includes indirect quotation, allusive quotation, exegesis, midrash, typology, and reminiscence.
21. Ibid.

scholars do not distinguish between an "echo" and an "allusion."[22] Intertextuality is a murky field, Porter warned, and it often lends itself to conflicting definitions and to unbridled, undisciplined excess.[23]

Hays sometimes used the term *echo* to refer in a general manner to the citation of one text by the author of another—whether intentional or unintentional. In other places Hays made a distinction between an echo and an allusion: an allusion would be an obvious intertextual reference whereas an echo would be a subtler, more subliminal reference bordering on "the vanishing point."[24] Most scholars who have distinguished an allusion and an echo have viewed the echo as having less volume from the Jewish Scriptures than an allusion. An echo only *seems* to be dependent on an OT text whereas an allusion is a clearer and more probable use of the precursor text.[25] Hays sometimes distinguished an allusion as *intended* by the author and *recognizable* by the audience from an echo, which does not depend on the author's conscious intention.[26]

Porter sought to bring greater precision to the discussion with five categories of citation or echo by one text of another on a cline, or continuum, from the explicit to the non-explicit: formulaic quotation, direct quotation, paraphrase, allusion, and echo. He observed, "The less control the original author has over the citation, the more control the citing author has over it. In other words, as one moves away from the control of the original author over a quotation towards echo, the more

22. G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2012), 32.
23. Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*, SSEJC 5, JSNTSup 148, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 79–96, here 87–88, 92–94; Porter, "Further Comments," 99–100.
24. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 23; cf. Porter, "Further Comments," 109.
25. Beale, *Handbook*, 32. He added, "However, the fact that scholars differ over specifically what criteria are best has led me to posit more general and basic criteria for allusions and echoes. At the end of the process, it is difficult to produce hard and fast criteria that can be applicable to every OT-in-the-NT allusion or echo. A case-by-case study must be made."
26. Hays, *Echoes*, 29.

control the later author gains over the original text."[27] None of the five categories is without its problems.

Formulaic Quotation

Surely the clearest use of the Hebrew Bible would be a quotation, but even a quotation has proved surprisingly difficult to define. For quotations, Porter relied on the work of Christopher Stanley. Stanley had whittled down a list of seven criteria—originally developed by Dietrich-Alex Koch for identifying a quotation—to three: (1) an explicit quotation formula (e.g., "as it is written"), (2) a clear, interpretive gloss; (3) syntactical tension between the quotation and its context.[28] Stanley limited himself to Paul's formulaic quotations since he was interested in the rhetorical effects that Paul's use of Scripture would have on his first hearers. Stanley has rightly stressed that most of the apostle's largely gentile audiences would not have recognized Jewish scriptural passages that were not clearly marked as such.[29]

In Gal. 3:13 Paul introduces a quotation of Deut. 21:23 with the words "it is written," the same words he used to introduce a quotation of Deut. 27:26 in Gal. 3:10. Stanley's methodology, in its emphasis on the effect of explicit citation formulas, excludes from consideration many passages that others would consider quotations (e.g., Rom. 10:13; 11:34-35; 12:20; 1 Cor. 2:16; 5:13; 10:26; 15:32; 2 Cor. 9:7; 10:17; 13:1). Sandwiched between the formulaic quotations in Gal. 3:10 and 13 are quotations that are *without* introductions in Gal. 3:11-12. Porter therefore relabeled Stanley's "quotation" category as "formulaic quotation."[30]

27. Porter, "Further Comments," 107. For a similar cline, see Geoffrey N. Leech and Michael H. Short, *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose*, English Language Series 13 (London: Longman, 1981), 318–36, esp. 324.

28. Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 4n5, 34–37; Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*, BHT 69 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1986), 11–24.

29. Stanley, *Paul*, 34; Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotation in the Letters of Paul* (New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 47. In *Arguing with Scripture*, Stanley's purposes were different, and thus he discussed several unmarked quotations in Galatians (e.g., pp. 127–28).

30. Porter, "Further Comments," 107.

Direct Quotation

As Porter noted, "To limit oneself to discussions of those passages that are introduced by an explicit quotation formula clearly skews the evidence."[31] Unlike the formulaic quotation with its introductory phrase, Porter's "direct quotation" is identified simply by a chain of three or more shared words (allowing for the potential morphological shifts that a new context might bring). A chain of three words is not likely coincidental.[32] To return to Hays's original example, Paul in Phil. 1:19 quotes several words from Job 13:16.

