
A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

later in life, it could only be expected to do with it. And as soon as the period of instruction arrives, and arrive it will very soon, if parents are faithful to the souls of their children, they have abundant reason to hope that, living or dying, God will bless them with his salvation.

Let them, then, commence early, and pursue assiduously, the work which God has given them to do. From the first, their children should be the objects of earnest prayer. From the first, they should be consecrated and devoted to the Lord. And as the infant mind begins to open, to receive impressions from parental lips, let their "doctrine drop as the rain, and distil as the dew; as the small rain upon the tender herb, and as the showers upon the grass." For although, as we said, so long as the child is incapable of parental instruction, the Spirit may be relied upon to bestow his blessing without it; yet the Holy Spirit will never wink at parental unfaithfulness. He will not tolerate it, or connive at it. He will not make himself, in this way, the minister of sin. Parents who carelessly neglect their duties to their children, and trust to the Spirit for their conversion, will probably be disappointed. It will be no more than justice, if they should be.

It will be seen, then, how closely this subject urges upon all parents to be faithful. Let them do *their* work, and the Spirit will do his. But let them neglect their appropriate work, as parents, and trifle with their obligations, and there is little hope either for their children or themselves.

ARTICLE VI.

THE ALLEGED DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN PAUL AND JAMES.

By E. P. Barrows, Jr., Prof. Sacred Literature in Western Reserve College.

It is not because we believe that the mass of Protestant readers find serious difficulty in reconciling the language of James respecting justification with that of Paul, that we devote an article to the subject of the alleged discrepancies between these two inspired writers.

On the contrary, it has ever been to us a weighty argument for their substantial harmony, that plain, unsophisticated men, who take the whole Scriptures for their rule of faith and practice, feel no real contradiction between the teachings of Paul and James. For this case falls under the common principles of interpretation, by which every man of good sense, though he may never have stated them to himself in a scientific form, or have heard them so stated by others, is, nevertheless, constantly guided in ascertaining the true import of an author's words. When men write, as did Paul and James, for the common mind, the meaning which the common mind naturally gathers from their language, may be lawfully received as the true meaning. An exception may be, indeed, allowed in the case where allusions to ancient customs, institutions, or modes of thought, require the light of learned research to place the modern in the exact position of the ancient reader. But the present is not such a case. On the subject of justification the New Testament is its own interpreter, and needs not for its illustration the light of archaeological lore. Justly, then, may we adduce the fact that the great body of readers have never found serious difficulty in bringing the doctrines of Paul and James into harmony with each other, in evidence of their substantial agreement.

We think, nevertheless, that an investigation of the alleged disagreement between these two writers will be profitable, as furnishing an occasion for illustrating some important principles of interpretation; and, we would add, for showing how learned critics may dwell upon differences in the mode of apprehending, exhibiting or applying the self-same truth, until these differences grow, in their view, into irreconcilable contradictions of doctrine.

We begin with a statement of the points on which it is conceded that there is no contradiction between the views of James and Paul.

1. *Both teach that true faith is essentially connected with good works, so that an alleged faith that is without good works, is vain, and cannot avail to justification before God.*

This idea of faith without works James illustrates by two similitudes. The first is that of a man who shall say to the hungry and naked: "Depart in peace: be ye warmed and filled," but shall refuse to give "those things which are needful to the body." Here it is manifest that he means to exhibit an *empty* and *unreal* faith. For the love with which he compares it, being unaccompanied by deeds of mercy, is an empty and unreal love — a love which consists in word and in tongue only, not in deed and in truth.

The other similitude is drawn from the faith of devils. "Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe, and tremble." In this he exhibits a *theoretical* faith unconnected with love and obedience. The faith of devils does, indeed, differ from the dead faith set forth by the first similitude. It is, in a certain sense, real, for it produces trembling. But, since it is not connected with love and good works, it agrees with the former kind of faith in the main point of being a *false*, and not a *true* faith.

These two comparisons, taken together, show that, in the mind of James "faith without works" is a spurious faith, and not that which the Gospel demands.

It would be wasting words to show that to such a spurious faith the Apostle Paul would deny, with as much vehemence as James, all saving efficacy. His view of faith makes it necessarily operative in good works; and of those who, professing to hold the doctrine of the cross, continue in the practice of sin, he affirms peremptorily that they "shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. 9: 10.)

2. *Both teach that they who do righteousness shall be justified and saved.*

A proud, self-righteous dependence upon works, as the meritorious ground of justification, the Apostle Paul does indeed combat with all the vehemence of Scriptural argumentation. Works performed in such a spirit have, with him, only the outward form of righteousness without its substance; nay more, they are positively sinful and abominable in God's sight. To be truly good, they must be done in the spirit of love, and in humble, believing dependence upon God's mercy. And here there is an entire agreement between him and James. The Epistle of the latter is throughout thoroughly opposed to the spirit of self-righteousness. He is not contending *for* works without faith, into which pride must of necessity enter as an essential element, but *against* faith without works. With him, not less than with the Apostle of the Gentiles, the life of a Christian is cast in the mould of constant prayerful dependence upon God. In proof of this let us look for a moment at a single passage of his Epistle. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him. But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering. For he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea driven with the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord. A double-minded man" — divided between faith and unbelief — "is unstable in all his ways." (1: 5—8.)

