Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

_____

Thomas Jared Farmer, April 2, 2012

James in the "Q" Sayings Tradition:
An Examination of the Jesus Logia in the Epistle of St. James

By

Thomas Jared Farmer

Master of Theological Studies
Candler School of Theology

_____ Signature
Dr. Luke Timothy Johnson

_____ Signature
Dr. Steven J. Kraftchick

_____ Signature
Dr. Walter T. Wilson

James in the "Q" Sayings Tradition:
An Examination of the Jesus Logia in the Epistle of St. James

By

Thomas Jared Farmer

B.A., University of Illinois Springfield, 2010

Thesis Committee Chair: Luke Timothy Johnson, PhD.

An abstract of

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the

Candler School of Theology

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Theological Studies

May 2012

ABSTRACT

James in the "Q" Sayings Tradition: *An Examination of the Jesus Logia in the Epistle of St. James*

By Thomas Jared Farmer

The present investigation concerns itself with assessing the relationship between the Epistle of James and the sayings traditions of Jesus, as found in the Synoptics. For most observers, the use of Jesus *logia* by James has long since been established beyond reasonable doubt. Nevertheless, the nature and extent of the affinities between James and the Gospels remain a matter of debate among scholars. The questions raised by Jamesian scholars on the topic most often revolve around debates over which passages in James are identifiable as derivative of a Jesus *logion*. Secondarily, the extent to which James utilizes such traditions has been recognized as a possible window into the *Sitz im Leben* of the Jamesian community (itself a notoriously difficult question).

The thesis which guides the present discussion can be stated as follows: the Epistle of James represents an early stage in the development of the Jesus tradition found in the Synoptic Gospels. Correspondingly, it reflects a pre-gospel stage of development in the sayings of Jesus, reminiscent of the form found in the Q source (particularly in its Matthean recension). The two test cases for this hypothesis will be Jas 2:5 and Jas 5:12. The reason for the selection of these passages in particular is that they are nearly universally accepted by Jamesian scholars as evocative of the words of Jesus. Before undertaking an exegesis of these passages it will be necessary to briefly review the relevant literature, in order to see how Jamesian scholarship has developed from its origins to its current state. Following the exegesis of the targeted verses in James, we will conclude our investigation with a summary of our findings and an assessment of their implications.

James in the "Q" Sayings Tradition

An examination of the Jesus Logia in the Epistle of St. James

By

Thomas Jared Farmer

B.A., University of Illinois Springfield, 2010

Thesis Committee Chair: Luke Timothy Johnson, PhD.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the

Candler School of Theology

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Theological Studies

May 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

Bibliographical and General

Aristot.*Rhet*.	Aristotle, *Rhetoric*
AW	*Ausgewählte Werke in Einzelausgaben*. 5 Vols. by Ferdinand Christian Baur. Ed. Klaus Scholder. Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt: Friedrich Frommann Verlag (Günther Holzbog), 1963-75.
BDAG	*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, by W. Bauer, F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000)
BZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CE	Common Era (corresponds to AD "*Anno Domini*")
CG II	Nag Hammadi Codex II
Cp.	Compare frequency in reference to citation from ancient text
Didy.	Didymus Cæcus (The Blind)
HB	Hebrew Bible
IB	*The New Interpreter's Bible*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
Jos.As	*Joseph and Aseneth*
Jos.*A.J.*	Josephus, *Antiquitates judaicæ*/ *Antiquities of the Jews*
Jos.*Vita*	Josephus, *Vita Josephi*/ *Life of Josephus*
Jos.*J.W.*	Josephus, *Bellum judaicum* /The Jewish War
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NA^{27}	*Novum Testamentum Graece*, edited by [E. And E. Nestle], B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger, 27th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993)
NE	Near East
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
Od.	Homer, *Odyssey*
OT	Old Testament
Philo.*Ios*.	Philo of Alexandria, *De Vita Josephi/ On the Life of Joseph*
Philo.*Mos.*	Philo of Alexandria, *De Vita Mosis/ On the Life of Moses*
Philo.*Somn.*	Philo of Alexandria, *De somniis/ On Dreams*
Pliny.*Nat.*	Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia/ The Natural History*
Polyb.	Polybius, *Histories*
Polyc.*Phil*	Polycarp, *Letter to the Philippians*
Q^{L}	Lukan recension of the hypothetical "Q" source

