

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

AUTHENTICITY OF THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES
DEFENDED AGAINST HARNACK AND SPITTA.

I.

Two important works have recently appeared, in which very opposite views are taken as to the date of the Epistle of St. James. One is *Die Chronologie des altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, brought out this year by the distinguished theologian, Adolf Harnack; the other, F. Spitta's learned and acute contribution, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums*, vol. ii., 1896, of which 239 pages are occupied with a very careful study of the Epistle. I take them in this order because Harnack on this particular book still adheres to the old Tübingen tradition, from which he has receded in regard to many of the other documents of the New Testament, while Spitta occupies an entirely independent position. As Harnack only devotes six pages to the subject, and refers to Jülicher's *Einleitung*, 1894, as supplementing his argument, I have joined them together in the discussion which follows.

Jülicher begins (p. 129) with a general attack upon the authenticity of the Catholic Epistles. They are not really epistles at all; there is nothing personal about them; the epistolary form was simply adopted, by a stranger writing to strangers, in imitation of the widely-circulated epistles of St. Paul. This is enough to prove that they are post-Pauline, and therefore not written by any of the Apostles ("damit ist schon gesagt dass sie erst aus nach-paulinischen Zeit, also nicht wohl von Uraposteln her-rühren können"). Harnack also remarks on the fact

that St. James reads more like a homily than a letter, as casting doubt on its genuineness.

Are we to understand then that an epistle must be judged spurious if it is occupied with impersonal matter, or if it is a sermon or treatise masking under this form? If so, we must deny the genuineness of Seneca's letters to Lucilius, of the *De Arte Poetica* of Horace, of the letters to Herodotus and Menœceus, in which Epicurus summed up his philosophy; nay, even of St. Paul's circular epistle to the Churches of Asia Minor, known to us as the Epistle to the Ephesians. But if these are genuine, St. Paul was not the first person to make use of the epistolary form for didactic purposes; and if we accept the account given of the Apostolic Council¹ in the Acts, he was not even the first Jew to indite a circular letter; he was only following the example already set by the President of the Council in his circular to the Churches; as to which it has been elsewhere pointed out that the resemblances between it and the Epistle of St. James lead to the conclusion that they proceed from the same hand. Jülicher, however—I am not certain about Harnack—would probably deny that the account of the Council given in the Acts is historical. Let us assume then that St. Paul was the first Jew to write a didactic letter for general circulation, why is his example to remain unfruitful, not only till after his own death, but till the death of the last of the Apostles, say thirty years later? For this is what is required by his argument. Otherwise all the Catholic Epistles might still have been written before 60 A.D. by those whose names they bear.

I proceed now to consider the arguments offered in favour of the date 120-150 favoured by Jülicher and Harnack. Both lay stress on the low moral and religious

¹ Harnack places the Council in the year 47, and considers that St. Paul's earliest epistle was not written before 48-49.

tone implied by the language of the writer. Worldliness had reached such a pitch as can only be paralleled in the Shepherd of Hermas, with which indeed our Epistle has so much in common that both must be ascribed to the same age. Instances of this deplorable degeneracy are i. 13, in which the readers are warned against making God the Author of temptation; ii. 14, where orthodox belief is put forward as excusing lukewarmness or sin; ii. 6, where it is stated that the rich members of the Church drag their poorer brethren before the law courts and blaspheme the Holy Name by which they are called, a picture of the time which is in entire agreement with what we read in Hermas, *Sim.* viii. 4, ix. 19, etc., of the apostates and informers within the Church (*ἀποστάται καὶ βλάσφημοι εἰς τὸν κύριον καὶ προδότες τῶν δούλων τοῦ θεοῦ*). Such a state of things, implying that Christianity was a crime punishable in the Roman courts, and that the Christian body included a number of rich men who were so indifferent to their religion as to purchase safety for themselves by informing against their brethren, and even dragging them before the tribunals, is not conceivable before the year 120 (Harnack, p. 485 f.).

