

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Religion

For centuries, scripture and theology were the focus of prodigious amounts of scholarship and publishing, dominated in the English-speaking world by the work of Protestant Christians. Enlightenment philosophy and science, anthropology, ethnology and the colonial experience all brought new perspectives, lively debates and heated controversies to the study of religion and its role in the world, many of which continue to this day. This series explores the editing and interpretation of religious texts, the history of religious ideas and institutions, and not least the encounter between religion and science.

The Epistle of St. James

Fenton John Antony Hort (1828–1892) was Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and the editor, with B.F. Westcott, of an influential edition of the Greek New Testament. His detailed commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle (Letter) of St James was left incomplete at his death. When it was published in 1909, the editor wrote 'Each word and phrase and sentence has been examined in the light of the whole available evidence with characteristic freshness, and with a singularly delicate sense both of the meaning of words, and of subtle variations of grammatical structure.' The Introduction situates the Epistle in its New Testament context, and reflects on issues of authorship, reception and content. Hort's scholarly insights remain of interest to modern theologians. His work also bears witness to the strenuous efforts made by late Victorian theologians to create a textual bulwark against the growth of religious scepticism.



Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.



The Epistle of St. James

The Greek Text with Introduction, Commentary as Far as Chapter IV, Verse 7, and Additional Notes

Edited by Fenton John Anthony Hort





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paolo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108007535

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2009

This edition first published 1909 This digitally printed version 2009

ISBN 978-1-108-00753-5 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.



THE EPISTLE OF ST JAMES





MACMILLAN AND CO., Limited London · Bombay · Calcutta Melbourne

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK - BOSTON - CHICAGO
ATLANTA - SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD TORONTO



THE EPISTLE OF ST JAMES

THE GREEK TEXT

WITH INTRODUCTION, COMMENTARY AS FAR AS CHAPTER IV, VERSE 7, AND ADDITIONAL NOTES

BY THE LATE

F. J. A. HORT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.

SOMETIME HULSEAN PROFESSOR AND LADY MARGARET'S READER IN DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED ST MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON

1909

All rights reserved



CONTENTS

		PAGES
PREFA	CE	i —vii
INTRO	DUCTION	ix—xxxiii
Value of the Epistle		ix ff.
Authorship		xi—xxii
The Readers		xxii ff.
Circumstances and Date		xxiv f.
Reception		xxv—xxxi
Purpose and Contents		xxxi ff.
Style		xxxiii
	AND NOTES	ı—ıoı
I.	On "Brother" improperly used	102 f.
II.	Οη της δόξης	103 f.
III.	On Ͽλην	104 ff.
IV.	Οπ τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως	106 f.
v.	Οη έσπαταλήσατε	107 ff.
VI.	Peculiarities of vocabulary in the Codex Cor-	
	beiensis of St James	109 ff.
THEFT	7 .0	112-10



PREFACE

THE circumstances connected with the origin of this book have already been related by Dr Westcott in the preface to the companion edition of Dr Hort's Commentary on I St Peter i.—ii. 17, published in 1898. It was designed to take its place in a Commentary on the whole N.T. planned by the three friends, Westcott, Lightfoot, and Hort in 1860.

Dr Hort's share included the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles of St James, St Peter, and St Jude. After a brief period of work on the Gospels, of which only a few unimportant fragments remain, Dr Hort set to work on St James. If we may judge from the condition of the MS. the Commentary on Chapter I was complete when he came back to Cambridge, as a Fellow of Emmanuel College, in 1871. His notes were, however, worked over and written out afresh when he chose St James as the subject for his first three courses of Lectures as Hulsean Professor in 1880, 1881. It is idle now to regret that his attention was called away to lecture in 1882 on Tatian's Apology, leaving the Commentary incomplete, but within sight of the end. When at length he returned to the Epistle in the Summer Term of 1889, he dealt mainly with questions of Introduction. The introductory matter printed in this volume was prepared for that course of Lectures. It was



ii

supplemented by condensed notes on select passages from the earlier chapters of the Epistle. No further progress was made with the Commentary on the Text.

The Introduction and Commentary have been printed substantially as they stand in the MS., except that for the sake of uniformity English renderings have in some cases been supplied at the head of the notes. This however has only been done in cases where the note itself gave clear indication of the rendering which Dr Hort would himself have proposed.

No one who reads this book with the attention that it requires and deserves will feel that any apology is needed for its publication, in spite of its incompleteness. Introduction no doubt the scholarship appears to a certain extent in what Dr Sanday, in the Preface to Dr Hort's notes on Apoc. i.—iii. published last year, aptly describes as 'undress.' And some points would naturally have received fuller treatment, if the author himself had been spared to prepare his own work for publication. But there is no reason to suppose that his conclusions would have been seriously modified by anything that has been written on the Epistle since his death. His Introduction has, it will not be superfluous to point out, an advantage from the appended Commentary, inevitably but none the less unfortunately lacking in the still more compendious introduction provided, e.g. in such a recognized Text-book as Jülicher's. For after all the ultimate appeal on most of the vexed questions of Introduction lies to the Text itself. And on one point at least Dr Hort's patient and minute examination of the Text supplies a conclusive answer to the charge of incoherence not uncommonly brought against the Epistle on the ground of the obvious abruptness of

¹ On this point it is well worth while to compare A Discussion of the General Epistle of St James by R. St John Parry, published by the Cambridge University Press in 1903.



iii

its style. No one can study these notes consecutively without becoming conscious of a subtle harmony underlying the whole Epistle, due partly to the consistent application of a few fundamental principles characteristic of the author¹, and partly to the recurrence in different forms of the same fundamental failing in the people to whom his warnings are addressed².