Q^M	Matthean recension of the hypothetical "Q" source
rhet.Her.	Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RTK	*Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne*
SAC	Studies in Antiquity & Christianity
Sen.*Ep.*	Seneca, *Epistles*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
Tg.Yer.	*Targum Yerušalami* or *Targum Jonathan*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, translated by and edited by G. W. Bromiley, 10 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976)
TSK	*Theologischen Studien und Kritiken*
UBS^4	*The Greek New Testament*, edited by B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger, 4th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994)
y.Šeb.	Jerusalem Talmud Shevi'it
y.Sanh.	Jerusalem Talmud, Sanhedrin Tractate
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift fur die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Selected Biblical References

Gen	Genesis	Wis	Wisdom of Solomon
Exod	Exodus	Sir	Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)
Lev	Leviticus	Matt	Matthew
Num	Numbers	Mark	Mark
Deut	Deuteronomy	Luke	Luke
1 Kgs	1 Kings	John	John
Job	Job	Acts	Acts
Ps	Psalms	Rom	Romans
Prov	Proverbs	1 Cor	1 Corinthians
Isa	Isaiah	2 Cor	2 Corinthians
Jer	Jeremiah	Eph	Ephesians
Ezek	Ezekiel	Jas	James
Amos	Amos	1 Pet	1 Peter
Zech	Zechariah	Rev	Revelation (Apocalypse)
Mal	Malachi		

Extracanonical References

Barn.	*Barnabas*	*Apoc. El.*	*Apocalypse of Elijah*
1 Clem	*1 Clement*	*T.Sol*	*Testament of Solomon*
Gos.Thom	*Gospel of Thomas*	*T.Levi*	*Testament of Levi*
T.Benj	*Testament of Benjamin*	*T.Job*	*Testament of Job*

INTRODUCTION:

A Brief History of the Reception and Interpretation of James

1.1 *Jamesian Research during the Reformation*

Like a great treasure hidden in plain sight, *the Epistle of James* has been overlooked and undervalued for much of its history. Due largely to the influence of Martin Luther, the epistle has been forced to languish at the margins of the New Testament since the Protestant Reformation. Luther, who famously referred to James as "an epistle full of straw,"[1] dismissed the work as not possessing apostolic authority or character. In his 1522 preface to the New Testament, Luther concluded that John's Gospel, the Pauline Letters, especially Romans, Galatians and Ephesians, along with First Peter are the "books that show Christ to you."[2] He therefore diminished the doctrinal significance of the remaining books of the NT accordingly. In his German translation of the Bible, Luther relegated James, along with Hebrews, Jude and Revelation to the appendix, saying in his preface to James, "I refuse him a place among the writers of the true canon of my Bible."[3]

Thus, it can be seen that Luther's use of *sachkritik* ("content criticism") was certainly not limited to the Epistle of James, but rather extended across the canon. By privileging certain texts over others, however, Luther, in effect, created a "canon within the Canon," by which he offered gradations of importance based on his own perceptions of authority. This program of evaluating the merit of books based on his principle of *sola fides*, however, reflects not simply his own

---

[1] M. Luther, "Preface to the New Testament (1522)," In *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Anchor Books, 1962), 18-19.

[2] Ibid.

[3] M. Luther, "Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude," In *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Anchor Books, 1962), 36.

idiosyncrasies as a reader but, perhaps more importantly, situates Luther historically within a period of wider reevaluation of biblical texts. In fact, Luther's construals owe much to the spirit of critical inquiry associated with the intellectual environment of the High Renaissance.[4] Modern textual criticism also shares many of the intellectual commitments which became prevalent within this period, namely an interest in both ancient Greek and the historical circumstances of biblical authorship. Indeed, many of Luther's positions on James were already present in the work of his contemporary, the Dutch humanist Desiderius Erasmus. Erasmus had earlier questioned the apostolicity of the epistle, but unlike Luther did not reject the letter outright.[5] Erasmus was himself of signal importance in shaping Reformation conceptions of the Bible. In addition to his work with the *Textus Receptus*,[6] he, along with Thomas More, had helped to again popularize the use of the 'humane letters' (*literæ humaniores*) for their value in education. These Greek and Latin classics, many of which were being rediscovered and published thanks to the newly developed printing press, were valued by humanists for their use in grammar, philology, and rhetoric. The British philosopher A. J. P. Kenny notes that Erasmus and the other humanists "believed that their scholarship, applied to ancient pagan texts, would restore to Europe long-

