

The Gospel in the Epistle of James.

REV. J. RITCHIE SMITH.

BALTIMORE, MD.

IT is the purpose of this paper to inquire what place is held by the distinctive truths of Christianity in the Epistle of James.

I. DIRECT REFERENCES TO CHRIST.

a. 1¹, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." In view of the intensely Jewish cast of the Epistle, it is noteworthy that Jesus is placed beside God the Father as Lord and Master.

b. 2¹, "Hold not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons." Upon any probable construction of the phrase τῆς δόξης, Jesus is recognized as the Messiah, to whom belong the faith of men and the glory of heaven.

c. 2⁷, "Do not they blaspheme the honorable name by the which ye are called?" The name of Christ was called upon the Christian in baptism, as the name of Jehovah was called upon the Jew, in recognition of his lordship.

d. 5⁷, "Be patient therefore, brethren, until the coming of the Lord." The Parousia, according to the usage of the New Testament, is the second coming of Christ, and involves therefore his resurrection and ascension.

e. 5⁸, "The coming of the Lord is at hand."

f. 5⁹, "The judge standeth before the doors." As James is speaking of the Parousia, the judge is Christ. In 4¹² God is the judge.

g. 5¹⁴, "Anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord." If we omit τοῦ κυρίου, bracketed by Westcott and Hart, we have simply "anointing him with oil in the name," as in Acts 5⁴¹ 3 John⁷. In either case the name is that of Christ, for the anointing is by the elders of the church.

h. 5¹⁵, "The Lord shall raise him up." If it is Christ in whose name the sick are anointed, it is he by whom they are restored.

Here are eight distinct and direct references to Christ. There are scholars who think that he is referred to also in 1^{7,12} and in 5^{6,11}, but

they are probably in error. It is often asserted, as by Beyschlag (*N. T. Theol.* i. 344), that the title δ $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is seldom given to Jesus in this Epistle; but in fact $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$, with or without the article, occurs fourteen times, and six times, including 5¹⁴, where the text is somewhat doubtful, refers to Christ.

James, then, represents Jesus as his Master, the risen and ascended Messiah, Lord of glory, upon whom faith must rest, whose name believers bear, who shall come again to judgment, to whom believers pray, in whose name the sick are anointed, and by whom they are restored to health in answer to prayer, and their sins forgiven. The attributes of Deity are ascribed to him.

II. REMINISCENCES OF CHRIST'S TEACHING.

It is evident that James was profoundly impressed by the ethical teaching of Christ. The groundwork of the Epistle is the Sermon on the Mount. This perhaps gave rise to the tradition that James translated the Gospel of Matthew from Hebrew into Greek.¹ Some of the most striking points of resemblance between the Epistle and the Gospels may be noted :

Joy in temptation	1 ²	Mt. 5 ¹⁰⁻¹²
Ask in faith	1 ⁶	21 ²²
Hearers and doers	1 ²²	7 ²⁴⁻²⁷
Poor are heirs of the Kingdom	2 ⁶	5 ³ Lk. 6 ²⁰
Law of love	2 ⁸	22 ³⁰
Faith without works	2 ¹⁴	7 ²¹
Judgment	2 ¹² 5 ⁹	5 ⁷ 6 ¹⁶ 7 ¹ f.
Faith proved by works	2 ¹⁸	7 ²⁰
Not many masters	3 ¹	23 ⁸
Fig tree and olives	3 ¹²	7 ¹⁶
Importance of speech	3 ²⁻¹²	12 ³⁶ f.
Humility	4 ¹⁰	23 ¹²
Moth and rust	5 ^{2, 3}	6 ¹⁹
Judge at doors	5 ⁹	{ Mt. 24 ²⁸ Mk. 13 ²⁹
Swear not	5 ¹²	5 ³³ ff.

It is maintained by some scholars that the Epistle also preserves several sayings of Christ which are not recorded in the Gospels (see Mayor on 1¹²), but their arguments are not convincing.