In regard to the evidence to be derived from the language in which the Epistle is written it is clear that Dr Hort worked habitually on an hypothesis, the possibility of which many modern critics either ignore or deny. Everything here turns on the extent to which a knowledge of Greek may be presupposed among the Jewish inhabitants of Palestine in the First Century A.D. Jülicher, for example, regards the excellence of the Greek of the Epistle as in itself conclusive against the traditional attribution. This seems arbitrary in the case of a man whose father according to an early tradition (St Matth. ii.) spent some time in Egypt. Dr Hort on the other hand regarded a knowledge of Greek as anything but exceptional in Palestine. He thinks it possible to identify dialectic peculiarities of Palestinian Greek3. He is prepared to believe in the currency4 of 'Greek paraphrases of the O.T. resembling the Hebrew Targums.' The influence that he everywhere ascribes to the LXX in moulding N.T. vocabulary presupposes a considerable familiarity with the Greek Version of the O.T. in Apostolic circles5. And he finds the Epistle of St James full of implied references to the words of the Lord in their Greek form. This point is one of far-reaching importance, and if there are good reasons for supposing that a man in St James' position could

н. J.

ъ

¹ See notes on i. 18, 21, iii. 9 for St James' doctrine of Creation: on the true Law i. 25, ii. 12: on his conception of the World i. 27, iii. 6, iv. 4.

² E.g. formalism i. 22, 26, 27, ii. 19: censoriousness i. 19, iii. 1, 9, 12.

³ See p. 46 b, 84 a.

⁴ See p. 94 b. ⁵ See esp. p. 97 b.

⁶ See p. 91 a, p. xxxiii. etc.



iv

not have had a thorough knowledge of Greek, it would be well that they should be produced.

The Commentary itself, as far as it goes, is finished work in every line. Each word and phrase and sentence has been examined in the light of the whole available evidence with characteristic freshness, and with a singularly delicate sense both of the meaning of words, and of subtle variations of grammatical structure. At times, no doubt, in Dr Hort's work as in Dr Westcott's, the investigation of a particular word or form of thought seems to be carried beyond the limits strictly necessary for the interpretation of the passage immediately under discussion. It is however only fair to recal the fact that each separate Commentary was meant to form part of an inclusive scheme. Both scholars combined a keen sense of the variety of the several parts of the N.T. with a deep conviction of the fundamental unity of the whole. Their field of view was never limited by the particular passage on which they might happen to be commenting. No single fragment, they felt, could be fully understood out of relation to the whole Revelation of which it formed a part. Conciseness and, as regards the rapid apprehension of the salient points in individual books, something of sharpness of focus were sacrificed in consequence. But for students of the N.T. as a whole, the result is The labour entailed in following out the suggested pure gain. lines of thought is amply repaid by a growing sense of depth beyond depth of Wisdom hidden under familiar and seemingly commonplace forms of expression. And even the several books stand out in the end in more clearly defined individuality.

This characteristic of Dr Hort's method minimizes the disadvantages arising from the fragmentariness of the finished work. The discussion of representative sections of different writers has given him wider scope for the treatment of the various departments of N.T. Theology than would have been



٧

afforded by a Commentary formally complete on a single Epistle. The First Epistle of St Peter occupies no doubt a peculiarly central position in N.T. The relation in which it stands to the Epistles to the Romans and to the 'Ephesians' led Dr Hort to treat many of the characteristic problems of the Pauline Gospel, and its relation to the Epistle of St James is remarkably illustrated by the fact that in commenting on St Peter Dr Hort not infrequently summarizes the results of investigations recorded in full in this volume. Yet even I St Peter would not have given him the scope afforded by these chapters of St James for treating of the fundamental problems of individual (as distinct from social) Ethics, and of Psychology.

In spite therefore of its apparent fragmentariness Dr Hort's work is marked by a real unity, and possesses a permanent value for all serious students of N.T. In details no doubt both of vocabulary and syntax his results will need to be carefully checked in the fresh light which is coming from the Papyri. But in work so broadly based, fresh evidence we may well believe will confirm far more than it will upset.

But, some one may say, granted all this, what is meant by the permanent value of a Commentary? Are not Commentaries like all scientific text-books, only written to be superseded? In every other department of study, however gifted a scholar may be, he must be content that his particular contribution to the advancement of knowledge shall be merged and lost in the general sum. Is there any reason to think that the case is different in Theology? Strangely enough there is.

The subject-matter of the science of Theology is provided by the Bible. 'That standard interpretation' of the primary Gospel 'was ordained to be for the guidance of the Church in all after ages, in combination with the living guidance of the

1 p. ix.

 b_2



vi

Spirit.' Each age must go back for itself to the fountain head. Yet for the thinkers in each age there are abiding lessons to be learnt from the labours of their predecessors. It is not surprising, therefore, that all the outstanding leaders in Theological thought, the men of creative insight, who have moulded the minds of their fellows throughout the Christian centuries, e.g. Origen, Theodore, and Augustine, have been great primarily as interpreters of Scripture, content to sacrifice any glory of 'originality,' all licence of unfettered speculations, that they might be the servants of a Text. And the work to which they gave their lives is living work to-day. Their Theologies have still a message for us, in spite of antiquated method and defective intellectual equipment: full of light which we can ill afford to neglect. Though 'they must remain a dead letter to us, till they are interpreted by the thoughts and aspirations of our own time, as shone upon by the light of the Spirit who is the teacher of Christ's disciples in every age1.