[4] See L. T. Johnson, *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels* (San Fransisco: HarperSanFransisco, 1996), 67-75.

[5] It should be noted that Luther's rejection of James was based on his perception, right or wrong, that James contradicted Paul's soteriology. Despite sidelining James for interests of theological consistency, Luther found much to admire in the content of the letter itself (see Luther, *Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude*, 36; also J. H. Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, ed. Francis Brown and Alfred Plummer (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916), 45, 104-108; M. Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 11th ed. Ed. Helmut Koester. trans. M. A. Williams (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 54; L. T. Johnson, *The Letter of James, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 37A. of *the Anchor Bible Series* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 140.

[6] See B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 137-152.

neglected arts and sciences, and, applied to the Bible and to ancient Church writers, would help Christendom to a purer and more authentic understanding of Christian truth."[7]

Despite more positive views of the epistle by reformers like Calvin and Zwingli,[8] Erasmus' and Luther's critical reading of James has exercised perhaps the most historical influence on scholarly perceptions of the epistle. This is due in no small part to the disproportionate influence of German biblical scholarship on the development of modern textual criticism and the historical-critical model.[9] Through popular dissemination, as well as the concomitant influence of "confessionalization,"[10] Luther's biases and proclivities came to significantly inform the theological assumptions of later German scholarship and its dominant interpretive method the historical-critical model. In his 1995 commentary on James for the *Anchor Bible* series, L. T. Johnson argues that, "the historical-critical model, despite its explicit break with dogma, continued to be shaped by the premises and perceptions of the Reformation." Indeed, "the historical project of F. C. Baur is profoundly, if unconsciously, shaped by the

---

[7] A. Kenny, *The Rise of Modern Philosophy*, vol. III of *A New History of Western Philosophy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006)

[8] In 1550, John Calvin published a commentary on James, which was included in a collection of the Catholic Epistles the following year. Calvin's work on James demonstrates none of the fierce antagonism toward the epistle shown by Luther. Ulrich Zwingli also refers to James favorably in his 1523, *Defense of the Reformed Faith*.

[9] Metzger and Ehrman argue that the beginnings of "scientific textual criticism" of the New Testament can be traced to the French priest and scholar Richard Simon (1638-1712) [see Metzger and Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament*, 197-204].

[10] "In German scholarship, the term 'confessionalization' has become a paradigm of social history. Confessionalization 'designates the fragmentation of the unity of Christendom (*Christianitas latina*) of the Middle Ages into at least three confessional churches – Lutheran, Calvinistic or 'Reformed,' and post-tridentine Roman Catholic. Each formed a highly organized system, which tended to monopolize the world-view with respect to the individual, the state, and society, and which laid down strictly formulated norms in politics and morals…[these] churches joined forces with their respective 'states,' albeit under state control, to educate and discipline their people in their respective confessions" (C. Lindberg, *The European Reformations.* 2nd ed. (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2010), 348.

theological predilections of Luther."[11] Johnson goes on to detail in *The Real Jesus*, two implicit assumptions in the "back-to-the-sources" approach to Scripture promulgated during the Reformation and the traditions that have followed it. The first assumption is that "the recovery of origins means the recovery of essence." This implies that "the first realization of Christianity is naturally the best." Following necessarily from this assumption is the conviction that any subsequent development in Christianity is, by definition, a decline from its pristine origin. The second implicit assumption is "that history can act as a theological norm for the reform of the church: the recovery of 'original Christianity' made available through the recovery of the 'original Scripture' should [thereby] naturally serve as measure and critique for all subsequent forms of Christianity."[12] Today, these assumptions are largely taken for granted by both scholars and laity alike. The unfortunate consequence of this development for James is that, within the historical-critical paradigm, Luther's characterization of the epistle as both late and pseudonymous has historically been transposed into meaning inauthentic and commensurately of less value.[13]