It is possible that the influence of Christ's teaching appears further in the abundance of figures drawn from nature, more numerous per-

¹ *Synopsis Script. Sac.*, cited by Mayor, *Comm. on James*, p. ccxxxvii.

haps than in all the Epistles of Paul. We read of the surge of the sea (1⁶), the flower of the grass (1¹⁰), the sun and the scorching wind (1¹¹), the shadow cast by turning (1¹⁷), the mirror (1^{23, 24}), horses (3⁸), ships (3⁴), fire (3⁵), the wheel of nature (3⁶), beasts, birds, creeping things, and things in the sea (3⁷), the fountain (3¹¹), the fig tree and the vine (3¹²), vapor (4¹⁴), moth and rust (5^{2, 3}), the husbandman and the harvest (5⁷). Most of these figures are employed in the teaching of Christ, though the application is often different.²

III. THE DOCTRINE OF FAITH.

Is James in accord with the general teaching of the New Testament, which represents faith as the root-virtue of the Christian life ?

Apart from the passage which treats of the relation of faith and works (2¹⁴⁻²⁶), the word *faith* occurs five times in the Epistle.

(a) 1^{3, 4}, "Knowing that the proof of your faith worketh patience. And let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing." With this combine 1¹², "When he hath been approved he shall receive the crown of life."

(b) 1⁶, "let him ask in faith."

(c) 2¹, "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ."

(d) 2⁵, the poor are chosen of God to be rich in faith and heirs of the promised kingdom.

(e) 5¹⁵, "the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins it shall be forgiven him." As the anointing so the prayer is in the name of Christ.

Moreover, the act of faith is clearly implied in 1²¹, "receive with meekness the implanted word, which is able to save your souls." To receive is to believe (John 1¹²).

It is plain that James ordinarily conceived of faith in the generic sense, as faith in God.³ Once only is faith in Christ specifically named (2¹), though if the prayer on behalf of the sick be offered in the name of Christ (5¹⁵), the faith from which the prayer proceeds rests upon him. And even after speaking of "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ" in 2¹, he reverts to generic faith, and illustrates it by examples drawn from the Old Testament. In the passage which treats of faith and works, again, it is faith in God, the faith which

² See Plummer, *Expos. Bible*, ch. 7.

³ This is also the prevailing conception of faith in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

confesses that God is one (2¹⁹), that he has in mind, and not faith in Christ as a Saviour.

Faith, then, is represented as resting upon God and upon Christ : when put to the test it issues in patience, and patience in perfection, and it is crowned with life eternal ; it is the essential condition of prevailing prayer, which secures the healing of the body and the forgiveness of sins ; the rich in faith are heirs of the kingdom of God ; and through faith the divine word is received to the saving of the soul.

Thus far James is evidently in harmony with other New Testament writers in his conception of faith. If in the passage 2¹⁴⁻²⁶ he depreciates vital faith, he is not only at variance with evangelists and apostles, but he contradicts himself. To the consideration of that passage let us turn.

Every possible theory of the relation of James to Paul has been ably maintained. Do they differ in their conception of truth, or only in their mode of presenting it? Here we enter upon one of the most hotly contested fields of New Testament exegesis. The decisive fact is that both James and Paul regard faith and works—true faith and good works—as inseparable, though Paul emphasizes the one and James the other. Paul affirms that works without faith are dead ; James affirms that faith without works is dead. Paul discovers no value in works except as the fruit of faith ; James discovers no value in faith except as the root of works. Yet Paul declares that God “ will render to every man according to his works ” (Rom. 2⁶), and that not the hearers but the doers of a law shall be justified (Rom. 2¹³). And James asserts that works have no merit apart from the motive which prompts them, for the royal law, the supreme law of the Christian life, is love (2⁸). Faith without works is dead, says James ; faith without love is dead, says Paul (1 Cor. 13²), love which is the fulfilling of the law. And John teaches that love without works is dead (1 John 3^{17, 18}). If there be a question at issue between Paul and James, it is simply the question whether the root or the fruit is more important—the root from which the tree proceeds, or the fruit for which the tree was made. The common formula of salvation in which James and Paul and John unite is *faith that worketh by love*.