The fact is that just as in the original communication of the Divine Revelation the personality of the writer is an integral part of the message which he was chosen to convey, so the personality of each interpreter of these 'living oracles' is a vital element in all the fresh light that he is able to perceive in them. Any contribution that he makes to their fuller understanding remains to the end of time recognisably his, for those who have eyes to see. Here, as in the case of all other builders on the one foundation, the fire tries, and the day will declare each man's work of what sort it is: though it is only the few here and there who are called out by, and exercise a dominant influence in, the successive crises in the development of Christian thought, whose names survive upon the mouths of men, and whose work is studied for its own sake in later generations.

¹ Hort on The Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 138.



vii

Now Lightfoot, Westcott and Hort have not left behind them a body of systematic Theology. The treatise on Christian Doctrine which was to have been the crown of Dr Westcott's work was never completed. They founded no school marked by common adherence to any characteristic tenets. message to their age lay rather in the attitude and method than in any specific results of their work. The crisis in Christian thought which they were called to face affected primarily the Authority, the Inspiration, and the Interpretation of the Bible. And it is impossible to over-estimate the debt which English Christianity has owed in this perilous period of transition to the steadying influence exerted over the minds of their contemporaries by the simple fact of their lifelong devotion to the study of the sacred text, their fearless faith in Truth, their 'guileless workmanship,' and their reverent humility. At the same time it is hard not to believe that the actual results of work done in such a spirit will be found to possess a value in the eyes of other generations besides that which witnessed its production.

It only remains for me to express my heartiest thanks to my colleague, the Rev. P. H. L. Brereton, Fellow of St Augustine's College, without whose scholarly and ungrudging assistance I should have found it impossible in the pressure of multifarious distractions to see this book through the press and verify the references: to Professor Burkitt for his kind help in the note on the Latin renderings of $\epsilon \rho \iota \theta \iota a$: and to the printers and proof-readers of the University Press for their patience and thoroughness.

J. O. F. MURRAY.

ST AUGUSTINE'S COLLEGE,

CANTERBURY.

St Peter's Day, 1909.



INTRODUCTION.

The Epistle of St James is among the less read and less studied books of the N.T.; and this for obvious reasons. With one partial exception it has not supplied material for great theological controversies. But moreover it is a book that very few Christians on consideration would place among the *most* important books. No one wishing to refer to the written records which best set forth what Christian belief and even Christian practice is would turn to it as they would turn to the Gospels or to some, at least, of St Paul's Epistles. Nay, as we all know, even distinctively Christian language in one sense of the phrase, i.e. such language as no one but a Christian could use, is used in it very sparingly. Thus no wonder that it has been comparatively little valued by Christian readers, and comparatively little examined and illustrated by Christian commentators.

Yet on the other hand it has an important place and office of its own in the Scriptures of the N.T. Its very unlikeness to other books is of the greatest value to us, as shewing through Apostolic example the manysidedness of Christian truth. Our faith rests first on the Gospel itself, the revelation of God and His redemption in His Only begotten Son, and secondly on the interpretation of that primary Gospel by the Apostles and Apostolic men to whom was Divinely committed the task of applying the revelation of Christ to the thoughts and deeds of their own time. That standard interpretation of theirs was ordained to be for the guidance of the Church in all after ages, in combination with the living guidance of the Spirit. But it could not have discharged this office if it had been of one



X

Cambridge University Press 978-1-108-00753-5 - The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction, Commentary as Far as Chapter IV, Verse 7, and Additional Notes Edited by Fenton John Anthony Hort Frontmatter More information

INTRODUCTION

type only, moulded by the mental characteristics of a single man, though he were an inspired Apostle. It was needed that various modes of apprehending the one Truth should be sanctioned for ever as contributing to the completeness of the faith. And that mode of apprehending it which we find in St James stamped the comprehensiveness of Apostolic Christianity in a marked manner, being the furthest removed from that of the Apostle of largest influence, St Paul.

That special type of Christianity which is represented by St James had a high intrinsic value apart from its testimony to the various because partial character of Divine truth as apprehended by One of the most serious dangers to Christian faith in the early ages, perhaps we may say, in all ages, was the temptation to think of Christ as the founder of a new religion, to invert His words "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil." St Paul himself was entirely free from such a view of Christianity: but the part which he had to take in vindicating Gentile freedom against Jewish encroachments made him easily appear to be the herald of a new religion. The Divine judgement of the fall of Jerusalem and the Jewish State, and also the bitter hatred with which the Jews long pursued Christians. would all tend to produce the same impression. Thus many influences prepared the way for the influence of Marcion in the second century and long afterwards, and made him seem a true champion of the purity of the Gospel. When he cast off the worship of the Creator, of Jehovah the Lord of Israel, the merely just God of the O.T., as he said, and set up the God of the N.T. as a new God, alone in the strict sense good, alone to be worshipped by Christians, he could not but seem to many to be delivering the faith from an antiquated bondage. And so again and again the wild dream of a "Christianity without Judaism" has risen up with attractive power. But the Epistle of St James marks in the most decisive way the continuity of the two Testaments. In some obvious aspects it is like a piece of the O.T. appearing in the midst of the N.T.; and yet not out of place, or out of date, for it is most truly of the N.T. too. It as it were carries on the line of intermediate



AUTHORSHIP

хi

testimony which starts from John the Baptist, and is taken up by the hymns in Lk. i., ii. (Magnificat, Benedictus, Nunc Dimittis). As they reach forward towards the Gospel, so the Epistle of St James looks upon the elder dispensation as having been in a manner itself brought to perfection by the Gospel.