The *subject-matter* of the prayer here recommended is "wisdom," which implies in the petitioner a humble, self-distrustful spirit. The *form* is that of unwavering faith in God's goodness and liberality; and this, again, carries, by necessary implication, the idea that the petitioner renounces all claim to the gift on the ground of his own merit. The expression, "and upbraideth not," presupposes, on the part of him who offers the prayer, a deep consciousness of his many infirmities and short-comings, and of the just ground which God has to withhold his gifts, or to accompany them with merited reproaches. The closing remark, "a double-minded man is unstable in all his ways" (which implies the constancy of the man of single-minded faith), brings to view the influence of such a humble, dependent, prayerful spirit, or of its opposite, upon the life. Here, then, we have that life of faith upon which the Apostle Paul insists, though not in a form so definite and perfectly developed.

Besides the above, and other similar passages, where faith is expressly recognized as the principle of the Christian life, it is to be further observed that the writer, through the whole progress of the Epistle, is continually dealing out heavy blows against that spirit of worldliness and pride which constitutes the very essence of Phariseeism, as it was encountered by the Apostle Paul. This is admirably exhibited by Neander in his brief Commentary on the Epistle to James, in which he shows the entire unity of spirit and aim between the two writers. To this work we refer the reader, contenting ourselves with a single extract from it.

"The Pauline view of faith presupposes the strongly marked distinction between Law and Gospel, a doctrinal position opposed to legal righteousness, to the merit of one's own works. Opposition to the Jewish tendency to externals was the precise ground on which it planted itself; and where that tendency prevailed, a perverted form of this view could as little gain admission as the view itself.

"But to resume our question: may not this particular error, — the false idea of faith and over-estimation of mere faith, — which James opposes, be also traced back to the same radical tendency? Let us only compare what precedes and what follows the discussion of this topic in the second chapter. It is preceded (chap. i.) by a rebuke of those who founded an imaginary claim on the mere hearing of the word, on the mere knowledge of it, without holding themselves bound to practise it; to which is added the rebuke of a mere fancied and seeming service of God. What now is this but that very same spirit of reliance on the external, which manifests itself in a mere adherence to certain articles of faith, — faith in the one true God, the Messiah, — and on this ground alone claims to be righteous, without recognizing the

demands of this faith upon the life? As knowledge and practice are at war with each other, so are faith and life. A merely theoretical faith corresponds exactly to a merely theoretical knowledge. The same man, who satisfies himself with being able to discourse much of the law without obeying it, is also the one who makes a boast of his faith, without holding himself bound to the practice of that which faith requires. The same man who finds the essence of religion in certain external works, and claims to be a true worshipper of God merely on the ground of professing the true religion, is the one also who claims to be accounted righteous through a faith which produces no works. If we turn now to what follows (chap. iii.), we find that James is here rebuking those who were ever ready to exalt themselves into teachers of others; but who, by teaching what they did not practise, made themselves the more liable to condemnation. What then is this but that same radical tendency over again? And on what ground should we be justified in rending the intermediate passage from its connection, and making it refer to something else, the explanation of which must be sought elsewhere than in this one radical tendency?

"It is true, that in the manner of meeting these errors, which we will now further consider, James is distinguished in a peculiar way from Paul. It is the more practical man in contrast with the more systematic; the man to whose wholly Jewish development, faith in Christ was superadded as the crown and completion, — in contrast with him, whose faith in Christ took the form of direct opposition to his earlier Jewish views, as the centre of a wholly new creation. Hence with James, opposition to error takes more the form of single propositions and exhortations; with Paul, it is a connected view, in which all proceeds from one central point. With James, the reference to Christ appears only as one particular among others, a peculiarity especially objected to this Epistle, as if Christ were not to be found in it; while with Paul, on the contrary, the chief object is to exalt Christ, who is everywhere placed foremost, and is everywhere represented as the centre of the whole life, from whom all is derived, to whom all is referred. But yet, in these single propositions and admonitions of James, we are able to trace the higher unity lying at the basis; and can show that all have reference to Christ as the living centre, even though he is not expressly named. There may be a form of moral development, which receives its true light and its true significance through reference to Him as its centre and source, although he is not expressly recognized by name; and his name may be often on the lips, while yet the whole inward character has formed itself without reference to Him. In this light we must now endeavor to understand the controversial and admonitory passages of this Epistle."

James does not, then, any more than Paul, ascribe saving efficacy to works without faith. The good works on which he insists flow from the spirit of love, faith and humility. They constitute, therefore, *true personal righteousness*, and not the false righteous-

ness upon which the Jewish legalists rested their claim to God's favor.

Now the Scriptures uniformly represent that they who do righteousness — the true righteousness which we have been considering — shall be justified and saved. This they sometimes do in formal connection with the doctrine of faith, faith being regarded as the fountain, and good works as the stream issuing from this fountain (which is the most fundamental view of the subject); and sometimes in a simple and direct way; but always with the assumption that men live under an economy of grace which offers pardon to the penitent, and accepts sincere obedience, though it be alloyed with many imperfections.