James clearly teaches, then, that works have no independent value. They are acceptable to God as the fruit of faith and love. By works faith is shown and proved. Salvation is not of works. “ Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point,

he is become guilty of all" (2¹⁰). "In many things we all stumble" (3²). We have all therefore need of mercy. Judgment without mercy is condemnation (2¹³). James is evidently in full accord with his Master (Mt. 7¹⁷⁻²⁷ 25^{31ff.} John 5^{28, 29}), and differs from Paul only in emphasis and proportion. Of Abraham, the typical example of faith, James teaches that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect. Evidently neither is sufficient alone. And, again, by his *works* was the Scripture fulfilled, that he *believed* God (2^{22, 23}). Abraham furnishes the most notable illustration of the truth that faith and works are inseparable in the godly life.

The logical and chronological relation between the Epistle of James and the earlier epistles of Paul, especially the Epistle to the Romans, is a problem which has long exercised the ingenuity of scholars, and still awaits solution. The theory is at least as probable as any besides that James and Paul wrote independently of each other. That they were in substantial accord is attested by the book of the Acts (ch. 15), and by the Epistle to the Galatians (2⁹), and is confirmed, as we have seen, by a careful examination of their teaching. Paul cannot have written therefore to refute the doctrine of James, nor James to refute the doctrine of Paul. On the other hand, the supposition that the later epistle, whether James's or Paul's, sought to correct misapprehension of the teaching of the other, is confronted by the apparent contradiction which they present. If either was seeking to guard the doctrine of the other from abuse, we should expect him to define his position with such care as to avoid even the appearance of opposition. If one epistle was written with reference to the other, we have either a singularly clumsy and ineffective polemic, since it may be shown that its teaching is not contradictory, but complementary, to that which it assails; or, on the other hand, an attempt to correct popular misconception of truth which is itself equally liable to misconception, and appears to refute the doctrine which it seeks to rescue from abuse. The readiest solution of the problem presented by the superficial difference and underlying harmony of the teaching of James and Paul is that neither wrote with reference to the other. They dealt with a question which necessarily emerged in the preaching of the gospel. Gen. 15⁶, "He believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness," to which Paul appeals in illustration of the power of faith, and James in proof of the value of works, was one of the commonplaces of discussion in Jewish schools. (Lightfoot on Galatians,

p. 346, "The Faith of Abraham.")⁴ Paul condemns Jewish legalism, and James Pharisaic orthodoxy, the faith of those of whom Jesus said, "They say, and do not" (Mt. 23^{2,3}).

The theory of the independence of James and Paul is not presented as established, for no theory is free from difficulties, but simply as at least as probable as any other that has been proposed. If a relation of any kind existed between them, the view of Dr. Sanday deserves consideration, "that the argument of St. James is directed not against the writings of St. Paul or against him in person, but against hearsay reports of his teaching, and against the perverted construction which might be (and perhaps to some slight extent actually was) put upon it" (*Rom.*, p. 105). This modified form of the theory of dependence, however, throws little light upon the problem; nor is it probable that in an epistle eminently straightforward and practical James would devote so much space to perversions of truth which "perhaps to some slight extent actually" existed. He was not dealing with possible misconception, but with prevalent error.

IV. THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

The sharp antithesis which Paul recognizes between law and gospel finds no place in the Epistle of James. He conceived of the gospel as the law made perfect, a view to which he was inclined by character, by experience, by the nature of his office as a minister of the circumcision. To the ceremonial law, though himself, according to tradition, a devout observer of it, he nowhere refers. There was no occasion for it in writing to those who were "zealous for the law" (Acts 21²⁰). Why should he urge upon them the claims of that ceremonial law which they were already prone to magnify unduly, and which in the council of Jerusalem he had declared was not needful for salvation, while they were trampling under foot the first principles of that moral law which he who transgresses is condemned? The religion, the worship, the ritual, the outer garb of godliness, which belongs to the new dispensation, is purity and beneficence, "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world" (1²⁷). In this he is in thorough accord with the teaching of the prophets (Is. 1, Micah 6, Hosea 6⁶).