This distinctive value of St James' Epistle is closely related to the distinctive value of the first three Gospels. The relation is not merely of affinity, but almost of direct descent. The Epistle is saturated with the matter of those Gospels (or narratives akin to them). No other book so uses them. And though the completeness of Christianity would be maimed if the teaching of the Gospel of St John were away, yet the three Gospels give in their own way a true picture. Many perversions of Christianity could not have arisen if they had in practice as well as theory been taken with the Gospel of St John; and so the combination of St James with St Paul is a safeguard against much error.

Besides this general value of the Epistle as a whole, its details are full of matter of high interest and importance, often by no means lying on the surface. It is also far from being an easy Epistle. Many verses of it are easy, but many are difficult enough, and even in the easier parts the train of thought is often difficult to catch. Much, though not all, of the difficulty comes from the energetic abruptness of style, reminding us of the older prophets. Thus for various reasons the Epistle is one that will repay close examination and illustration.

Authorship.

Two questions arise: (1) What James is intended by `Iáκωβos in i. 1. (2) Whether the James so intended did really write the Epistle: is it authentic or supposititious?

There is no need to spend much time on this second question, which is almost entirely distinct from the general question of the date of important N.T. books. Some critics of ability still uphold a late date, but on very slight and intangible grounds. One has urged similarity to *Hom. Clem.*, a late book: but such little simi-



xii

INTRODUCTION

larity as there is proceeds from the fact that both are by Jewish Christians, though in quite different generations. Others refer to the judicial persecutions, or to the presbyters. Others, with less reference to date, say that though Jewish it is not Jewish enough for the James whom they rightly suppose to be intended: but then this image of James they have constructed out of problematical materials. Again it is said that it contains Orphic language, strange in a Palestinian Jew $(\tau \partial \tau \tau \rho \rho \chi \partial \nu \tau \eta \hat{s} \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \omega \hat{s}$ in iii. 6): but this interpretation of the words cannot stand.

A somewhat more tangible ground is the supposed reference to Hebrews and Apocalypse, books apparently (Apoc. certainly) written after St James' death. In ii. 25 there is a reference to 'Paàβ ή πόρνη as with Abraham an example of justification by works. It is urged that as Abraham is taken from St Paul, so Rahab is taken from the Pauline Hebrews xi. 31 (cf. Bleek Heb. 1. 89 f.). It is quite possible that Rahab may have been cited by St Paul or disciples of his as an example of faith: but the reference to Heb. is unlikely, for there is no question of justification there. She is merely one of a long series (οὐ συναπώλετο). But at all events it is enough that she was celebrated by the Jews as a typical proselyte (Wünsche, Erläuterung der Evangelien, 3 f.). As Abraham was the type of Israelite faith, so Rahab was of Gentile faith. In i. 12, τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωης is referred to Rev. ii. 10; and ii. 5, κληρονόμους της βασιλείας to Rev. i. 6, 9; v. 10. "Crown of life" is a striking phrase, not likely to arise independently in two places: but probably of Jewish origin, founded on O.T. (see further, in loc.). Κληρον. τ. βασιλ. comes straight from our Lord's words Mt. v. 3, 10; Lk. xii. 32, etc. as regards βασιλεία (the poor, as here) and both words Mt. xxv. 34; I Cor. vi. 9, etc. These supposed indications, practically all isolated, crumble into nothing.

A striking fact is that Kern, who initiated the more vigorous criticism of the Epistle in modern times by his essay of 1835, then placed it late: yet himself wrote a commentary in 1838 in which he retracted the former view, and acknowledged that he had been over hasty.



AUTHORSHIP

xiii

It is not necessary at present to say more on authenticity, which will come under notice incidentally. But how as to the James intended? Practically two only come into consideration: James the son of Zebedee and James the Lord's brother. Who James the Lord's brother was is another question.

Was it the son of Zebedee? For this there is hardly any external Cod. Corbeiensis, an interesting Ms with an Old Latin text, has Explicit epistola Jacobi filii Zebedaei. The date is cent. x (Holder ap. Gebhardt Barn. xxiv f.); but the colophon is probably much more ancient. The Epistle is not part of a N.T. or of Epistles, but is in combination with three other Latin books all ancient, the four together forming the end (true end) of a vol. of which the first three-quarters (69-93) are lost (Bonnell ap. Hilgenf. in Zeitsch. 1871, 263). Philaster on Heresies (soon after the middle of cent. IV); Novatian (called Tert.) de cibis judaicis (cent. III); and an old translation of the Ep. of Barnabas, next to which (i.e. last) it stands. Thus it is highly probable that the Corb. Ms was copied from one written late in cent. IV, or not much later, i.e. at a time when the Epistle of St James was treated in the West as a venerable writing, but not as part of the N.T. This could hardly have been the case after cent. IV, owing to the authority of Jerome, Augustine and the Council of Carthage (prob. 397).