Taking the last argument first, I observe that one trait in St. James's description, *αὐτοὶ ἔλκουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς κριτήρια*, is not to be found in Hermas, and it seems very improbable that actual members of the Church, though from cowardice (*Sim.* ix. 21. 3) they might apostatize and give information against their brethren, would themselves take the lead in dragging them before the magistrate. I observe also that St. James nowhere says that these rich men were Christians; as Dr. Plummer has pointed out, the Holy Name was not called over *them*, but (*ἐφ' ὑμᾶς*) over those whom they arrested. The whole passage (ii. 2-7) is directed against the respect of persons shown in favouring the rich at the expense of the poor; this is illustrated by the supposition

of two strangers visiting the synagogue, of whom nothing is known, except that one is well-dressed, the other in shabby clothes. St. James says their hearts should have been drawn rather to the poor than to the rich, because the poor made up the bulk of the Christian community, while the rich were their persecutors. If we want a parallel to the "dragging before the tribunals," we find one ready to our hand in Acts viii. 3, where Saul, *σύρων ἄνδρας καὶ γυναικας*, committed them to prison. So far, I see no reason why we should not understand the words of St. James in reference to the persecution of the first Christians by Jews, especially by the rich Sadducees, as in Acts iv. 1, xiii. 50, in accordance with the warning of our Lord (Matt. x. 17).

I take now the other instances of degeneracy, which, it is said, could not have been paralleled in the Church before the time of Hermas. The first is the warning against making God accountable for temptation. I must say I am surprised at this being instanced as an extraordinary example of depravity. From the time when Adam threw the blame of his eating of the forbidden tree on "the woman whom *Thou gavest to be with me*" down to the present moment, I should have thought this the natural and almost inevitable excuse by which man, conscious of wrong-doing, endeavours to palliate his fault to himself. Whether he pleads hereditary bias, or overwhelming passion, or the force of circumstances or of companionship, all these are in the end ordained or permitted by Divine Providence. In my note on the passage I have quoted from Homer, from the Proverbs, from Philo, from St. Paul, as bearing witness to this universal tendency of fallen humanity.

Nor can I see that there is anything unprecedented or abnormal in the idea that orthodox belief is sufficient for justification. Justin tells us (*Dial.*, 370 D) this was the idea of the Jews in his day, who believed that,

“though they were sinners, yet, if they knew God, the Lord would not impute sin to them.” Is this at all more heinous than the belief with which John the Baptist charged the Jews, that, as Abraham’s children, they stood in no need of repentance? Is it more heinous than the belief of the Pharisee that he should be justified because, unlike the publican, he fasted twice in the week, and gave tithes of all that he possessed? Is it not in fact Paul’s own description of a Jewish Christian (Rom. ii. 17–25): “Thou art called a Jew and retest in the law and makest thy boast of God, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them that sit in darkness . . . thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God”? I will venture to say that the history of the Church in every age, as well as the experience of every individual Christian, attests the need of this warning of St. James against confounding orthodoxy of belief with true religion.

The view of the Mosaic law contained in the Epistle is regarded as proof that it could not have had James for its author. Thus Jülicher asks, How could the strict legalist against whom Peter did not venture to maintain his right to eat with Gentiles (“vor dem Petrus eine Tischgemeinschaft mit Heidenchristen nicht zu vertheidigen gewagt hätte”), have written a letter in which no mention is made of the ceremonial law, in which worship is made to consist in morality, and in which the perfect law of liberty, culminating in the royal law of love, is spoken of with enthusiasm? One who could write thus must have looked on the old law as a law of bondage. So, too, Harnack, “Law with this writer is not the Mosaic law in its concrete character, but a sort of essence of law which he has distilled for himself” (p. 486).

The incident referred to is not quite correctly stated. It is not James himself, but “certain from James” (Gal. ii.

12), whose presence had this baneful effect on Peter and the other Jews. That they did not represent the real feeling of St. James is not only probable from the fact that the responsible leaders of a party are usually less extreme than their followers, but it is also expressly stated, if we accept the account given in Acts xv. 24; for there we read that James had previously had to complain of unauthorized persons speaking in his name (*τινὲς ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξεληθόντες ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις . . . λέγοντες περιτέμεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον, οἷς οὐ διεσπειλάμεθα*). James was certainly included in the number of those who sanctioned the conduct of St. Peter in eating with Cornelius (Acts xi. 1-3, 18), and later on (xxi. 20) we find him explaining to Paul the difficulty he had in controlling the zealots of his party, the converted Pharisees of xv. 5. There is nothing in the New Testament to suggest that he was an extreme legalist. Even tradition goes no further than to show that his own practice was ascetic: it does not state that he enforced this practice on others. When Harnack says he invented a law of his own ("ein Gesetz welches er sich destillirt hat"), he seems to me to shut his eyes to the main factor in the history. If the author was really the brother of Jesus, brought up with Him from infancy, and acknowledging Him as Messiah before His departure from earth, he must have been greatly influenced by His teaching, as indeed is abundantly shown in the Epistle. What then was Christ's teaching as to the law? I make no reference to the Fourth Gospel, as the discourses there may be supposed to be coloured by the reporter, but in the Sermon on the Mount we see the law of the letter changed to a law of the spirit. The law of love to God and man is described as the great commandment on which hang all the law and the prophets. Men are called to bear Christ's easy yoke and light burden, as opposed to those heavy burdens which the scribes, sitting in Moses' seat, lay upon men's shoulders,