⁴ Beyschlag aptly remarks, "Above all, the way in which he (James) introduces the example of Abraham (2²¹) as an unquestioned and unquestionable proof for his own doctrine, makes the assumption of a polemical reference to Rom. 4 absolutely impossible, for no reasonable man would quote a disputed case as conclusively establishing his point" (*N. T. Theol.* ii. 367).

The word *gospel* nowhere occurs in the epistle. The revelation given in Christ is called the word, or the law; and it is important to observe how closely James's conception of the gospel corresponds to the Old Testament representation of the moral law.

a. It is perfect. "He that looketh into the *perfect law*" (1²⁵). Comp. Ps. 19⁷, "The law of the Lord is perfect."

b. It is a law of liberty (1²⁵). "So speak ye, and so do, as men that are to be judged by a law of liberty" (2¹²). It is obeyed not through compulsion, but spontaneously and gladly, as David said, "I delight to do thy will, O my God" (Ps. 40⁸). Comp. Ps. 119³², "I will run the way of thy commandments, when thou shalt enlarge my heart." Also 119⁴⁵, "And I will walk at liberty; for I have sought thy precepts." (See also Rom. 8², "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death." And Jn. 8³², "The truth shall make you free.")

c. It is comprehended in love. "The royal law according to the scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (2⁴). In the relation of man to man, of which alone he is speaking here, love is the royal law, the supreme law, in which all duty is comprised. It is the law to which all others are subordinated, in which all others are contained. ("Love is the fulfilment of the law," Rom. 13¹⁰.) Jesus taught that love was the central principle also of the Old Testament. "On these two commandments" — of love to God and love to man — "hangeth the whole law and the prophets" (Mt. 22³⁵⁻⁴⁰).

d. The law is one. "Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all" (2¹⁰). The law is one as the will of one lawgiver. "One only is the lawgiver and judge" (4¹²). "He that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill" (2¹¹). (Comp. Mk. 12²⁹: "The Lord our God, the Lord is one.") Moreover, as Augustine observes, the law is one because it is summed up in love. "No one sins without violating this love. . . . Hence it is true that if a man shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he becomes guilty of all, because he does what is contrary to the love on which hangs the whole law" (Letter 167, 16). Mark the connection here: "If ye fulfil the royal law," — of love, — "ye do well; but if ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin. . . . For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all." The law of God, whether in the Old Testament or the New, is not a series of detached and independent precepts. It is an organic unity, expressing one will, pervaded by one spirit, directed to one end. To trans-

gress it in any particular is to oppose that will, to antagonize that spirit, to defeat that end. Observe, again, that James is not concerned with conduct only, but with motive, disposition, character.

e. The law is the rule of judgment. "So speak ye, and so do, as men that are to be judged by a law of liberty (2¹²). (Comp. Jn. 12⁴⁸, "The word that I spake, the same shall judge him in the last day.")

But the gospel is not only termed the law, it is called moreover the word, the word of truth. This designation also is drawn from the Old Testament. Of this divine word we are told that when implanted it is able to save the soul (1²¹). It is the instrumental cause of that regeneration which is wrought within us by the grace of God. "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures" (1¹⁸). Here the doctrine of salvation by grace is clearly taught. And in this representation of the gospel we note the clearest advance upon the teaching of the Old Testament. The truth of salvation and sanctification through the word was not strange to Israel, but in the Christian dispensation it is disclosed with new fulness and power. It was true from the beginning that "except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (Jn. 3³); but the nature and necessity of regeneration were clearly revealed by him who brought life and incorruption to light through the gospel (2 Tim. 1¹⁰). (See Oehler's *O. T. Theol.* § 204.) Combining these passages we find James teaching that men are regenerated by the grace of God through the implanted word, which is received by faith, and wrought out in a life of loving obedience.

The gospel, then, according to this epistle, is a law, moral, perfect, royal, a law of liberty, summed up in love, by virtue of its origin and character an organic whole, the word of truth, implanted in the heart and received by faith, through which men are regenerated, and the rule by which they shall be judged. It is obvious how closely this corresponds to the Old Testament representation of the law, while at the same time it marks a distinct advance. The gospel is the law fulfilled, according to the word of the Master: "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil" (Mt. 5¹⁷).