Another probable trace of this tradition in the West is in Isid. Hisp. de ortu et obitu patrum 71: Jacobus filius Zebedaei, frater Joannis, quartus in ordine, duodecim tribubus quae sunt in dispersione gentium scripsit atque Hispaniae et occidentalium locorum gentibus evangelium praedicavit etc. It has been suggested that "scripsit" is an interpolation. Apparently the only reason is because (in some MSS (?) not noticed by Vallarsi) Jerome de vir. illust.

¹ Syr. often cited, on account of a Syriac note common to the three Epistles:

Of the Holy Apostles
James Peter John
Spectators of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ
The several Epistles
printed in the Syriac tongue and characters.

But this is now understood to be due to Widmanstadt.



xiv

INTRODUCTION

after Matthew has: J. Zebedaei filius duodecim tribubus quae sunt in dispersione omnibus praedicavit evangelium Dni. nostri J.C. etc. (Martianay, Vulgata, p. 191: cf. Sabat. III. 944). But this may just as easily be a shortened abbreviation of Isidore. This addition in Jerome is by Martianay referred to some Greeks (a Graecis nescio quibus); but what Greeks are meant? The motive probably was to make him an apostle, the identification with the son of Alphaeus not being known to those who gave the title; also the connexion of Peter, James and John. Practically the same motive still exists; but it is not an argument. Plumptre (pp. 7-10) quite sufficiently answers Mr Bassett's reasons. They all are merely points in which words said in the Epistle are such as might easily have been said by one who saw and heard what the son of Zebedee did, but suit equally the other James in question. Besides Apostleship the other motive is to obtain an early date, on which more hereafter. At all events it is obvious that the existence of recipients such as the Epistle presupposes would be inconsistent with all that we know of the few years before St James' death. Indeed if he had written, it is most strange that no better tradition should exist; most strange also that there should be no record of such a special position and activity as would lead to his writing in this authoritative tone.

We come therefore as a matter of course to James the Lord's brother. About him a large literature has been written: it is worth while here only to take the more important points. To take first what is clear and accepted on all hands, he was the James of all but the earliest years of the Apostolic age. Three times he appears in the Acts, all memorable occasions:—(I) xii. 17. When Peter is delivered from the imprisonment which accompanied the death of James the son of Zebedee, he bids his friends go tell the news to "James and the brethren," which shews that already he was prominent, to say the least. (2) xv. 13. At the conference or council at Jerusalem, arising out of the Judaizers' attempt to enforce circumcision at Antioch, when Peter has spoken in favour of liberty, and Barnabas and Paul have recounted their successful mission in Asia Minor, James likewise recognises Gentile



AUTHORSHIP

хv

Christianity, but proposes restrictions which were virtually a compromise; finally he refers to the Jews and their synagogues in different cities. (3) xxi. 18. When Paul comes to Jerusalem (for the last time, as it proved) and is welcomed by the brethren, he goes in next day to James, all the elders being present: he greets them and recounts his missionary successes. They (James and the elders) glorify God for what had happened, and then mentioning the great number of Christian Jews at Jerusalem, all zealots for the law, and ill-disposed towards St Paul, suggested his performance of a Jewish rite of purification in the temple to shew that he himself had not abandoned Jewish practice though it was not to be imposed on Gentiles. Thus, again, substantially accepting Gentile freedom, but urging subordinate concession to Jewish feelings.

Now as regards St Paul's Epistles:—(1) 1 Cor. xv. 7 (to which we must return). Christ was seen by James, then by all the (2) Gal. i. 19. Referring to the first visit to Jerusalem after the conversion, "other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother." (3) Gal. ii. 9. The second visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Galatians, but apparently the third altogether, and probably identical with that of Acts xv. (see Lightft. Gal. 10 pp. 123 ff., 303 ff.). Here James, Cephas, John, οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι, recognising the grace given him, give them the right hand of fellowship, that Paul and Barnabas should go to the Gentiles, they to the circumcision, with a proviso that they should remember the poor (brethren of Judaea), which, he says, for this very reason I made it a point to do. (4) Gal. ii. 12. Certain came from James (from Jerusalem to Antioch). [See Jud. Christ. pp. 79 ff.] Doubtless we must add Jude 1, άδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου: but this is of less consequence. Here then we have James as the leading person at Jerusalem from the time of Peter's imprisonment to Paul's last visit. Here the N.T. leaves him. More we learn from Hegesippus (Eus. ii. 23; cf. iv. 22) about his way of life ("the Just"), his reputation among the people, and his martyrdom. His death is also mentioned by Joseph. Ant. xx. 9. 1, for there is no sufficient reason to suspect the passage to be interpolated.



xvi

INTRODUCTION

We now come to matters of question and debate. Was he one of the Twelve? i.e. Was he the son of Alphaeus? Why was he called the Lord's brother? Without attempting to trace out all the intricacies of the scriptural argument a word must be said on the cardinal points.

