of the canonical Ezra and Nehemiah to other literature; on which, however, we should have welcomed a larger discussion of the questions connected with First Esdras.

The volume more than sustains Professor Ryle's reputation. It is written with a just appreciation of the interest and importance of these books—books which, as Professor Ryle observes, "record no mighty miracle, no inspiring prophecy, no vision, no heroic feat of arms," but which touch the historical foundations of Judaism, and teach great lessons on the Divine promise, the discipline of disappointment, the hallowing of common life, and the preparation of the Messianic age.

Mayor's "Epistle of St. James." 1

By the Rev. G. H. Gwilliam, B.D., Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford.

The February number of The Expository Times contained a short notice of Dr. Mayor's exhaustive commentary on the Catholic Epistle of St. James; we are glad to avail ourselves of the editor's kind permission, to insert in the present number a fuller account of this excellent work.

Of such an author as Dr. Mayor (the bearer of an honoured name, and the possessor of high academical distinctions) we expect great things; in the work before us, our expectations are entirely satisfied. There are, of course, statements and conclusions not a few, from which many of us would dissent; but distinct utterances on matters of controversy are, like original views, points of excellence in any treatise; and excellently does our author set forth the opinions to which his studies have led him. From the thoroughness of those studies is derived the great value of the present volume. The author has limited himself to a small portion of the Holy Scriptures. This portion has been his constant study during very many years. Researches in many directions have combined to elaborate the details of a well-matured plan. The result is a book, which the author can hardly himself improve, and which will long serve as a model of laborious and exhaustive biblical commentary. From such a work, we may ourselves learn how to work in kindred studies.

On the threshold of Dr. Mayor's treatise, we are brought into the presence of controversy; but we do not intend in this review to enter into controversy. (1) In the Preface he states that the text through which he will comment on St. James is almost entirely that of Westcott and Hort. (2)

In chap. i. the discussion of the authorship of the Epistle necessarily introduces a well-known ecclesiastical question. The pious belief (if indeed it be not something more) about the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, is not shared by Dr. Mayor; for he concludes, after an exhaustive examination of the evidence, that the author of the Epistle was the Bishop of Jerusalem, who was called the brother of the Lord, and that that term is to be understood in the usual sense, and does not mean the half-brother, or the cousin. And it must be admitted that our learned doctor has argued with much acuteness for the Helvidian view, which is the one he adopts, even if, in face of other considerations, we do not yet see our way to depart from the position of Pearson and of Mill.

As regards the question of Greek text, it would seem from the dogmatic confidence with which some handle the subject (and, I may add, from certain results of Oxford teaching, which have recently come to my knowledge) that there are not wanting many who think that the question has passed out of the region of controversy—that Dr. Hort was right, and that those who do not share his admiration for Codex B, or accept his theory about the revision of the Syriac, are wrong. Again, we do not intend to argue, but will, for the present, content ourselves with reminding younger readers of this paper, that there is another side to the question; and that the arguments of the late Dr. Hort have not convinced all who have studied the history of the present text of the Greek Testament. It should be added that Dr. Mayor has at times exercised an independent judgment in the choice of readings. For examples, the reader may refer to the critical foot-

---

notes on the variants in chap. ii. 3 and 26. It will be seen that the editor more than once prefers the marginal readings of Westcott and Hort to that which has been admitted to the text of Westcott and Hort. Although Dr. Mayor modestly speaks of his dependence, as regards the text, on the labours of others, we may feel confident that such a scholar as he is, has carefully weighed the evidence; and his acceptance, on the whole, of the text of Westcott and Hort is, whether we agree with him or not, an acceptance of the principles on which that text is constructed. Scholarly readers of the work will be interested in the different forms of the Latin, which are set out by the side of the Greek text.

It is chiefly from the internal evidence of the Epistle itself, and of passages in other parts of the New Testament, that the person who addresses us in the name of Jacobus is identified; there remains, however, still the question, whether the Epistle be really authentic, or whether it be not a later forgery, ascribed to the apostle, as Brückner, Davidson, and others have held. To the solution of this question Dr. Mayor applies himself with vigour, and with marked success. The objections to the authenticity of the Epistle are clearly stated and fully answered. The external evidence is well set forth. The date, the occasion, the relation to other writings, are discussed. No point of importance seems to be overlooked; and certainly a very strong case is made out for the conclusion that not only is the Epistle a genuine production of the Apostolic age (as the Catholic Church has always held), but that it is to be classed amongst the earliest writings of the New Testament Canon. Chapter iv. contains a most instructive collection of resemblances between St. James and other parts of the New Testament. It is contended that other writers quote St. James rather than that he quotes from the other Epistles. Internal considerations point to about A.D. 45 as the probable date; and so this Epistle may be prior to even the earliest Gospel, at least in the form in which the Gospels are extant in the Canon.