---

[11] See L. T. Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 125; F. C. Baur, *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings; A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity.* 2nd ed. (London: Williams & Norgate [Republished in 1 vol. by Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.], 1873-1875), 297-313. It should be noted that Baur held to this position in spite of knowledge of alternative positions regarding the relationship of James and Paul. For example, he fiercly rejects the work of Neander and Schneckenburger which both held that such a contradiction did not exist between the two authors (see F. C. Baur, *Paul*, 297-313; A. Neander, *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung den christlichen Kirche*, 2 vols [Hamburg: Perthes, 1832-33]; M. Schneckenberger, *Annotatio ad Epistolam Jacobi Perpetua cum Brevi Tractatione Isagogica* [Stuggart: F. L. Löflund, 1832]).

[12]This was simply a natural extension of the work being done by Renaissance scholars on classics. As classical texts were recovered, scholars began to measure the apparent inadequacies of late-medieval society against the real or perceived grandeur of Greco-Roman society. In the same way, theologians could measure the inadequacies of the medieval Catholic Church against the conventions of nascent Christianity (see L. T. Johnson, *The Real Jesus*, 67-75).

[13] This is largely the case despite the affirmation of the Epistle at the Council of Trent and the Lutheran *Formula of Concord*, which attempted to harmonize James with Pauline teachings.

1.2 *Jamesian Research after the Reformation*

Within this frame of reference, M. Dibelius notes that, following the Reformation, the interpretation of James has passed through three important stages of development. The first major phase of critical research came in 1826, when W. M. L. de Wette dismissed the letter as inauthentic, and attempted to demonstrate linguistically that the brother of Jesus, a provincial Palestinian Jew, could not have produced a work exhibiting such an adept command of Greek.[14] F. H. Kern largely supported de Wette's conclusions in his own influential 1835 work, *Der Character und Ursprung des Briefes Jakobi*.[15] The innovation of Kern was to take the historical approach used earlier by A. Neander and M. Schneckenberger to refute, rather than support, the traditional claims of orthodoxy. In doing so, Kern simultaneously created the parameters of the modern debate over James and supplied it with its essential content.[16]

The second critical stage of development came with the work of Kern's colleague F. C. Baur. The inspiration and intellectual force behind the Tübingen School of biblical scholarship, Baur assigned the epistle a late date, but still gave James a place within his schematic of early Christian origins. Baur had come to understand early Catholicism in terms of a Hegelian dialectic.[17] Catholicism represented for Baur the synthesis of the competing theses of Jewish

---

[14] W. M. L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: Reimer, 1826). See also Ropes, 46.

[15] F. H. Kern, *Der Character und Ursprung des Briefes Jakobi* (Tübingen: Fues, 1835).

[16] As both Dibelius and Johnson point out, Kern later abandoned this position for a more traditional view; the restatement of his position through Baur, however, made Kern's claims, to use Johnson's words, "literally epochal" (see Dibelius, 57; Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 147-148). Though Kern was not as prolific and controversial as F. C. Baur, his influence should not be understated.

[17] The influence of Hegel on Baur's conceptions of history are evident in his "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des paulinischen und petrinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom" (*AW*, 1836, 1:1-146); "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefes...:Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung" (Ibid., 1:147-266]; "Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien, ihr

Christianity (viz. James and Peter) and its antithesis Gentile Christianity (viz. Paul).[18] The fundamental methodological flaw with this approach, however, is that it assumes rather than demonstrates that such a relationship existed. Indeed, when one looks at the texts in question it becomes exceedingly difficult to maintain Baur's position.