In accordance with this principle, our Saviour often points out to his hearers *obedience to God's will* as the way of salvation. "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. 7: 21.) To the young man who proposed to him the question: "Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" he gave a true answer: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Some, we are aware, have maintained that our Lord's object in this reply was to prepare the way for an exposition of the Divine law in its true character, in order that the young man might thus be convinced of the impossibility of salvation through the works of the law, and be shut up to the necessity of faith in himself. But this does not accord with either the simplicity and directness of our Lord's teachings, or with the general tenor of his instructions. Beyond all contradiction Jesus meant, by "keeping the commandments," keeping them in the spirit, and not in the letter only; and true spiritual obedience has, everywhere in God's word, the promise of eternal life. The first aim of the Saviour was, as it would seem, to turn away the inquirer's mind from self-imposed works of piety to the commandments of God. But when he betrayed his ignorance of the deep spiritual character of God's law, our Lord proposed a duty which put to the test the inmost affections of his bosom, and thus brought out distinctly to view the unwelcome truth that he was wholly under the control of a worldly spirit, and, by necessary consequence, destitute of all true obedience to God.

To the same purport are the words of Peter, uttered in view of Cornelius's account of the heavenly vision with which God had favored him: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him and worketh right-

cousness, is accepted with him." (Acts 10: 34, 35.) The reference of Peter is to the *past* life of Cornelius, while he was yet ignorant of the character and offices of Christ. He was "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always." (Acts 10: 2.) These services, being performed in a humble, believing spirit, were acceptable to God, and he had manifested his approbation of them by instructing Cornelius in a vision how he might learn the way of salvation through Christ. The words of Peter, in his rehearsal of the matter at Jerusalem: "Who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved" (Acts 11: 14), ought not to be so interpreted as to bring into the narrative an absurd and unscriptural idea — that of an impenitent man rendering to God acceptable service. The salvation which had come to Cornelius's house, before the preaching of Peter, existed, so to speak, in a rudimentary form. Its full development and completion was to be through faith in Christ crucified.

We now proceed to show that Paul also, not less directly than Christ and the Apostle of the circumcision, teaches that they who do righteousness, in the true, spiritual sense of the words, shall be justified and saved. Declarations to this effect will not of course occur in his arguments against Jewish legalists. But if we can find a passage where the question is not: *What is the meritorious ground of forgiveness of sin?* but: *What course of moral conduct will render a man acceptable to God?* there we may reasonably look for them. Now such a passage occurs in the second chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, where he is contending against precisely the same error which James attacks — a vain reliance on speculative notions and outward relations and privileges, unaccompanied by the substantial fruits of righteousness — and there we find, not that James has copied Paul, as De Wette and others groundlessly assume, but that the two writers, attacking the same error, naturally fall into the same method of argumentation.

Addressing the Jew who, glorying in his relations to Abraham, condemned the Gentiles for the sins which he himself committed, he says: "Who [God] will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory, honor and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and

also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God." (Rom. 2: 6—11.)

Can any one show why the Apostle Paul is not, in this passage, as much of a "legalist" as James in the second chapter of his Epistle? Paul affirms that it is not hearing and understanding the law, but *doing* it, that brings salvation to the soul; James, that it is not hearing the Gospel and professing to believe it — "though a man say he hath faith" — but *doing* it. Can there be a parallelism more complete?

De Wette, who denies the possibility of reconciling the views of Paul and James respecting justification, admits that both writers are agreed in the position that a disciple of Christ is not justified by faith alone without works; but adds, that Paul "would never have said with James that one is justified by works."[1] But we here see that Paul does say this very thing. For if God renders "glory, honor and peace to every man that worketh good," does he not do it in view of his working good? And if "not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified," shall they not be justified because they have done the law? Would it not be well, then, before asserting the irreconcilable nature of the difference between Paul and James on the doctrine of justification, to inquire first how Paul's doctrine in the second chapter of his Epistle to the Romans can be reconciled with his doctrine in the third chapter? "Ye see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only" (James 2: 24); "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law" (Rom. 3: 28); these two texts have often been arrayed, like hostile combatants, against each other. But is there between them any more discrepancy than between the two following of Paul: "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified;" "A man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law?" In the latter case the commentators justly reconcile these different, and apparently contradictory statements, by a consideration of the different objects which the Apostle had in view. Like every other writer of good sense, he adapts, they tell us, his language to the case in hand. If he is discussing the question of *the meritorious ground* of forgiveness and justification, he tells us that "a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." But if the question is: *What course of moral conduct* is acceptable to God? he affirms that "not the

[1] Niemals würde er mit Jak. gesagt haben, dass man durch werke gerechtfertigt werde. — *Excursus ad locum.*

hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." A good and sufficient explanation this. Now let the same just canon of interpretation be applied to the language of James as compared with that of Paul, and the alleged discrepancy vanishes.

Here, then, we might rest the argument. If the error which James attacks Paul also condemns, and if the position which James assumes Paul also defends, why talk any longer of irreconcilable disagreement? But since some writers of no mean standing, as, for example, Hug, have strenuously maintained that there is in the Epistle of James express reference to the Pauline doctrine of justification, and that he aims, if not to refute the doctrine itself, at least to oppose a one-sided and erroneous view of it, which was likely to become the prevalent view, a further discussion of the question seems to be necessary.

And here the question respecting the *date* of the Epistle immediately forces itself upon our attention. Hug, who maintains that it was "written of set purpose against Paul, against the doctrine that faith procures man justification and the Divine favor," assumes for its origin a time not long after the Epistle to the Hebrews had reached Palestine, that is, about the beginning of the tenth year of Nero; and it has been the fashion of the critics generally, with some notable exceptions however, to assign to the Epistle a post-Pauline origin. But the weight of evidence seems to us to preponderate very decidedly on the other side.