First Gal. i. 19: ἔτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου. Here, according to the most obvious sense, St Paul implies that James was one of the Apostles, while he directly calls him the brother of the Lord. Is this obvious sense right? i.e. Can ἔτερον εἰ μή reasonably bear another meaning? On the whole, I think not. For the very late exchange of $\epsilon i \mu \dot{\eta}$ and άλλά in N.T. there is no probability whatever. In three other books of the N.T. in less good Greek (Mt. xii. 4; Lk. iv. 25f.; Rev. ix. 4) the meaning looks like this, but fallaciously. Either the $\epsilon i \,\mu \eta'$ goes with the preceding clause as a general statement, dropping the particular reference, or (more probably) there is a colloquial ellipse of another negative (cf. Mt. xii. 4, οὐδέ τινι εἰ μὴ τ. ἰερεῦσιν μόνοις; Lk. iv. 26, οὐδὲ πρός τινα εἰ μὴ εἰς Σάρεπτα; Rev. ix. 4, οὐδέ τ_l εl $\mu \dot{\eta}$ τ . $\dot{a}\nu\theta\rho\dot{\omega}\pi o\nu s$). The force is thus not simply "but," but "but only." St Paul himself has some rather peculiar uses of \$\epsilon\$ i μή. Rom. xiii. 8, εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπῶν; 1 Cor. ii. 11, τίς γὰρ οἶδεν...τὰ τ. ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα κ.τ.λ.; (probably not Gal. ii. 16, οὐ δικαιοῦται...ἐὰν μή). Again with an initial ellipse 1 Cor. vii. 17, εἰ μὴ ἐκάστῳ κ.τ.λ. ("only"); Rom. xiv. 14, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ; Gal. i. 7, εἰ μή τινές εἰσιν κ.τ.λ. Thus it is not impossible that St Paul might mean "unless you choose to count" etc. a historical statement on a delicate matter he would probably with that meaning have hinted it by a particle, as by εἰ μὴ ἄρα, εἰ μή γε. Thus it is much more probable that he did simply accept James as "an apostle," while yet his mentioning so important a person (see ii. 9) only as an after thought, not with Peter, does suggest some difference of authority or position between them.

Next what did he mean by an apostle? Was it necessarily one

 $^{^{1}\,}$ Excellently given in Ltft., and summarised (rather too shortly) by Plumptre pp. 10 ff.).



AUTHORSHIP

xvii

of the Twelve? Here we must walk cautiously, and observe carefully the limits of usage. The range of the term in the N.T. is very peculiar. In Mt. and Mk. it is confined to the first mission and return of the Twelve, and is so introduced as to suggest that the previous narratives had it not (Mt. x. 1, 2, 5; Mk. iii. 14; vi. 30). In Jn. it is only used in its general sense of envoy (xiii. 16), οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τ. πέμψαντος αὐτόν. In these three "the Twelve" or "the disciples" take its place. But in Lk. it comes in more freely, though still not so commonly as "disciples."

In Acts (from i. 2) it is the frequent and almost (contrast vi. 2) exclusive designation of the Twelve and of them alone, with one remarkable exception. From xi. 20 Antioch begins to be a centre of Christian life and activity external to Jerusalem. Barnabas is sent (xi. 22) by the Church at Jerusalem to investigate what was going on. He approved it, fetched Paul from Tarsus, and they worked at Antioch together; and together they carried a contribution to the brethren in Judaea (xi. 28 ff.). Then (xiii. 1-4) in a very marked way they are described as set apart by a special command of the Holy Spirit, having hands laid on them and being formally sent forth. This was the first Missionary Journey: on the course of it they are twice (xiv. 4, 14) called "the apostles," but never after. This usage in xiv. is often urged to shew the latitude of usage. It seems to me to have quite the opposite meaning: it shews that the apostolate of the Twelve was not the only office that could bear the name: but the application is to one equally definite, though temporary, a special and specially sacred commission for a particular mission of vast importance for the history of the Church, being the first authoritative mission work to the heathen (in contrast to sporadic individuals), the first recorded extension of the Gospel beyond Syria, and by its results the occasion of bringing to a point the question of Gentile Christianity and the memorable decision of the Council or Conference of Jerusalem.

1 Pet. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1: "an apostle of Jesus Christ" (as in St Paul). 2 Pet. iii. 2; Jude 17: "the apostles" used in a way which neither requires nor excludes limitation. Rev. xxi. 14: twelve



xviii

INTRODUCTION

names of twelve apostles of the Lamb on the twelve foundations of the wall of New Jerusalem; xviii. 20 (more indeterminately). But ii. 2, the angel of the Church at Ephesus has "tried them that say they are apostles, and are not, and found them false," which seems to imply both a legitimate and illegitimate use outside the Twelve. Heb. iii. 1, Christ Himself "apostle and high priest of our profession," equivalent to "envoy" as in Jn.