and of which Peter afterwards declared that "neither our fathers nor we were able to bear them." How was it possible that the brother of the Lord should seek to reimpose such a yoke? Harnack and Jülicher write as if Christianity began with Paul. Yet even in the Old Testament the law is called perfect (Ps. xix. 7), and liberty is associated with the law (Ps. cxix. 45, "I will walk at liberty, for I seek Thy precepts"; *ib.* 32, "I will run the way of Thy commandments when Thou shalt enlarge my heart"); so when St. Paul contrasts the fleshly tables of the heart with tables of stone, he only reproduces the words of the prophet, "I will put my law in their inward parts." Nor was the idea of a law of liberty strange to the rabbinical writers or to Philo. Spitta quotes from Pirke Aboth vi. 2 (a comment on Exodus xxxii. 6), "None is free but the child of the law," and from Philo ii. 452, "ὄσοι μετὰ νόμου ζῶσιν ἐλεύθεροι."

I now proceed to the consideration of the section on Faith and Works, which is put forward as a crucial instance in favour of the late date of the Epistle. To narrow the field of discussion as much as possible, I will say at once that I agree with my opponents in holding that the resemblance between this portion of the Epistle and St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans is too great to be accidental. One of the two must have been written with reference to the other. I agree also in considering that the argument of St. James entirely fails to meet the argument of St. Paul. It is in fact quite beside it, and, if intended to meet it, rests upon a pure misconception of St. Paul's meaning. From this my opponents infer that it could not have been written by James the Just, or indeed by any contemporary of St. Paul. The identification of Paul's faith in Christ, which works by love, with the barren belief in the existence of one God, which is shared even by devils; the confusion between the works of the law, which Paul condemns, with the fruits

of faith, which he demands of every Christian—this was not possible till lapse of time had brought forgetfulness of the tyranny of the old Mosaic law, and made it possible to understand “the works of the law” to mean moral conduct. If James had written this section, he would have been rudely and ignorantly attacking Paul as guilty of heresy, but if it was written in the year 130, the author might well imagine that he was only expressing St. Paul’s own meaning in other words. Feeling sure that the great Apostle would never have encouraged the idea that a mere profession of orthodoxy could win heaven, he might naturally seek to follow his language as closely as possible in giving their due weight to faith and works (“deshalb stellte er mit möglichst nahem Anschluss an Paulus’ Worte fest, wie beide, Glaube und Werke zu ihrem Recht gelangen”). The “vain man” of v. 20 is not Paul (as Schwegler supposed, and as he must have been if James were the author), but some one who claimed St. Paul’s sanction for a religion of barren orthodoxy.

I pause here for a moment to consider the very extraordinary proceeding of the author whom Jülicher has conjured up for us. We are to suppose that he wishes to disabuse his neighbours of the notion that St. Paul would have condoned their idle and vicious lives on the ground that they were sound in their belief. If this was the author’s intention, surely he would have quoted such passages as the chapter in praise of charity, or the list of the fruits of the Spirit, or the moral precepts which abound in the Epistles, rather than flatly contradict St. Paul’s language as to the justifying power of faith. One can imagine with what just scorn Jülicher himself would have treated a makeshift theory of the kind, if it had been put forward in defence of Catholic, instead of Tübingen, tradition. But this is far from exhausting the self-contradictions involved in the supposition. Though the reason for postponing the date of the Epistle is that the misunderstanding

shown in it of St. Paul's doctrine of faith and works is inconceivable at an earlier period, yet we are now told that there was no real misunderstanding in the mind of this late author: he did not identify St. Paul's faith with the belief of devils, or his works of the law with the fruits of faith. The only person who labours under the misunderstanding is the "vain man" of v. 20.