His assumption that the history of early Christianity is essentially reducible to the conflict between Jewish Christianity (Petrine/Jacobean), and Pauline Christianity lead him to diminish the historical significance of canonical books which did not conform to his interpretive matrix (e.g. James and Luke-Acts). Baur correspondingly privileged non-canonical books where such conflicts did seem apparent. The most prominent example of this is Baur's highly suppositious reading of the fourth-century Pseudo-Clementine literature, as a kind of crypto-commentary on the struggle between James/Peter and Paul.[19]

Verhältniss zu einander, ihren Charakter und Ursprung (1847)"; and "Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe des Apostels Paulus aufs neue kritische untersucht" (1836). Baur's critical exegetical work, along with his synthesis of the ideas of Hegel and F. D. E. Schleiermacher (and to a lesser extent J. G. Fichte and F. W. J. Schelling), had a tremendous effect on NT research. In particular, his influence was felt through the work of his students A. Schwegler and D. F. Strauß. Schwegler's work, *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, was important in promoting the Tübingen School's method of historical-critical analysis. The publication of Strauß's, *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, however, was a watershed moment in the history of NT research, as well as in popular conceptions of Christianity.

[18] The pitiable position of Baur's interpretive model is not simply that it represents a poor reading of history (which it does), but also that it fundamentally misinterprets Hegel's dialectic. The reading of Hegel as positing a necessitarian or progressivist model of history is simply misplaced. Hegel does not, as is often thought, refer to a self-enclosed circle in which things simply actualize their potential and become what they always-already were. Rather, as Slavoj Žižek has pointed out, "[the dialectic's] wager is not to adopt toward the present the 'point of view of finality,' viewing as if it were already past, but, precisely, to reintroduce the openness of the future into the past, to grasp that-which-was in its process of becoming, to see the contingent process which generated existing necessity" (S. Žižek, *The Parallax View* [Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009], 77-78). It is through this misreading that Baur infers his metanarrative of religious conflict between the forces of legalism (viz. Judaism) and liberty (viz. Pauline Christianity), which cannot themselves be justified through appeal to Hegel's dialectic (see G. W. F. Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit* [*Die Phanomenologie des Geistes*], trans. A. V. Miller, with analysis of the text and foreword by J. N. Findlay [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977]; also Kenny, *The Rise of Modern Philosophy*, 111-116).

[19] L. T. Johnson here provides a salutary reminder that the legendary James of Hegesippus or the pseudo-Clementines—the James connected to circumcision, Torah observance, and opposition to Paul—are not the only ways in which the figure of James has been developed historically. "[T]he Nag Hammadi writings shows us that the figure of James could be developed in a quite different direction by later parties seeking legitimation in the founding

Recognizing the obvious lack of a Judaizing program in James' epistle,[20] not to mention the glaring omission of anything resembling an attack on Paul, Baur concluded that James' epistle must be post-Pauline. While continuing to maintain that the "historical James" was in direct conflict with Paul, Baur posited that the epistle bearing his name was a pseudonymous second-century production. He maintained that the epistle reflects the conditions of the church in the second-century; a church largely expunged of its anti-Pauline malcontents and thereby subjected to the harmonizing tendencies of early Roman Catholicism. Such a view, of course, affirmed both the anticlerical and restorationist tendencies of religious discourse in the Enlightenment. This bias, and perhaps more importantly, the initial simplicity of Baur's dialectic, can account for much of its continued staying power even long after the last vestiges of its justification were dismissed. Indeed, the peculiar interpretive proclivities of Baur and the Tübingen School were largely repudiated by scholarship in the twentieth-century, though they continue to color the perceptions of many still engaged in the enterprise of "historical reconstruction".

---

figures of the Christian movement. The place of honor held by James in this Gnostic collection suggests that, like other eponymous figures in earliest Christianity, he was capable of various exploitations" (L. T. Johnson, "The Social World of James: Literary Analysis and Historical Reconstruction," in *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James* [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004], 114; see for example, "The Apocryphon of James," in *The Other Bible*, ed. Willis Barnstone [San Fransisco: Harper Collins, 1980] 343-349). The influence of Baur's reading of the Pseudo-Clementine literature can be seen in more recent memory in the commentary of Sophie Laws, who says, "Certainly James of Jerusalem was the hero of heterodox Jewish Christianity, as he is in the pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* and *Recognitions* [in contrast to their villain, Simon Magus, a thinly-disguised Paul]" (S. Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1980, 41).