And, *first*, the hypothesis of its earlier composition best explains the fact that it is addressed exclusively to *Jewish believers*. That it is limited to these we assume as an indisputable fact. We are aware, indeed, that the expression used in the salutation, *ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς*, "to the twelve tribes," has been compared with the words of Paul, *τὸν Ἰσραὴλ τοῦ Θεοῦ*, "the Israel of God," that is, *the true church of God*. But the exactly equivalent expression, *τὸ δωδεκάφυλον ἡμῶν*, "our twelves tribes" (Acts 26: 7), denotes the *literal* Israel, and this is certainly the natural and obvious sense of the words in the salutation of James, especially when taken in connection with the words that follow, *ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*, "who are in the dispersion." We ought not to assume for the expression a metaphorical sense, without obvious necessity. But here no such necessity can be alleged; for there is not, throughout the whole Epistle, so much as a trace of the existence of Gentile converts in the churches addressed. The sins rebuked by the writer, such as a vain reliance on knowledge and speculative notions without obedience, anxiety to usurp the office of teaching, a contentious and slanderous spirit,

"wars and fightings," contempt and oppression of the poor, and presumptuous devotion to the pursuit of worldly gain; are all thoroughly Jewish in their character. No man, who is not under the influence of a previously adopted theory, can, we think, peruse the Epistle without the conviction that it is addressed, as its salutation implies, to churches which are exclusively Jewish, or in which, at least, the Gentile element is not so considerable as to deserve separate notice.

Now it is conceded that "if the Epistle was not written," to use the words of Davidson, "till after the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, and if it was addressed to churches of Jewish Christians only, it is difficult to find such communities."[1] But, as the same writer shows, nothing militates against the supposition of the existence of many such churches at an earlier date. In the beginning of Christianity the spread of the Gospel among the Jews was exceedingly rapid. Very early in its history, after the lapse of only a few weeks at the farthest, we are told that, in Jerusalem, "the number of the men was about five thousand" (Acts 4: 4); and, after this, that "believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women" (5: 14). After the murder of Stephen, there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles" (Acts 8: 1). These converts, we are told, "went everywhere, preaching the word" (v. 4). Again we read that "they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word unto none but unto Jews only (Acts 11: 19); until, at Antioch, some of them "spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord" (vs. 20, 21).

It would be absurd to suppose that the above is a full record of the labors performed by these Jewish converts out of Palestine. The history contained in the Acts of the Apostles is confessedly fragmentary, covering only detached portions of the whole great field of Christian activity. The present seems to be given simply as *a particular case* which the writer wishes to connect with the important event of Paul's coming from Tarsus to Antioch. We have reason to believe that the primitive Jewish converts spread themselves throughout all the regions bordering on Palestine, and abounding with Jews; and that everywhere they observed, at least for a considerable period

[1] Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. III. p. 322.

of time, the rule of "preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only." Nothing forbids us to suppose that, under their labors, were founded numerous Jewish churches, such as those which the writer of this Epistle manifestly addresses. The visit of Barnabas to Tarsus to seek Paul (which was in close connection with the first preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles), is generally placed in A. D. 48. This allows ample time for the wide diffusion of Christianity among the Jews who lived out of Palestine.

Secondly, the hypothesis of the early composition of the Epistle explains the circumstance that it contains no allusion to any controversy respecting the obligation of Gentile converts to observe circumcision and the law of Moses. This acknowledged characteristic of the Epistle, De Wette uses as an argument for the *post-apostolic* date of its composition. The controversy respecting justification (in which he represents James as taking towards Paul an antagonistic position) hinges no longer, he tells us, as in Acts xv, Gal. iii, etc., on the observance of the Mosaic law; the author is through in respect to that question; he knows only the "law of liberty."

A far more natural explanation of this fact is furnished by the supposition that the Epistle was written *before the origin* of the controversy respecting the obligation of the Gentiles to keep the law of Moses. Of this controversy the history is given in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts; and from this we learn that it first arose, as it was natural it should, in immediate connection with the very successful labors of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles. Up to that period there had been no occasion for any serious discussion of the question; since the great body of converts consisted of Jews, who, while they received Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah promised to their fathers, yet persevered as before in the observance of the Mosaic ceremonies. An Epistle written, as we assume this to have been, some time before the convocation of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem recorded in Acts xv, would, as a matter of course, be silent respecting a controversy which had as yet no existence.

If, now, we suppose the Epistle to have been written soon after the death of James the brother of John,[1] which event took place A. D. 44, and before the origin of the controversy between the Jews and Gentiles respecting the observance of the law of Moses; while

[1] We intentionally omit all discussion of the vexed question respecting the *person* of James, assuming that, whether he was or was not identical with James the son of Alpheus, he was the man who, according to the uniform testimony of antiquity, presided for many years over the church in Jerusalem.

as yet Christianity was regarded not as a new form of religion, but rather as the old form of Judaism exalted to its most perfect condition; while the number of the Gentile converts was comparatively few, and even these were considered rather as accessions to the Jewish religion, in its most perfect form, than as a portion of the Christian church exempted from obligation to the Mosaic ritual (an idea which was certainly not apprehended by the churches before the labors of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles) — if we assume this hypothesis, then, so far as concerns the persons addressed and the method of reasoning, everything appears natural and in place. This cannot, we think, be affirmed of any other hypothesis.[1]

The above view is substantially that maintained by Schneckenburger, Neander, Davidson, and others. It is also adopted by Alford, as is manifest from a remark in his Commentary upon the Gospel of Matthew, 24: 12, where he calls this Epistle of James "the earliest Apostolic Epistle."