V. CHRISTIAN PHRASEOLOGY.

Here we may bring together various terms and phrases which belong to Christian doctrine and Christian life. Nowhere in the New Testament is there greater need of a careful induction of particulars, for the aim of the epistle is purely practical. Truth is not

so much expounded as applied, and the great doctrines of Christian faith are not drawn out and discussed as by Paul, but are rather assumed as the basis of exhortation. The theology of James therefore must be gathered from hints and suggestions scattered throughout the epistle.

(a) The frequent use of the term *brethren*, which occurs fifteen times in the epistle. Those to whom he writes are brethren not only as children of Abraham, "our father" (2²¹), but because they are begotten of God (1¹⁸).

(b) Alone among New Testament writers James styles the Christian Church both *συναγωγή* and *ἐκκλησία*.⁵ Once is *ἐκκλησία* used of the Jewish Church (Acts 7³⁸), and this epistle furnishes the only instance in which *συναγωγή* is used of the Church of Christ (2²).⁶ (See Trench, *Syn. N. T.* § 1.) Later Christian writers, as Ignatius, Hermas, and Theophilus, follow the example of James, and give both titles to the church. The church, like the synagogue, has its bench of elders (5¹⁴).

(c) Believers are the firstfruits of the new creation (1¹⁸).⁷ They are the earnest and the pledge that the universe shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God (Rom. 8²¹). For they are not the firstfruits of *the church* simply, but of *his creatures*. Here is indicated a breadth of view, a prophetic outlook, which we do not find elsewhere in the epistle. And again we are reminded that James is not setting forth a system of doctrine, and that with regard to truths of great importance we must often rest content with incidental references and passing allusions. We need not suppose that the thought of the final restoration of all things through Christ lay as clearly in the mind of James as in the mind of Paul, but that he had some conception of it is evident from this passage.

(d) We meet again with a specifically Christian thought in the reference to the last days, which are at hand: "Ye have laid up your treasure *in* the last days" 5³ (comp. 5¹), and shall be terminated by the coming of the Lord to judgment: "The coming of the Lord is at hand" (5⁸), "The judge standeth before the doors" (5⁹). James evidently shared the general expectation of the early church that Christ would speedily return.

⁵ Both are used of the Jewish Church in the Septuagint.

⁶ In Heb. 10²⁵ *ἐπισυναγωγή* is used in the sense of assembly. In 2 Thess. 2¹ it signifies "gathering together."

⁷ On Spitta's theory, that the original creation of man is intended, see Mayor, *Comm.*, p. clxxv.

These instances may suffice to illustrate the basis of Christian doctrine which underlies the ethical teaching of the epistle.

Combining now the direct references to Christ, the reminiscences of his teaching, the doctrine of faith, the conception of the gospel, and the words and phrases of Christian origin or significance which the epistle presents, we discover that the evangelical element which it contains is by no means so meagre as is often represented. The theory has been ably urged that the epistle was written by a pious Jew in the century before Christ, and subsequently adapted to Christian use. The name of Christ appears twice only (1¹ and 2¹), and in both cases is an evident interpolation. When all direct reference to him is eliminated, other passages which have been thought to bear a Christian sense must be differently interpreted. (See Mayor, *Comm.* clxviii.) But the objections to this view are obvious: *a.* If the epistle was interpolated by a Christian hand, why is the interpolation so slight and superficial as this theory maintains? It is at least as easy to believe that the epistle was *prepared* for Christian use as that it was *adapted* to Christian use.

b. We have seen that the points of contact with the gospel are numerous, and are interwoven with the whole structure of the epistle.

On the other hand, it is true that New Testament ideas are clothed in Old Testament forms. Jesus is the Messiah rather than the Saviour; faith is trust in God manifested by obedience to his word; the gospel is the law fulfilled. Wisdom holds a conspicuous place, as in the Proverbs (3¹⁵⁻¹⁷). Examples of obedience and patience are drawn entirely from the Old Scripture. The afflicted are not pointed to Christ, as in Peter, but are told to consider the prophets and Job (5^{10, 11}). The new faith wears the garb and speaks the language of the old. The Holy Spirit is nowhere named, unless it be in 4³.