[20] Baur associated the "Judaizers," as well as the later "Judaizing" program of the Ebionite heresy, with the historical James through his own conjectural reading of Gal 2:11-14, as well as, the description of James in Hegesippus as an observant practitioner of the strictures of the Torah. Additionally, one might wonder the degree to which Baur's apparent "anti-Judaism" colored his perception of the conflict as being both inevitable and indeed necessary.

1.3 *Contemporary Jamesian Research*

The third major critical development enumerated by Dibelius was the hypothesis of F. Spitta[21] and L. Massebieau.[22] Each had independently concluded that James was originally a Jewish document (*Grundschrift*) with only later Christian interpolations (i.e. vv. 1:1 and 2:1). While this view has met with nearly universal dismissal by scholars,[23] it did serve to cast new light on the discussion of the epistle, in particular its place in early Christian history. Among the works which appeared on James following Spitta and Massebieau, were the important commentaries of A. Schlatter (1900),[24] who emphasized the relationship between James and the rabbinic tradition, H. J. Cladder (1904),[25] who argued for the use of poetic strophes in James, J. B. Mayor (1910),[26] who demonstrated parallels between James and ancient Hellenistic writings,

[21] F. Spitta, "Der Brief des Jakobus," in *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*, vol. 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896).

[22] L. Massebieau, "L'Épître de Jacques est—elle l'oeuvre d'un Chrétien," (*RHR* 32, 1895).

[23] A notable exception to this dismissal is the work of Arnold Meyer, who in 1930 presented a similar notion when he conjectured that James was based on a slightly modified Jewish allegory, "The Letter of Jacob to the Twelve Tribes." The work of Burton Scott Easton is sympathetic to Meyer's conclusions but, he contends that the Christian editor had a more pronounced role in shaping the material than that postulated by Meyer (see A. Meyer, "Das Raetsel des Jacobusbriefes," *BZNW* vol. 10 [Giessen: Alfred Toepelmann, 1930]; and B.S. Easton, "The Epistle of James," in *IB* vol. 12, ed. George A. Buttrick et al., 1-74).

[24] A. Schlatter, "Die Briefe des Petrus, Judas, Jakobus, der Briefe an die Hebräer (1900)," in *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1961-1965).

[25] H. J. Cladder, "Die Anlage des Jakobusbriefes," and "Der formale Aufbau des Jakobusbriefes," *ZKT* 28, 37-57 and 295-330.

[26] J. B. Mayor, *The Epistle of James*, 3rd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1910).

and J. H. Ropes (1916) [27] whose critical commentary emphasized James' relationship to ancient wisdom literature, as well as the diatribal nature of the epistle.[28]

It was in 1921, however, that perhaps the most significant moment in modern Jamesian research occurred, with the publication of M. Dibelius,' *Der Brief des Jakobus*.[29] The significance of Dibelius' work on James can hardly be overstated. To this day, it exercises such magisterial influence as to be the source by which all subsequent work on James is judged. In the Forward to the 1976 English edition, Helmut Koester noted that Dibelius' work was "pioneering in its application of form and literary critical methods to the interpretation of a writing from the New Testament."[30] He went on to say that Dibelius' commentary had remained, at the time, "unsurpassed with respect to thoroughness, depth of insight, consistency of method, and presentation of relevant historical materials."[31] Part of the reason for the commentary's success, beyond Dibelius' own erudition and attention to detail, was its integration of the large body of work already completed on the epistle by Ropes and Mayor.

---

[27] Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James* (1916).

[28] See W. H. Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 32-36; L. T. Johnson, "A Survey of the History of Interpretation of James," *Brother of Jesus Friend of God*, 43.

[29] Originally published as part of Meyer's Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, the commentary was later revised by Heinrich Greeven. In 1976, it was published in English as part of the Hermeneia Series.

[30] H. Koester, "Forward," in *James*, by M. Dibelius, ix-x; Dibelius, along with Rudolf Bultmann and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, helped to popularize the "form critical" approach, used in OT studies by Julius Wellhausen, Hermann Gunkel, and later by Martin Noth, Gerhard von Rad, et al., in the study of the NT. "Form criticism is a method of analyzing and interpreting literature through a study of its literary types and genres. In particular, form criticism is a means of identifying the genres of that literature, their structures, intentions and settings in order to understand the oral stage of their development" (G. M. Tucker, *Form Criticism of the Old Testament* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976], 1).