But against the above view of the early origin of this Epistle various arguments have been urged, the principal of which will now be considered.

1. It is difficult to believe that the abuses censured in the Epistle could, at so early a period, have taken such deep root. This objection De Wette presses in proof of the *post-apostolic* origin of the Epistle.[2] With more show of reason might it be urged in favor of the date assigned by Hug and others, viz. about A. D. 62; for the corruptions which it portrays correspond well with the predictions of our Saviour and his Apostles respecting "the last days" (Matt. 24: 12. Acts 20: 29, 30. 2 Tim. 3: 1—5). Yet, without denying altogether its force as an argument for the later *apostolic* composition of the Epistle, we think that a careful consideration of the history of the Corinthian church will show that it is far from being conclusive. Five years had scarcely elapsed since the formation of that church, when it became necessary that Paul should rebuke its members for vices and irregularities of a very gross character. Nor ought this to be to any a matter of surprise. The idea that the primitive churches

[1] Other arguments for an early date which appear to us of doubtful validity, such as that drawn from the use of the word συναγωγή, we have omitted. And we shall, in like manner, pay no regard to sundry frivolous objections, such as that no adequate reason can be assigned why James should have addressed a general letter to all Christians; and that the external conveniences enjoyed by the Christian assemblies (2: 2, 3), betray a later period.

[2] Introduction to his Commentary on James, p. 104.

were suddenly and at once elevated above the influence of the vice and ignorance in which most of the members had passed their lives, and above the contamination, also, of the extremely corrupt state of society by which they were surrounded, is more romantic than Scriptural. It is as contrary to historic truth, as to the entire analogy of the plan of redemption. The vices which infected the Corinthian church were, as was natural, those to which its members had been addicted before their conversion — the prevailing vices of the city and region. How early they manifested their insidious power, and to what a lamentable extent, the two Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians clearly inform us.

Let, now, the same rational principle be applied to the Jewish churches addressed by James. The Jewish people had become, as a body, exceedingly corrupt. Glorying in their prerogative as the children of Abraham, boasting of their superior light and knowledge, despising the Gentiles as involved in the ignorance and vice of idolatry; they cherished a proud, worldly, rebellious and contentious spirit, such as that against which believers are warned in the present Epistle. We are aware that Macknight and others argue from the "wars and fightings" to which James alludes, that he must have written just before the overthrow of the Jewish nation by the arms of Rome. But, admitting that these "wars and fightings" were of the nature of seditions and insurrections, rather than of contentions among themselves about rank, property, and the like (which is very doubtful), still the argument is not conclusive. For that last terrible outburst of insurrection which involved the Jewish nation in irretrievable ruin, was not the sudden rise of a new spirit, but rather the culmination, so to speak, of an old spirit of strife and sedition that had been long actively operating in the bosom of Judaism. "During the three centuries preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, and while, with transient intermissions, this nation of true worshippers was contending against the Macedonian, Syrian and Egyptian kings, or fretting under the pressure of the Roman power, there was going on a slow accumulation of those emotions upon the national mind — intense, profound and ungovernable, which, after many a portentous heave, at last burst forth, and spread a universal ruin."[1]

Now it was natural that the peculiar vices of Judaism, in the midst of which the Jewish converts had lived and moved from childhood, should very early insinuate themselves into their churches, and should require precisely such rebukes as are administered by James in the

[1] Fanaticism by Isaac Taylor, Section 7.

Epistle now under consideration. We see, then, no necessity for assuming so late a date as A. D. 62, or 63. If five years sufficed to develop in Corinth such gross *heathenish* irregularities as those reproved by Paul, why should not a longer period of years be adequate to account for the *Jewish* vices rebuked by James?

2. The repeated allusions to the speedy coming of Christ — "the coming of the Lord draweth nigh"; "behold the Judge standeth before the door" — have been supposed to indicate the late origin of the Epistle. It is not necessary, in the present discussion, to go into the question of the true meaning of these expressions. Let it be conceded, if so the reader choose, that they refer to the end of the world, of which the Christians of the primitive age seem to have thought in near connection with the predicted overthrow of Jerusalem. Now believers were taught that "of that day and hour knoweth no man," and that it was their duty to hold themselves in constant readiness for it. Even this interpretation, then, of the words furnishes no serious objection to the early date of the Epistle, and that other interpretations can furnish no objection whatever, is manifest.

3. The author of this Epistle is alleged to have borrowed ideas and forms of expression from the Epistles of Paul. A full examination of this argument would require a comparison of the various passages of James, in which the hand of an imitator is said to be visible, with the corresponding passages of Paul's Epistles. This is a work which we would most willingly undertake, did our limits permit it, and from some examination which we have already made, we are quite certain that the allegation of imitation would appear to be groundless. At present we can only indicate the principles upon which such an investigation should be conducted. It being conceded, then, as it must be by every reasonable critic, that the general style of James betrays no marks of a copyist, but is, on the contrary, exceedingly original, fresh and lively, the question respecting his borrowing from Paul is reduced at once to an inquiry about particular words, phrases and ideas. Now, so far as these can be shown to have belonged to the common stock of Jewish religious thought and phraseology, the employment of the same words, phrases and ideas by two writers cannot prove that the one borrowed from the other. There must be, beyond this, such special coincidences in the connection of the thoughts and the costume of the arguments as cannot be explained from a common religious education. But between Paul and James no such special coincidences can be made out. The most striking agreement adduced by Schott is James 1: 3, compared with Rom.