Porter's three-word-chain definition of a quotation, while a useful step forward, is not fully satisfactory either. The interpreter must be aware of the possibility that the phrase or clause in question may be a common Jewish idiom of the day rather than an actual quotation.[33] Alec Lucas questioned the requirement of a minimum of three shared words since two-word quotations are also conceivable (e.g., "Jesus wept" in English, a quotation of John 10:35).[34] In other words, volume is not just a matter of verbal/syntactical repetition (of three or more words) but also of prominence and rhetorical stress, as Hays pointed out.[35]

A final concern is to determine whether Paul is quoting *verbatim* the source text or whether he has adapted the quotation with his own wording. In Rom. 10:6-8 Paul quotes much of Deut. 9:4 (or 8:17) and 30:12-14 verbatim while also deleting whole phrases, changing words, and even changing the subject. "The line between allusion and explicit quotation is not hard and fast. . . . Paul seems to exercise great freedom."[36] Also, the Greek Septuagintal text was not a fixed entity but

---

31. Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 92—in relation to a fuller exposition of the apostle's use of the Scriptures than Stanley had intended. Paul quotes the Scriptures approximately a hundred times; Dwight Moody Smith, "The Pauline Literature," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 265–91, here 266.
32. Porter, "Further Comments," 107–8.
33. Stanley, *Paul*, 67n8; Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 90–92.
34. Alec J. Lucas, "Assessing Stanley E. Porter's Objections to Richard B. Hays's Notion of Metalepsis," *CBQ* 76 (2014): 93–11, here 111. The problem is compounded when one adopts a definition of a quotation as six or more words, as did Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, Biblical Interpretation Series 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 16–17.
35. Hays, *Echoes*, 30.

was already being revised prior to the early Christian movement.[37] "It is still hard to know how much Paul, for example, may be altering the reference, since he may be citing from different forms, protorevisions, or variant textual traditions of the Septuagint, some of which may no longer be extant."[38] Many quotations in Paul appear to include some alterations and adaptations of language.[39] Why Paul explicitly signaled some of his quotes and not others remains a question to be explored.[40] The difficulties with the definition and identification of quotations are a powerful argument for caution in the categories that involve less verbal identity.

Paraphrase

A paraphrase does not have the minimal three shared words in sequence but uses some of the same words, perhaps not consecutively, along with other words. A paraphrase is an intentional restatement of a particular passage in changed diction and form.[41] Philippians 2:10-11, for instance, paraphrases Isa. 45:23. Paul alters the word order and grammar for his own purposes:

Philippians 2:10-11

. . . ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσηται ὅτι κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός.

. . . so that at the name of Jesus *every knee should bend*, in heaven and

---

36. Smith, "The Pauline Literature," 267–76. Stanley (*Paul*) analyzes each instance of the apostle's adaptations of quoted material in the undisputed letters.
37. The tendencies were toward both "Hebraizing" and improvements in the Greek style; Stanley, *Paul*, 15.
38. Beale, *Handbook*, 30.
39. On these matters, see the survey in Kenneth D. Litwak, "Echoes of Scripture? A Critical Survey of Recent Work on Paul's Use of the Old Testament," *CurBS* 6 (1998): 260–88, here 280–83.
40. Steve Moyise, "Quotations," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBLSymS 50, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 15–28, here 15–16.
41. C. Hugh Holman, *A Handbook to Literature*, 3rd ed. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1972), 379.

on earth and under the earth, and *every tongue should confess* that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

Isaiah 45:23

κατ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ὀμνύω, ἦ μὴν ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ τοῦ στόματός μου δικαιοσύνη, οἱ λόγοι μου οὐκ ἀποστραφήσονται, ὅτι ἐμοὶ *κάμψει πᾶν γόνυ* καὶ *ἐξομολογήσεται πᾶσα γλῶσσα* τῷ θεῷ

"By myself I have sworn, from my mouth has gone forth in righteousness a word that shall not return; To me *every knee shall bow [/bend], every tongue shall swear [/confess]*."

Allusion

"Allusion has proven to be one of the most difficult notions to define in literary study."[42] Porter defined "allusions" as the non-formal invocation of a literary work or a person, event, or place that the author "could reasonably have been expected to know" (in the case of Paul, the Old Testament).[43] In a quotation the high degree of verbal/syntactical repetition requires a written or oral source text; an allusion, on the other hand, may *not* be to a written or oral text but, again, to a person, an event, or a place.[44]

Initially, Porter thought that allusions, unlike paraphrases, may or may not be consciously intentional.[45] Later, he modified his definition to require authorial intent, whether or not the reader grasps the

---

42. Porter, "Further Comments," 109.
43. Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 95; Porter, "Further Comments," 109.
   The use of the label "Old Testament," while prominent in intertextual discussions is problematic and may miscommunicate. Jewish scholars would object to their Scriptures being labeled pejoratively as "old" in favor of the "new" and better. Unfortunately, no suitable alternative presents itself. The label "Hebrew Scriptures" is problematic since Paul is usually drawing on the Greek version of those Scriptures, and even his use of the Septuagint is more "septuagintal" than of the Septuagint as such. "Israel's Scriptures" (thus William Scott Green, "Doing the Text's Work for It: Richard Hays on Paul's Use of Scripture," in *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*, JSNTSup 83, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993], 58–63, here 58) is a possibility but a bit cumbersome. With these qualifications, "Old Testament" is often retained here.
44. See also the definitions and discussion in James H. Coombs, "Allusion Defined and Explained," *Poetics* 13 (1984): 475–88.
45. Porter, "Further Comments," 109.