St Paul emphasizes his own apostleship in salutations etc., and the energy with which he asserts his own claim as connected with a special mission from Christ Himself on the way to Damascus is really incompatible with looseness of usage. The Twelve were confessedly apostles: so was he: but this was not worth saying if the title might be given to others not having as definite an authority. This comes out clearly when we consider the passages in which he acknowledges the priority of the Twelve in time (1 Cor. xv. 9; Gal. i. 17; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11). How then about the apparent exceptions in his use? Among these we must not reckon Rom. xvi. 7 (οἶτινες ἐπίσημοι ἐν τ. ἀποστόλοις). The next clause speaks of them (Andronicus and Junius) as having become Christians earlier than himself, so that doubtless they had been at Jerusalem, and so would be, as the words would quite naturally mean', "men of mark in the eyes of the apostles," "favourably known to the apostles." The only real passages are 2 Cor. viii. 23 (Titus and others), ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν between ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν and δόξα Χριστοῦ; and Phil. ii. 25 (Epaphroditus), τ. άδελφον καὶ συνεργον καὶ συνστρατιώτην μου, υμών δὲ ἀπόστολον; both marked by the added words as used in the limited sense of "envoys of churches," somewhat as in Acts xiv. This throws no light on "other of the apostles," apparently absolute and equivalent to apostles of God or of Christ.

Thus far we find St Paul's use not vague at all, but limited to (1) the Twelve, (2) himself, (3) envoys of churches, but in this case only with other words (defining genitives) added. Yet it does not follow that he would refuse it to St James unless he were of the

¹ For this use of ἐπίσημος ἐν, and the opposite ἄσημος ἐν, there is good classical analogy. It is analogous to 1 Cor. vi. 2, εἰ ἐν ὑμῦν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος.



AUTHORSHIP

X1X

Twelve. Supposing he had some exceptional claim like his own, he might allow the name. I Cor. xv. 5-8 seems to shew that it really was so:

"seen of Cephas, then of the Twelve, seen of James, then of all the apostles."

The use of all implies the Twelve and something more, and it is not unlikely that the relations correspond of single names and bodies.

Whether St James was the only additional apostle, we cannot tell: but probably he was. His early and peculiar authority would be accounted for if he had some exceptional Divine authorisation analogous to St Paul's. Not to speak of confused traditions about this, St Paul's mention of Christ's appearance to him (I Cor. xv. 7) points to a probable occasion, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews had a story referring to this event (Jerome, de vir. illustr. 2). Such an event as the conversion of a brother of the Lord by a special appearance after the Resurrection might easily single him out for a special apostleship.

Thus Galatians i. 19 is compatible either with his being one of the Twelve, or an additional member of the apostolate by an exceptional title; and 1 Cor. xv. rather suggests the latter.

The details of the "brotherhood" question must be left to the books on the subject. Speaking generally there are four theories:

- (1) Helvidian: brothers strictly, sons of Joseph and Mary.
- (2) Palestinian or Epiphanian: brothers strictly in scriptural sense, though not the modern sense, sons of Joseph but not Mary.
- (3) Chrysostom (confusedly) and Theodoret: cousins, as children of Clopas.
- (4) Hieronymian: cousins, as children of Alphaeus. The third is of no great historical importance or intrinsic interest: it is apparently founded on a putting together of Mt. xxvii. 56 || Mk. xv. 40 with Jn. xix. 25 (contrast Ltft. Gal. Pp. 289 f.). But in modern times it is usually combined with the fourth by the (in itself probable) identification of Clopas with Alphaeus.

The Hieronymian, largely accepted in the Western Church, and with rare exceptions in England before Lightfoot, is probably, as

Н, Ј,



xx INTRODUCTION

Lightfoot shews, historically only an ingenious scholar's theory in Intrinsically it gives an unnatural and for any but patriarchal times unexampled sense to "brethren". It occurs in the Gospels, Acts, and St Paul: nay (Mt. xii. 46-50 | Mk. iii. 31-35 | Lk. viii. 19-21) the original narrative puts it into the mouth of those who told Him that His mother and His brethren sought to speak with Him. It makes the "unbelief" of the brethren unintelligible, and involves various petty difficulties in subordinate details. I mention only one of the details, as deserving more attention than it has received, Jn. xix. 25. The cousinhood theory turns on Mary wife of Clopas being sister to the Virgin, and this on there being only three persons here, not four. arrangements are possible: two pairs more natural, "mother" the common word of the first, "Mary" of the second. striking is the antithesis of soldiers and women. As Ewald pointed out, the soldiers would be four, or a combination of fours (see Wetst. on Acts xii. 4). Thus St John would evidently have had dwelling in his mind the two contrasted groups of four, the four indifferent Roman soldiers at sport and gain, the four faithful women, two kinswomen, two disciples.

On the whole the biblical evidence, which alone is decisive, is definitely unfavourable to the cousinhood theory; and, as far as I can see, it leaves open the choice between the Helvidian and the Palestinian. Some might say that "brethren," if less inapplicable than to cousins, would still be unlikely on the Epiphanian view. But the language of Mt. and Lk. is decisive against this predisposition. Joseph was our Lord's not genitor but pater. Lk. ii. 33, δ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ; 48, δ πατήρ σου καὶ ἐγώ; 27, 41, 43, οἱ γονεῖς [αὐτοῦ]; and both Mt. and Lk. carry the genealogy to Joseph. Yet both assert the miraculous conception, and it is impossible on any rational criticism to separate the two modes of speech as belonging to different elements. The birth from the Virgin Mary exclusively and the (in some true sense) fatherhood of Joseph are asserted together; and if Joseph could rightly be called father, his

¹ See Additional Note, p. 102.



AUTHORSHIP

xxi

children could rightly be called "brethren." Still this leaves neutrality only.