5: 3.[1] And here the only identical phrase is *ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται*, "*worketh endurance*;" while the idea that afflictions, as producing this good result, should be undergone with alacrity, was thoroughly familiar to the Jewish mind. But many of the alleged parallelisms contain not even the semblance of proof; as, for example, James 1: 18, compared with Rom. 8: 23, where the same Jewish term, *ἀπαρχή*, is indeed used, but in totally different connections.[2]

4. We come now to the main argument of Hug for the later composition of the Epistle, which is, that it furnishes internal evidence of having been written, at least a portion of it, in opposition to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith without the works of the law. On this point he uses very strong language, affirming that "it cannot be by chance that they resemble each other so much in their modes of presenting their arguments; and that "the Epistle was written of set purpose against Paul, against the doctrine that faith procures man justification and the Divine favor."[3]

We have already seen that the views of Paul and James, fairly interpreted from their connection and scope, are in entire harmony with each other. All that remains is to examine the alleged resemblance in their modes of presenting their arguments, which is supposed to prove that James had specific reference to the prior writings of Paul. With regard to the example of Abraham, Hug himself says: "It is not surprising that both sought in the life of Abraham support for entirely different positions, since the father of the whole Jewish nation and the earliest depositary of the promises was an illustrious example of the Divine providence, to which the most dissimilar writers might easily have recourse, without mutual controversy or mutual concert." How, then, does the use which they make of Abraham's example prove that James had reference to Paul? "There is," says Hug, "this peculiarity in respect to the example of Abraham, that each draws his argument for his position from the same event in Abraham's life; and the same passage in the Old Testament; and that, in doing this, both have used almost exactly the same phraseology: Rom. 4: 1, 2, *Τί ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραὰμ τὸν πατέρα*

[1] Isagoge, § 91. note 20.

[2] This subject the reader will find discussed by Davidson in his Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. III. pp. 323, 324. In the same volume, p. 339 sq., he may see an examination of various arguments adduced by Kern, De Wette and Schwegler, to show the *post-apostolic* origin of the Epistle, and consequently its *spuriousness*. Into this general question our limits will not permit us to enter.

[3] Introduction to N. T., § 158; from which section also the quotations following are taken.

ἡμῶν εἰσφωνεῖσθαι . . . . εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη; James 2: 21, Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη." We answer, How could they well make use of Abraham's example, without both appealing to that most illustrious manifestation of his faith in the offering up of Isaac? And, in doing this, they must, of course, draw their arguments from the same event of Abraham's life. As to the allegation that "both have used almost exactly the same phraseology," an examination of the two passages compared by Hug shows that the sameness extends only to the two phrases, Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν, and, ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη. Now the former was an appellation of Abraham as common on the lips of Jews as is with us the expression, "our Puritan fathers;" and is just as weighty an argument to prove the reference of James to the writings of Paul, as would be the phrase "our Puritan fathers," employed by two New England divines, to show that the one must have had reference to the writings of the other. And, as to the expression ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, not only was δικαιωθῆναι a religious term in common use with all Jewish teachers, but it was employed in this very construction — δικαιωθῆναι ἐκ — the words λόγων, ἔργων, πίστεως, being added according to the subject matter under discussion. Thus our Saviour, in warning his disciples against the use of idle words, says: "Ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ," "For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned;" where ἐκ is used, precisely as it is by James and Paul, of the ground of procedure.

But Hug further adds: "They then appeal alike to the words of Gen. 15: 6, Ἐπίστευσε Ἀβραὰμ τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην." We answer that, considering the nature of their arguments, they could not help appealing to this text, since it is perfectly unique, being the only declaration concerning Abraham's faith as the ground of his justification which his history furnishes. We think, then, that Hug's argument from the case of Abraham is utterly inconclusive.

"But the fact," says Hug, "that both seek in a person so inconsiderable, and so little praiseworthy as the harlot Rahab, an example and an argument in support of their opposite opinions, cannot be explained by saying that the preëminence and extreme interest belonging to the person, might have attracted the attention of both."

We cannot but think that this is estimating "the preëminence and extreme interest belonging to the person" whose example is adduced upon a very erroneous principle. These would, in the mind of an inspired Apostle, be determined not so much by the outward rank of

the person, as by the inward splendor of the faith exercised. The faith of the penitent malefactor is not the less illustrious, nor the less frequently referred to by Christian divines, because he was a person "so inconsiderable and so little praiseworthy." Rather does the meanness of his external condition add to the brightness of the example which he has left us. "This thief," says Alford, "would fill a conspicuous place in a list of the triumphs of faith supplementary to Heb. xi."[1] So also the humble outward condition of Rahab makes her example, for all spiritual purposes, not the less, but the more illustrious. It is such an exemplification of faith, in its nature and effects, as finds few parallels in the Old Testament; and it is, moreover, intimately connected with a most conspicuous portion of the Israelitish history.