The attempt to explain the section as a production of the 2nd century having failed, as I have tried to show, is it not better to look at the matter from the other side, and see whether it may not be more in accordance with the facts of the case to suppose James to have written before Paul? Neither Jülicher nor Harnack will listen to such a suggestion for a moment. The latter tells us that, with the exception of a few critics whose assertions are every day losing ground ("mehr und mehr in Vergessenheit gerathen"), all are now agreed that the Epistle does not belong to the Apostolic age. The former calls it ridiculous ("komisch") to dream of its being written in 30 or 40 A.D. Such flowers of speech need not detain us: like the anathemas of earlier times, they are the natural weapons of those who wish to strengthen a weak cause by the intimidation of adversaries. I must, however, express my regret that Harnack should have spoken in such slighting terms of men like Mangold, Spitta, Lechler, Weiss, Beyschlag, Schneckenburger, above all, of the great Neander, all of whom have given their opinion in favour of the priority of James. If Neander's great name is "passing into oblivion," I venture to think it augurs ill for the future of theological study in Germany. But let us see what further arguments are alleged against the early date of the Epistle. "A discussion on Faith and Works as the ground of Justification could not have arisen before the question had been brought into prominence by St. Paul's writings. The attempt to assign the priority to St. James springs from the wish to

leave no room for opposition between the two" (Jülicher). "The misuse of the Pauline formula is presupposed in the Epistle." "The doctrine of justification by faith and works combined belongs to the time of Clement, Hermas, and Justin; we cannot conceive that it was a mere repetition of what had existed ninety years before; diese Annahme, die uns an die seltsamste Dublette zu glauben nöthigen würde, unhaltbar ist" (Harnack). To this we may add the more general statement of Jülicher, quoted with approval by Harnack, that when we compare this Epistle with what we know of the prevailing views and interests of Apostolic Christianity, we find ourselves in an altogether different world, the world of the Roman Clements, Hermas, and Justin. The specific Christian doctrines are conspicuous by their absence; Christ is hardly mentioned, and only as the coming Judge. Moreover, its late date is shown by plain allusions to the Gospels, the Hebrews, the Epistles of Paul and 1 Peter, and it is closely connected with Hermas, though it cannot be absolutely decided which of the two borrowed from the other.

I take first Jülicher's assertion that it was the wish to get rid of the controversy between Paul and James which was father to the thought that James was the first to open the debate. This, of course, will not apply to those who hold, as I do, that we have Paul's answer to James in the Epistle to the Romans. For others the easiest way of getting rid of the controversy would have been to accept the Tübingen view, that James had nothing to do with the Epistle, which was forged in his name by a late writer. (2) The impossibility of a historical "Dublette" is a bold *a priori* assumption, to which I think few Englishmen will give their assent. We are not prepared to admit principles which would lead us to deny the existence of Elizabethan Puritanism, of the High Churchism of Andrews and Laud, of the "Latitude men" of the same century, on the ground

that we find history repeating itself in the Low Churchmen, the Tractarians, and the Broad Churchmen of the 19th century. How far more philosophical was the view of Thucydides when he magnified the importance of the lessons of history, because "the future will surely, after the course of human things, reproduce, if not the very image, yet the near resemblance of the past!" There is nothing against which the historical inquirer should be more on his guard than any *a priori* assumption in determining such a question as this: Is the character, are the contents, of the Epistle of St. James consistent with what we know of the pre-Pauline Church, of the teaching of Christ, and of contemporary Jewish opinion? I venture to think there is a correspondence so exact that, given the one side, it would have been possible to infer the other side. We will test this in the case of Faith and Works. Faith is with St. James the essential condition of effectual prayer (i. 6, v. 15), it is the essence of religion itself, so that Christianity is described as "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ" (ii. 1); the trials of life are to prove faith (i. 3); those who are rich in faith are heirs of the kingdom (ii. 5). Just so in the Gospels: Christians are those who believe in Christ (Matt. xviii. 6; Mark ix. 42); faith in God is the condition of prayer; "all things are possible to him that believeth" (Mark ix. 23); "whatsoever things ye desire when ye pray, believe that ye have received them, and ye shall have them" (Mark xi. 24); "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief" (Matt. xiii. 58); "thy faith hath saved thee" (Mark v. 34). But faith, which comes from hearing, must be proved, not by words, but by deeds, if it is to produce its effect (Jas. i. 22, 25, 26; ii. 14-26). So in the Gospels: "By their fruits ye shall know them," "Whosoever heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them, I will liken him to a wise man" (Matt. vii. 20, 24); "The Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father, and