On the other hand the traditional authority is by no means undecided. For the Helvidian we have only the guess of the erratic Tertullian and obscure Latin writers of century iv. For the Epiphanian we have in the earlier times some obscure writings probably connected with Palestine as the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, the Alexandrian Fathers, Clement and Origen (sic), and various important writers of the fourth century. It was of course possible that such a tradition should grow up, before Jerome's solution was thought of, by those who desired to maintain the perpetual virginity of Mary. But still the absence of any trace of the other, even among Ebionites, is remarkable, and the tradition itself has various and good attestation. The evidence is not such as one would like to rest anything important upon. But there is a decided preponderance of reason for thinking the Epiphanian view to be right.

Hence the writer of the Epistle was James the Just, bishop or head of Jerusalem, brother of the Lord as being son of Joseph by a former wife, not one of the Twelve, a disbeliever in our Lord's Messiahship during His lifetime, but a believer in Him shortly afterwards, probably in connexion with a special appearance vouch-safed to him.

Before we leave the person of James, we must speak of his death and the time of it. According to Josephus (Ant. xx. 9. 1) the high priest Ananus the younger, "a man of peculiarly bold and audacious character" (θρασὺς τ. τρόπον καὶ τολμητὴς διαφερόντως), a Sadducee, and accordingly, Josephus says, specially given to judicial cruelty, took advantage of the interregnum between Festus and Albinus to gather a συνέδριον κριτῶν, at which "James the brother of Jesus, who is (or, was) called Christ, and some others" were condemned to be stoned to death as transgressors of the law. He adds that the best men of the city were indignant, some wrote to King Agrippa, others met Albinus on the way to point out the illegality of the act, and the result was that Ananus was deposed. An interpolation has been supposed here; but the whole story

C 2



xxii

INTRODUCTION

hangs together, and Lightfoot with good reason supports it, pointing out that in a real interpolation the language is by no means so neutral. The date of these events can be accurately fixed to 62, which must therefore be the date of St James' death if the passage about him is genuine.

Hegesippus' account is much more elaborate (see Ltft. Gal.10 366 f.). Dr Plumptre makes a good fight for some of the particulars, on the ground that St James was apparently a Nazarite. But on the whole Lightfoot seems right in suspecting that the picture is drawn from an Ebionite romantic glorification of him, the 'Αναβαθμοί 'Ιακώβου, part of which is probably preserved in the Clementine Recognitions. Hegesippus ends with the words καὶ εὐθὺς Οὐεσπασιανὸς πολιορκεῖ αὐτούς, which is commonly understood to mean that St James suffered only just before the siege, say in 68 or 69. If so, no doubt this must be taken as an error as compared with Josephus. But a writer of a century later might very well speak of the judgement as immediate even if eight years intervened. At all events we must hold to 62 as the date.

The Readers.

These are distinctly described as the Twelve Tribes in the Dispersion. Nothing is apparently clearer. Some say to the Church at large, as referring to the true Israel. But this comes in very strangely at the head of a letter with no indication of a spiritual sense, and coupled with $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ τ . $\delta\iota ao\pi o\rho\hat{q}$; and especially so from St James. If Gentile Christians are intended at all, then they are considered as proselytes to Jewish Christians. This however is not likely. Gentile Christians were very numerous, and are not likely to be included in so artificial a way. Nor do the warnings of the Epistle contain anything applicable to them distinctively.

On the other hand with much more plausibility the Readers have been taken as either Jews alone, or Jews plus Jewish Christians. That Jewish Christians were at least chiefly meant seems proved by "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ" (ii. I), probably also by "the good



THE READERS

xxiii

name" (ii. 7), and perhaps "the coming of the Lord" (v. 7); and it is confirmed by the circumstances of those addressed It is neither unnatural nor wrong that St James should regard Jewish Christians positively as the true Israel, the true heirs of Abraham. With Gentile Christians he was not concerned. Jewish Christians were to him simply the only true and faithful Jews. His own position as head of the Jerusalem Church gave him a special right to address Jewish Christians, but no such special right to address others; though doubtless he would not refuse to speak to such as were associated with Christian Jewish communities.

The only question therefore is whether he meant to include unbelieving Jews. If the story in Hegesippus is true, he was honoured by all the people, and even Josephus' account shews that his death might cause offence to men who were not Christians. Still the Epistle contains no evidence that he had them in view (neither the δώδεκα φυλαῖs, nor the slightness of definitely Christian teaching prove anything), and it is fairly certain that he wrote to Christian Jews and to them alone. [Yet see on iv. 4.]

Next to what Christian Jews? "Those in the dispersion." Cf. I Pet. i. I; Jn. vii. 35. Certainly therefore not those of Palestine, nor including them. No others probably are excluded; but it does not follow that he sent copies of his Epistle broadcast over the world, to wherever Christian Jews might be found. distribution might have been by means of returning visitors to Neither method is unlikely. Perhaps we may go further and say that he would naturally chiefly have in view those of Syria beyond Palestine, and possibly Babylonia. And in Syria especially those of Antioch. Josephus, B.J. vii. 3. 3, speaks of the Jews as sprinkled among the nations κατὰ πᾶσαν τ. οἰκουμένην, but especially mingled with Syria on account of the neighbourhood, and peculiarly numerous at Antioch on account of the size of the city. The Acts shew how important Antioch was in the early Church. In writing in the first instance to Antioch he would be writing to the chief centre of Hellenistic Judaism, from which what he wrote would go forth elsewhere. At the same time he might have a good deal in