But of the example of Rahab, Hug affirms that "the brief manner in which it is treated by both writers exhibits a similarity more than accidental." Let us examine the proof by which this assertion is sustained. (1) Both writers designate Rahab by the epithet *ἡ πόρνη, the harlot.* Answer: they could not well help doing so, since that is the very epithet applied to her in the Old Testament *in all the passages where she is mentioned.* (Josh. 2: 1. 6: 17, 25.) (2) Both speak of her receiving the spies, "and James uses the same word in the same participial form." On this we remark that it was the one simple act of receiving into her house the spies, in which Rahab manifested both her faith and her works. That *any* two writers, who had occasion to use her example, should name this act, was exceedingly natural, we might say, unavoidable; and they would be very apt, moreover, in perfect accordance with the idiom of the Greek, to employ the same participial form, the aorist, which is the true tense of history. But, to show how little ground there is for supposing that James copied from the Epistle to the Hebrews, we set down the words of the two writers side by side.

James 2: 25.	Hebrews 11: 31.
Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους, καὶ ἑτέρᾳ, ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα;	*Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη οὐ συναπώλετο τοῖς ἀπειθήσασι, δεξαμένη τοὺς κατασκόπους μετ' εἰρήνης.*

The verbal agreement between these two passages extends, as the reader will see, to the single appellative, *Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη, Rahab the harlot.* Not another word, particles excepted, is the same; while

[1] Commentary on Luke 23: 39—43.

the circumstances added by the two writers — by the former, that she *sent them out another way*; by the latter, that her reception of them was *in peace* — are entirely different. Certainly this looks like the work of two independent authors.

There seems to be in the minds of many an impression that Paul not less than James has placed the two examples of the patriarch Abraham and the harlot Rahab in special connection with each other, and that too in a polemic discussion of the ground of justification. But let us look at facts. In the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians, Paul dwells at length on the history of Abraham, as establishing, in opposition to Jewish legalism, the doctrine of justification by faith, but says not a word respecting Rahab. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, he does indeed mention the names of Abraham and of Rahab in the same chapter; but it is in the midst of *a long catalogue of worthies*, so that Rahab's example is brought into no nearer connection with that of Abraham, than are the examples of a dozen other Old Testament personages. If we even make the supposition that James *had read* the Epistle to the Hebrews, this does not explain the phenomenon of his selecting from the whole list her particular case. After the example of Abraham, that of Rahab may have suggested itself upon the principle of contrast in respect to outward condition; or, as several writers have remarked, "the example of Rahab may have been current in the mouths of the people;" or his mind may have been led to it from the influence of some law of association too subtle for us to trace. However this may be, it remains true that her example holds, in the Old Testament record, a prominent place, and that it was alike pertinent to the scope of each writer.

Nor is it true that the object of the writer to the Hebrews, in giving us this long catalogue of worthies, is to establish the doctrine of justification by faith in opposition to Jewish legalism. His manifest aim is *to illustrate the nature and effects of faith*, upon the silent assumption, indeed, that this is the ground of justification, but not, as in the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians, in any polemic connection.

The above comparison of the arguments for and against the early composition of the Epistle of James, gives, we think, the preponderance to the evidence in favor of its early date; and, by necessary consequence, of its independence in respect to the Pauline epistles.

But we are far from thinking that the establishment of its prior date is necessary to the maintenance of its substantial harmony with the writings of Paul. If, as we trust it has been sufficiently shown, the language of the one, fairly interpreted from its connection and scope, contains no contradiction to the views of the other, then we may readily grant (though we think the supposition unwarranted) that James wrote after Paul; and, further, that he had a general reference to perversions of Paul's doctrine concerning justification. Some may, indeed, think that, in this case, he would have expressly guarded his readers against the idea that he was writing to contradict the doctrine of justification as taught by Paul himself. But it is only a lower degree of confidence that leads to the employment of caveats of this kind. The highest state of confidence, such as we know from the Acts of the Apostles that James reposed in Paul, whose apostleship he acknowledged, would make it to him unnecessary, in combatting manifest perversions of Paul's writings, to put in the declaration that he did not mean to combat Paul himself.

In bringing the present article to a close, we wish briefly to notice a characteristic of the Epistle of James from which different writers have drawn very different conclusions: to wit, that, in this Epistle, the statement of Christian doctrine is imperfect and incomplete, containing no allusion to the expiatory nature of Christ's death; and that the position which the writer occupies seems to be peculiarly Jewish. Some, as Neander, explain this phenomenon upon the supposition that James, in the development of his views, stood only on the threshold of the doctrinal system peculiar to the new religion; others, as Davidson, think that the author may have adopted this method of instruction in consequence of the state of mind belonging to the persons addressed, becoming, by a wise condescension to the spiritual condition of his hearers, as a Jew to the Jews; while Kern finds in the absence of the essential principles of Christianity, as those concerning the death of Jesus, concerning redemption and expiation, and concerning the Holy Ghost, proof of the *post-apostolic* composition of the Epistle.

So far as the absence of definite reference to the doctrine of redemption through the expiatory death of Christ has any bearing upon the date of the Epistle, it favors its earlier origin; for this doctrine, though contained from the very first in the Gospel as a vital principle, having been clearly taught by the Saviour himself, was yet gradually developed to the apprehension of the Christian church, under the revelations of the Holy Ghost, and attained to its full and perfect

form and just prominence in the Christian system only by being brought into conflict with Jewish legalism.