then He shall reward every man according to his works" (Matt. xvi. 27). The relation of faith and works as shown in James ii. 22, "Faith wrought with his works, and by works was his faith made perfect," agrees with the image of "fruits" used in Matthew vii. 20, xii. 33, and with the language of 4 Ezra, "one of the very few Jewish writings which can be attributed with any confidence to the Apostolic age,¹ cf. vii. 34: *veritas stabit et fides conualescet et opus subsequetur et merces ostendetur*; xiii. 23: *Ipse custodit qui in periculo inciderint, qui habent operas et fidem ad fortissimum*; ix. 7: *omnis qui salvus factus fuerit et qui poterit effugere per opera sua vel per fidem in qua credidit, is relinquetur de prædictis periculis et videbit salutare meum*. In the last passage faith and works are mentioned as alternative grounds of salvation, not, as in the two other passages, as constituting together the necessary qualification, but they all show that the question of salvation by faith or works had been in debate before St. Paul wrote; cf. also vii. 24, 76-98; viii. 32-36. It is worth noting that the 7th and the 9th chapters are included in that portion of the book which Kabisch considers to have been written at Jerusalem B.C. 31.²

It was indeed impossible that, with such texts before them as Proverbs xxiv. 12 and Jeremiah xxxii. 19, in which God's judgment is declared to be according to man's works, and, on the other hand, Genesis xv. 6 and Habakkuk ii. 4, in which it is said that faith is counted for righteousness, the question of how to reconcile the opposing claims of faith and works should not be frequently discussed among the Jews. Lightfoot, *l.c.*, quotes many examples from Philo and the rabbinical writers in which the case of Abraham is cited and the saving power of faith is magnified. On the other hand the doctrine of justification by works is

¹ Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 161.

² James, *Texts and Studies*, vol. iii., 2, p. 89.

put forward in the most definite form in some of the passages cited above from 4 Ezra and in the *Test. Abrahæ* (James, p. 93). "After death the archangel tests men's works by fire, and if the fire burns up a man's work, the angel of judgment carries him away to the place of sinners; but if the fire does not touch his work, then he is justified, and the angel of righteousness carries him to the place of the just."

The only question that can arise is as to the first use of the phrase "justified by faith." The word *δικαιῶ* is often used, e.g., in 1 Kings viii. 32, *δικαιῶσαι δίκαιον, δοῦναι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ*; Ps. cxliii. 2: *οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιον σου πᾶς ζῶν*; Isa. xlv. 26: *ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιωθήσονται*. . . . *πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ*; Matt. xii. 37: *ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ*, and in the passage just quoted from *Test. Abr.*; but I am not aware of any instance of the use of *δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως* or *ἐξ ἔργων* prior to Paul and James. It does not follow that it was therefore introduced by one of them for the first time. Both seem to use it as a familiar phrase. In any case we have no right to assume that it was borrowed by James from Paul; for, as I have shown in my *Introduction*, while the argument of James on justification bears no relation to that of Paul, the argument of Paul exactly meets that of James. It is just like the pieces of a dissected puzzle: put Paul above, and no amount of squeezing will bring them together; put Paul below and James above, and they fit into one another at once. If this is so, it is unnecessary to spend time in showing that James does not quote from the Hebrews and 1 Peter and other epistles of Paul, far less from Clement or Hermas, but all these from him. For proofs that this is so in each case, and for the principles which should determine our judgment of priority, I must refer again to my *Introduction*, chap. ii.

To my mind there is only one real difficulty in the supposition that the Epistle was written by James the Just, say, in

the year 45, and this difficulty consists in the scanty reference to our Lord. It is not easy to explain why James should have been content to refer to Job and the prophets, as examples of patience, where Peter refers to Christ. It may have been, as I have elsewhere suggested, that the facts of our Lord's life were less familiar to these early Jewish converts of the Diaspora than the Old Testament narratives, which were read to them every Sabbath day. Perhaps, too, the Epistle may have been intended to influence unconverted as well as converted Jews. In any case, I do not see that the difficulty becomes easier if we transfer the writing to a time when the Gospels were universally read. On the other hand, Spitta's hypothesis, to which I shall turn immediately, has undoubtedly the merit of removing it.