We may ask in conclusion what light is thrown by our study of the epistle upon the question of authorship.

The epistle purports to be the work of "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ." Jude describes himself as "a servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James." In both instances it is assumed that James is so well known as to need no further designation. Throughout this epistle the writer speaks with authority, as one entitled and accustomed to obedience. Obviously this is in accord with the position of James, surnamed the Just, and to him tradition ascribes the epistle.

Against the authorship of James, however, two main objections are

urged: *a.* The lateness of the tradition which assigns the letter to him. Origen is the earliest writer who names him as the author, and Eusebius includes the epistle among the disputed books, with 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude. To this it may be replied that, though the tradition is somewhat late, it is the only external evidence that we have, and is respectable enough to command assent, unless it is contradicted by the tone and contents of the letter. *b.* It is urged again that the epistle does contradict the tradition. In particular, is it possible that James, the brother of the Lord, who knew him intimately during his earthly life, and was afterward numbered with his disciples, should have written a letter to Christians in which Christ is barely named? To this it may be replied: *a.* As we have already seen, Christ fills a larger place in the teaching of James than this objection admits. References to him are neither so few nor so superficial as is often maintained. *b.* That James has less to say of the life and ministry of Christ than we should expect is a peculiarity which he shares with the New Testament epistles in general. If our conception of what ought to be said is made the rule of judgment, few of them will survive the test. 1 and 2 Peter and Jude are rejected, and even in the epistles of John, while Christ is often named, how meagre are the references to his life! We have no standard to determine how much a writer must relate of what he knows. None is possible, for no man can be a law to another. If we accept, however, as the nearest approximation to a standard the general practice of New Testament writers, we shall find the difficulty in the case of James greatly diminished. They knew Jesus no longer after the flesh (2 Cor. 5¹⁰), but as the Lord of glory. And the very name by which he was familiarly known during his earthly life seldom appears alone in the epistles. (See *Expositor*, October, 1898.) *c.* The tone of the epistle is in close accord with the character of James as he is represented in the New Testament. He was the eldest brother of Jesus. There is no intimation in the gospels that he believed upon him until after the resurrection, and he was probably converted by the appearance of the risen Lord, which Paul only relates (1 Cor. 15⁷). He became the leader of the church in Jerusalem, and was famed for holy living and devout observance of the law. His life thenceforth was spent wholly in Jerusalem, so far as we are informed, and his ministry was confined to his own people. He was never, like Paul and in some degree the other apostles, brought into contact with the Gentile world. The epistle is addressed to Jewish Christians, "the twelve tribes which are of the dispersion."

Once only are words of James recorded in the Acts. He delivered the closing address in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15^{13ff.}), and it is interesting and instructive to compare his language and spirit on that occasion with those of the epistle. The tone of his speech is thoroughly Jewish. Peter is called Symeon, a Hebrew form of his name, used elsewhere only in 2 Peter 1¹. The prophecy of Amos is cited, and the church is the tabernacle of David. Moses is named. But the main point of interest is this : the question under discussion was the conditions of salvation, and in his argument James makes no allusion whatever to Christ or to the gospel. His thought moves upon the plane and employs the language of the Old Scripture. In striking contrast are the words of Peter, who names the gospel in the first sentence, and closes by affirming, "We believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." James treats of salvation without the slightest reference to the Saviour. The same is true of the letter addressed by the Council to the Gentiles, which, if not prepared by James, was drawn up in accordance with his judgment, and probably under his direction. If it be said that James in his speech was not dealing with the question of salvation in the abstract, but with simple regard to existing conditions and with a purely practical aim, the remark is true, but it is no less true of the epistle. If, then, James deals with the central truth of the new dispensation without the remotest reference to Christ, with what right do we insist that in an epistle treating avowedly of morals he must give larger space to specifically Christian truth?

So close is the correspondence between the character of James and the tone and spirit of the epistle that we need have no hesitation in accepting the tradition which names him as the author.