allusion.[46] With this shift, Porter was following earlier scholarship on allusions. For instance, as John Hollander wrote, "Intention to allude recognizably is essential to the concept. . . . Again, it should be stated that one cannot in this sense allude unintentionally—an inadvertent allusion is a kind of solecism." Allusion is "a poet's *deliberate* incorporation of identifiable elements from other sources."[47] Beale likewise defined an allusion as "consciously intended by an author."[48] An allusion may even consist, in some cases, of *fewer* than three unique words. Even a shared *idea* could be an allusion. For Beale, "The telltale key to discerning an allusion is that of recognizing an *incomparable or unique parallel in wording, syntax, concept, or cluster of motifs in the same order or structure.*"[49] He continued, "When both unique wording (verbal coherence) and theme are found, the proposed allusion takes on greater probability. Recognizing allusions is like interpretation: there are degrees of probability and possibility in any attempt to identify an allusion."[50] The recognition of an allusion is more art than science.

Echo

Porter attempted to offer a more precise distinction between allusions and echoes than had Hays: the echo "does not have the specificity

---

46. Stanley E. Porter, "Allusions and Echoes," in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul's Use of Scripture*, SBLSymS 50, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 29–40, here 35–36.

47. John Hollander, *Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 64 (emphasis mine); Earl Miner, "Allusion," in *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*, ed. Alex Preminger and T. V. F Brogan (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 38–39; he then added that allusion "assumes" "readers sharing knowledge with the poet."

48. Beale, *Handbook*, 31. See Porter's defense of the necessity of authorial intention behind allusions ("Allusions and Echoes," 34–36). Allusions are fundamentally functional rather than imitative; Peter D. Juhl, *Interpretation: An Essay in the Philosophy of Literary Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1980), esp. 58–62, here 58: "[A] fairly wide range of facts are difficult, if not impossible, to account for unless we assume that what a literary work means is determined by what the author meant. . . . The relevance of an author's intention to what his text means is perhaps most obvious in the case of allusion." Note Juhl's full discussion in "Is Evidence of the Author's Intention Irrelevant?," 45–65.

49. Beale, *Handbook*, 31, depending on Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 47–62. Alter pointed out that moderns may not recognize ancient allusive patterns, and that the existence of such patterns will have to be argued, as he himself does in his examples.

50. Beale, *Handbook*, 31–32.

of allusion but is reserved for language that is thematically related to a more general notion or concept."[51] At one point Hays suggested distinguishing an echo from an allusion as an *unintentional* reference, one "that does not depend on conscious intention."[52] Lucas added (apparently unaware that he was following Hays):

> An audience member, for example, may recognize an unwitting echo on the part of an author/speaker, one that the author/speaker would then acknowledge if brought to attention. What distinguishes echoes from allusions, or evocations, is authorial intention, not audience recognition. Ordinarily, however, an audience, at least some portion of the original one, would recognize both.[53]

Lucas conceded that "it may not always be easy" to discern the presence or absence of authorial intention.[54] Others have contended that an echo is simply not intended for the audience.[55] In short, a tidy distinction between allusion and echo is not forthcoming. Porter complained, "[M]any simply do not define their terms, and most attempts to do so fail to provide the kind of definitions necessary."[56]

Because echoes are on the subtler, weaker, subliminal end of Porter's cline, many of the echoes that have been identified by scholars are questionable. For instance, Roy Ciampa saw behind Paul's use of the phrase "churches/assemblies of God" in Gal. 1:13 the "clear indication of a scriptural-eschatological conception of the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ [the assemblies of God]"—that is, an echo of the assemblies of Israel. Even the word "churches" or "assemblies" (ἐκκλησία) earlier in Gal. 1:2 "should be understood to evoke, in a more subtle way, that scriptural-

---

51. Porter, "Allusion and Echoes," 40.
52. Hays, *Echoes*, 29, citing Hollander, *Figure of Echo*, 64. Lucas ("Assessing," 110) proposed the same distinction as something novel and, ironically, as a critique of Hays. Lucas's overlooking of Hays's original distinction is even more ironic in view of Lucas's extended critique of Porter's inadequate handling of Hays. At the same time, Hays was inconsistent in his use of the word *echo*.
53. Lucas, "Assessing," 110. In this distinction, Lucas followed earlier scholarship, e.g., Green, "Doing the Text's Work," 59, who distinguished "allusion, which usually connotes a conscious authorial act and perhaps a knowing audience, and echo, which requires neither."
54. Lucas, "Assessing," 110. Lucas distinguished between peering into the author's mind and the author's attempt to communicate in written form; see on this point E. D. Hirsch Jr., *Validity in Interpretation* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1967), 1–23.
55. Hollander, *Figure of Echo*, 64.
56. Porter, "Use of the Old Testament," 88.