I have endeavoured to show that the Epistle is a natural product of pre-Pauline Christianity. I now turn to the other side of Harnack's "Dublette," and venture with all diffidence to ask whether the half-century or so which embraces the names of Clement, Hermas and Justin was really characterised by such a monotonous uniformity of system and doctrine as is supposed, and whether it is true that the Epistle of James is of the same colour or want of colour? It would take too long to compare together the several writings which are assigned to this period. A mere recapitulation of names taken from Harnack's Chronological Table will, I think, suffice to throw grave suspicion upon the correctness of such sweeping generalizations.¹

A.D. 90-110, *Pastoral Epistles*; 93-96, *Apocalypse of John*; 93-97, *First Epistle of Clement*; 80-110, *Gospel and Epistles of John, Aristion's Appendix to Mark*; 110-117, *Letters of Ignatius and Polycarp*; 100-130, *Jude, Preaching of Peter, Gospel of Peter*; 120-140, *James, Apocalypse of Peter*; 125 (?), *Apology of Quadratus*; 130, *Epistle of*

¹ Canonical books are marked by italics.

Barnabas; 133-140, Appearance of the Gnostics, Basilides in Alexandria, Saturnilus in Antioch, Valentinus and Cerdo in Rome; 131-160, Revised form of the Didaché; 138, Marcion in Rome; 140, Shepherd of Hermas in its present form; 138-147, Apology of Aristides; 145-160, Logia of Papias; 150-175, *Second of Peter* (Harn., p. 470); 152, Justin's Apology; 155, Death of Polycarp, Epistle of the Church at Smyrna; 155-160, Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, Carpocratian heresy; 157, Appearance of Montanus; 165, Martyrdom of Justin.

A resultant photograph intended to give the form and body of a time illustrated by such incongruous names would, I fear, leave only an undistinguishable blot. It may be worth while, however, to devote a little space to the consideration of the Shepherd of Hermas, which is generally allowed to approach more nearly than any of those mentioned above to the Epistle of James. The resemblances have been pointed out in my *Introduction*, chap. ii., and the reasons for regarding them as proving the priority of James are given there and in Dr. C. Taylor's article in the *Journal of Philology*, xviii. 297 foll. I shall endeavour here to exhibit the main differences, and shall then consider what they suggest as to the relative priority of the two books.

Hermas distinctly says that he wrote after the death of the Apostles (*Vis.* iii. 5; *Sim.* ix. 15. 6), and that the gospel had been already preached in all the world (*Sim.* viii. 3. 2; ix. 17. 4, 25. 2); he distinguishes between confessors (*Vis.* iii. 2. 5; *Sim.* viii. 3) and martyrs "who had endured scourging, crucifixion, and wild beasts for the sake of the Name" (*Vis.* iii. 2); the ransom of the servants of God from prison is mentioned among good works (*Mand.* viii. 10); fasting is insisted on (*Vis.* iii. 10. 6), it is referred to as "keeping a station" (*Sim.* v. 1), nothing should be taken on a fast day but bread and water, and what is saved

is to be given to those who are in need (*Sim.* v. 3); through cowardice some Christians are ashamed of the name of the Lord and offer sacrifice to idols (*Sim.* ix. 21); baptism is essential to salvation (*Vis.* iii. 3. 5), even the saints of the old dispensation had to be baptized before they could enter the kingdom of God, and this baptism they received from the hands of the Apostles when they visited the other world after death (*Sim.* ix. 16); it is rightly said that there is no other repentance except that remission of sins which we obtain in baptism (*Mand.* iv. 3); by special indulgence one more opportunity only is granted to the Church (*Vis.* ii. 2), but to the Gentiles repentance is possible till the last day;¹ special favour and honour are bestowed on him who does more than is commanded in works of supererogation (*Sim.* v. 2, 3; *Mand.* iv. 4); martyrs and confessors should not glory in their sufferings, but rather thank God, who has allowed them to expiate their sins by their sufferings (*δοξάζειν ὀφείλετε τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀξιούς ὑμᾶς ἠγάγατο ὁ θεὸς ἵνα πᾶσαι ὑμῶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἰαθῶσιν . . . αἱ γὰρ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν κατεβάρησαν, καὶ εἰ μὴ πεπόνθατε ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου, διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ὑμῶν τεθνήκειτε ἂν τῷ θεῷ, Sim.* ix., 28. 5, 6). [This is explained by the words of Basilides in *Clem. Alex., Str.*, iv. p. 600: *προαμαρτήσασάν φησι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν ἐτέρῳ βίῳ τὴν κόλασιν ὑπομένειν ἐνταῦθα, τὴν μὲν ἐκλεκτὴν ἐπιτίμως διὰ μαρτυρίου, τὴν ἄλλην δὲ καθαιρομένην οἰκεία κολάσει.*] The name of Christ is not mentioned, but we read that the "Son of God," who is the corner-stone and foundation of the Church, the door through which all men and angels must enter to be saved, who existed before all worlds as the Holy Spirit, became incarnate in human flesh, *τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ πρόον, τὸ κτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν κατέκτισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σάρκα ἦν ἠβούλετο (Sim.* v. 5, 6, ix. 1, 12, 14). Harnack thinks that the Son of God is