On the famous subject of the relation between the teaching of St. Paul and of St. James our author has delivered himself wisely and well. If there be no striking originality in his remarks, it must be conceded that perhaps all which can be spoken about the "faith" of the one and the "works" of the other has been already often repeated from the different standpoints of different critics. Our author's conviction of the priority of St. James' Epistle to those of St. Paul allows him to assume a clear position. "St. Paul," he says, "writes with constant reference to St. James, sometimes borrowing phrases or ideas, sometimes introducing a distinction for the purpose of avoiding ambiguity, at other times distinctly controverting his arguments as liable to be misapplied, though conscious all the while of a general agreement in his conclusions" (Introd. pp. lxxxviii, lxxxix; cf. Comment. pp. 201–205). We quote Dr. Mayor's words, but the reader should peruse the elaboration of the argument; and he will find that, though our author speaks of the later writer as controverting the arguments of St. James, he does not suppose that there was any contrariety in essentials of doctrine, or any formal opposition, as some have imagined between a Pauline and a Jacobean school of thought.

The grammar, diction, and style of St. James are subjected to a careful examination, worthy in all respects of the scholarship of the editor. He is "inclined to rate the Greek of this Epistle as approaching more nearly to the standard of classical purity than that of any other books of the New Testament, with the exception perhaps of the Epistle to the Hebrews" (p. clxxix). Of the style he writes in glowing terms, noting its rhythm, its energy, its vivacity, its "Miltonic organ voice." He rightly argues that such Greek must be original; it has not the marks of a translation (chap. x.). But in saying this, he does not commit himself to the unreasonable opinion that Greek was the common language of Palestine, but only supposes that James, as others, including possibly our Lord Himself, had acquired Greek in addition to their Semitic vernacular (p. xli).

The arrangement of a Paraphrase and Comment, as distinct from the Text and Notes, has many advantages in affording a clearer view of the meaning of the sacred writer, and the connexion of thought between the several parts of the Epistle. In the Comment will be found many interesting remarks in application of the teaching of the apostle to present day needs and controversies. One can hardly refrain from a smile at discovering on p. 199 "smoking" classed with the sins of "betting and drinking." Perhaps here the writer's prejudices find almost unconscious utterance. So on a greater subject there seems
a touch of anti-sacerdotalism in what is said about
the Anointing of the Sick (p. 219).

We must not omit to call the reader's attention
to the remarkable list of works in chap. xi., which
the author has studied in preparation for his own
edition. We ought not, perhaps, to complain, be­
cause in chap. xii. (Apparatus Criticus) he repeats
the stock assertion about the revision of the
Peshitto in the fourth century. We would venture,
however, to invite his attention to what has
been written on this subject in the third volume of
Studia Biblica. We heartily thank Dr. Mayor for
giving us this valuable edition of St. James. It is
a work replete with matter of interest for the
scholar, and of instruction for the student. It
will be helpful to the teacher, whether in prepara­
tion for lecturing to the class, or for preaching to
the parochial congregation.

The Old Testament in the Light of the Literature of
Assyria and Babylonia.

By Theo. G. Pinches, British Museum.

In the articles which have appeared in The
Expository Times under the above title, I have
brought forward the passages in the Babylonian
versions of the Creation-story which seem to show
parallels with the Biblical accounts in the first two
chapters of Genesis. In many cases the parallels
are striking, but in a few they have to be sought
out, and, when examined, do not prove to be
wholly satisfactory. Nevertheless, those which
have been noted are most interesting and impor­
ant, and show a close connexion between the two
nations with whom they arose.

So far, however, I have only brought forward
the passages which agree in sense with similar
verses of the Bible story. A certain number of
lines have been taken from their context, and
compared with the corresponding passages in the
Biblical account. Our examination of the Baby­
lonian records has therefore been a one-sided one,
and would naturally be incomplete without at
least a few words on the other side of the question,
namely, the differences between the Hebrew and
Babylonian versions.

As is well known, there are in Genesis two
accounts, one occupying the whole of the first
chapter and the first three verses of the second
(thirty-four verses in all), the other taking up the
remainder of the second chapter (twenty-two
verses), whilst chapter three is devoted to an
account of the temptation and fall (twenty-four
verses). The Biblical accounts are, therefore,
short, and told in as few words as is possible
consistent with the amount of detail which the
inspired writer has been able to put into them; in
fact, five pages of the Hebrew Bible, in fair-sized
type, hold the whole.

Shortness is not, however, a peculiarity of the
longer Babylonian account, for it must have covered
about seven closely-written tablets, making fourteen
pages of much larger size and more compressed
matter than the Hebrew account has, and the forty
lines of the recently published Akkadian version
almost equal, in themselves, one of the first three
chapters of Genesis. In bulk, therefore, we find
at the outset a great difference, the Babylonians
carrying off the palm as far as amount of text goes.

The longer of the two Babylonian accounts (that
wholly in the Assyrian or Babylonian language),
regarded as having covered about seven tablets,
began with a description of the time when heaven
and earth were not, when everything existing was
brought forth by Mummu Tiamat (Moumis­
Tauthe), but was without order or completeness.
This period was followed by that in which the
creation of the gods took place.

In the break which follows (the text being very
imperfect in parts) there was probably described
the creation of further deities, as well as the intro­
duction to, and account of the origin of, the fight
between Merodach and Kirbiš-Tiamat, or Bel and
the Dragon. Word of the hostility of Tiamat to

1 See The Expository Times for Jan. 1892, pp. 165-167.
2 A better transcription would probably be Tiawat, a form
which would account for the Greek Tauthe.
3 See The Expository Times for March 1892, p. 267
(col. 1, text and note 2).
4 Ibid. p. 269, note 3.