We do not find, however, in the character of the Epistle now under consideration anything mysterious or difficult of solution. The fact of the absence of any formal statement of the doctrine of redemption through the blood of Christ may, in our view, be explained by referring,

First, to the *end* which the writer proposed to himself. This did not require such a statement. It cannot be reasonably demanded of any teacher, inspired or uninspired, that, in the compass of a single letter not longer than the present, he shall develop all the parts of the plan of salvation. If what he says be true, and pertinent to the points discussed, that is enough.

Secondly, to the writer's *peculiar turn of mind;* to which, perhaps, we may add, with Neander, his peculiar religious history, as one who had passed, without any abrupt change, from Judaism to Christianity. The Gospel allows each man the free exercise of his own individuality. One of its excellences is that it can enter into and sanctify minds of every order, and in every stage of development; not annihilating, but purifying and ennobling what is peculiar to each. We may readily concede that the Apostle Paul, with his religious experience and his field of Christian activity, would probably have introduced the doctrine of redemption through Christ's blood more than once in the course of an Epistle of equal length, without thereby condemning James. Each had from one and the same Divine Spirit his peculiar gifts, which he exercised with equal acceptableness to the great Head of the Church, and with equal adaptation to the wants of his fellow Christians.

As a suitable conclusion to the present discussion we add an exposition of the last six verses of the second chapter of James.

Verses 21, 22: "Was not Abraham our father justified from works [ἐξ ἔργων, *ex* of the *ground*] when he had offered up Isaac his son upon the altar? Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and from works was faith made perfect."

These two verses are mutually explanatory of each other. The Apostle cannot mean that Abraham *first came into a state of justification before God, when* he offered up Isaac, and *by* that act; for the narrative declares of him, many years before, that "he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness" (Gen. 15: 6).

Neither does the idea seem to be that, by this particular act, his

faith *first manifested itself before men as true faith;* for he had before this performed other works of faith — all the works that had been enjoined upon him.

Neither, for both the above reasons, can the meaning be that his faith had before been in its nature incomplete, and that it now *received an addition which made it perfect.*

But James conceives of faith and works as in their nature inseparable, and as *constituting together one perfect whole.* They may be compared to a fountain and a stream, the absence of either of which implies the absence of the other. According to this view, faith and works had, from the first, been united in Abraham, and by his works his faith had, all along the path of his history, been made perfect. But this *one* work is selected on account of its preëminence, and it stands as the representative of a life of works, wrought in faith, and making the faith from which they flowed perfect.

V. 23: "And the Scripture was fulfilled [*ἐπληρώθη, was verified,* or *its declaration made good;* viz. by Abraham's having not a dead faith, but one which wrought with his works] which saith: And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteousness; and he was called the friend of God." (Is. 41: 8. 2 Chron. 20: 7.)

V. 24: "Ye see that a man is justified from works [that is, as the previous verses show, from works coöperating with his faith, and making his faith complete] and not from faith only." This is only a generalization of what has been shown in respect to Abraham.

V. 25: "But in like manner was not also Rahab the harlot justified from works, when she had received the messengers and sent them forth another way?" No one will deny the writer's meaning to be that Rahab, like Abraham, was justified *from works coöperating with faith and making faith complete.* We need not, then, dwell upon this example.

What, then, does James teach? That a man, discarding the principle of faith, may be justified from works alone? Far from it. The truth upon which he is insisting is that *works are inseparable from true faith, and, therefore, necessary to its completeness in respect to its nature.* This idea he brings out very distinctly in the next verse.

V. 26: "For as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." It would seem, at first view, more natural to consider faith as the animating principle, and works as receiving from faith their vitality. And this corresponds, we think, more nearly with the Apostle Paul's view, that works are a visible outflow from faith dwelling in the soul. But the view of James, fairly inter-

preted from the context, is, metaphysically as well as popularly considered, strictly accurate. For if good works inhere in faith, as has been shown, so that they naturally and necessarily flow from it, as light and heat from the sun, then their absence vitiates the very nature of faith, and makes it "dead, being alone."

There is another principle which will illustrate the language of James in this last verse. The faith upon which both he and Paul insist, is a "faith which worketh by love. Faith and obedience — the obedience which embodies itself in *good works* — both have for their ground-principle holy love; and, where this principle exists, it produces both by the same necessity; so that if one be present the other must accompany it, and if one be absent, the other can exist only in name; and may be well described as "dead, being alone." Thus we have, in the absence of love, the same essential spirit of formalism manifesting itself in a two-fold way. First, there is the formalism of *works without faith*, in other words, of Phariseeism as encountered by the Apostle Paul; proud, self-righteous and self-sufficient; resting, for its ground of justification, on the merit of outward religious observances. Secondly, there is the formalism of *orthodox profession without good works*, as encountered by James; equally proud, self-righteous and self-sufficient; prone to usurp the office of teaching others ("my brethren, be not many masters"); virulent and abusive in its language ("therewith curse we men which are made after the similitude of God"); destitute of the substantial fruits of godliness; "earthly, sensual, devilish." "It is only a different form of development which is here [in the Epistle of James] treated of; the same radical tendency is too obvious to be mistaken. There were two leading forms of this tendency. One of these consisted in an undue estimation of outward works of the law; the other exalted the mere knowledge of the law, of the true God, and of what pertains to his worship, into the principal thing; and, on the ground of knowledge merely — of the mere profession of belief, of faith simply as an act of the understanding — claimed superiority over the Gentiles, although the course of life by no means corresponded to this knowledge and outward profession."[1]

[1] Neander's Commentary on James, pp. 29, 30.