¹ This strict Montanistic view is not consistently adhered to (cf. *Mand.* xii. 6; *Sim.* viii. 8).

identified with Michael, the first of the angels; see his notes on *Vis.* iii. 4. 1; *Vis.* v. 2; *Sim.* viii. 3. 3, ix. 6. Believers who have persevered to the end become angels after death (*Sim.* ix. 24, 25). Mention is made of false prophets who give responses for money and lead astray the double-minded (*Mand.* xi.), and also of false teachers (Gnostics) who profess to know everything and really know nothing (*Sim.* ix. 22): some of the deacons are charged with defrauding orphans and widows (*Sim.* ix. 26. 2).

Surely no unprejudiced person who will weigh these passages can help seeing that it must have taken many years to change the Church and the teaching of St. James into the Church and the teaching of Hermas. A long process of development must have been passed through, before the simple, practical religion of the one could have been transformed into the fanciful schematism and formalism of the other. Still more striking is the contrast of the two men: the latter an illiterate Renan of the Church's silver age, with a perpetual smirk of sex-consciousness¹ and self-consciousness; the former a greater Ambrose of the heroic age, his countenance still lit up with the glory of one who had been brought up in the same household with the Lord, and who kept and pondered the words which had fallen from His lips.

It only remains to give Harnack's views as to the integrity of the Epistle. Place it in what year he will, he finds it impossible to be satisfied. It is paradox from beginning to end. There is no system, no connexion. The use of the word *πειρασμός* in chap. i. is inconsistent with the use of *πειράζομαι* a few lines below. A portion of the Epistle reads like a true reproduction of the words of the Lord, plain, energetic, profound; another portion resembles the Hebrew prophets; another is in the best style of Greek rhetoric; another exhibits the theological con-

¹ See especially *Vis.* i. 1-8, *γέλασάσά μοι λέγει, κτλ.*, *Sim.* ix. 11.

troversialist. But the most paradoxical thing of all is that, in spite of this diversity, there is still perceptible an inner unity both of thought and expression. The only explanation seems to be that it is an amalgamation of homiletical fragments originally written by a Christian teacher about 125 A.D., and put together and edited after the death of the writer, probably without any name or address. Then, at the end of the century, it occurred to some one to publish it, under the name of St. James, as an epistle addressed to the Twelve Tribes, *i.e.*, to the Church at large.

The above account of the Epistle seems to me important as showing that the Tübingen solution of the problem of the authorship is found to be inadequate even by the ablest supporter of the Tübingen theory. I have not time here to examine it in detail, but I may remark that it is vitiated by the same *a priori* method to which I called attention before. A letter is not necessarily bound together by strict logic, like a philosophical treatise. More commonly it is a loose jotting down of facts, thoughts, or feelings, which the writer thinks likely to be either interesting or useful to his correspondent. If slowly written, as this undoubtedly was, it naturally reflects the varying moods of the writer's mind. Even the Hebrew prophets are not always denunciatory; even St. Paul is not always argumentative. As to the objection founded on the use of the same word in different senses, this might easily arise from a limited vocabulary or a defect in subtilty of discrimination. In the particular instance cited objective temptation is naturally and properly expressed by the noun, subjective temptation by the verb. But the same mental characteristic is seen in the double uses of *πίστις* and *σοφία*, and in my edition (p. 202) I illustrated this by the double use of *ἔρις* in Hesiod and of *πανουργία* in Sirac. xxi. 12. The peculiarity is imitated by Hermas in his use of the word *τροπή* (*Sim.* vi. 5).

J. B. MAYOR.

(To be continued.)