[31] Ibid.

Though Dibelius' work was a massive achievement, and genuinely deserving of admiration, it is not without its own biases and limitations. For example, Dibelius' use of a form-critical approach, as Wachob has pointed out, tended toward the atomization of the text. This process of reduction would come to play a key role in both Dibelius' classification of James under the rubric of "*paraenesis*," as well as, his overall reading of the epistle.[32] Dibelius maintained that the genre of *paraenesis* was represented by, "a text which strings together admonitions of general ethical content."[33] This content, he held was characterized by, among other things: eclecticism and a lack of continuity or thoughtful progression.[34] As such, he concluded that James was not directed at any particular audience and lacked any epistolary elements beyond the prescript in v. 1. Additionally, as a collection of aphorisms, James itself had no theology. More recent commentators, however, have drawn into question both Dibelius' classification of James, as well as, his conclusions regarding the genre of *paraenesis*.[35] Nevertheless, since Dibelius, particular attention has been placed by scholarship on the importance of determining the genre of James as an integral dimension in understanding its purpose, authorship, date, and audience.

[32] Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, 37.

[33] Dibelius, *James*, 3, 5, 11.

[34] Besides James, Dibelius also classified Hebrews 13, parts of the *Epistle of Barnabas*, and the *Didache* as clear examples of the use of *paraenesis* (Ibid, 3).

[35] See P. H. Davids, *The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Epistle of James* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1982); P. J. Hartin, *James*, ed. Daniel J. Harrington, S. J., vol. 14 (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003); L. T. Johnson, "James 3:13—4:10 and the Topos περὶ φθόνου," and "Friendship with the World and Friendship with God: A Study of Discipleship in James," *Brother of Jesus, Friend of* God, 182-201, 202-220.

Since the publication of Dibelius' work, Jamesian research has grown exponentially. The last several decades have seen important works by F. O. Francis (1970),[36] who argued for the analysis of the structure of James, based on literary letters like those found in Josephus; S. Laws (1980),[37] who firmly locates James within the Hellenistic world and postulates that the author was a "God-fearer";[38] P. H. Davids (1982),[39] who argued for a two-stage authorship in which materials originating with James of Jerusalem were collated into the epistle by a later redactor; D. B. Deppe (1989),[40] who catalogued in immense detail the parallels between the epistle and the Jesus *logia* in the Gospels; P. J. Hartin (1991),[41] who proposed that James was structured according to a chiastic pattern and also, building on the work of Deppe, further explored the relationship between James and the wisdom tradition in Q;[42] L. T. Johnson (1995),[43] who

[36] F. O. Francis, "The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John" (*ZNW* 61, 1970), 110-126.

[37] S. Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (San Francisco: HarperSanFransisco, 1980).

[38] "God-fearers" were Gentiles who had, to some degree or another, attached themselves to the Jewish God and Torah observance without fully converting to Judaism (see J. D. Crossan, *God & Empire: Jesus Against Rome, Then and Now* [New York: HarperCollins, 2007], 154-156; Amy-Jill Levine, *The Misunderstood Jew: The Church and the Scandal of the Jewish Jesus* [New York: Harper Collins, 2006], 68-69, and "Visions of Kingdoms: From Pompey to the First Jewish Revolt," in *The Oxford History of the Biblical World*, ed. Michael D. Coogan [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998] 375-376).

[39] P. H. Davids, *The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Epistle of James*, (1982).

[40] D. B. Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James* [Dissertation; Amsterdam], (Chelsea, MI: Bookcrafters, 1989).

[41] P. J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

[42] "Q" (*Quelle*, or "source"), is the name given to the material, common to Matthew and Luke which does not appear in Mark. The "Q" source hypothesis arose out of the need to address the issue of literary interdependency noted among Matthew, Mark, and Luke. The hypothesis rests upon the speculation of "Markan priority" (the claim that Mark was the first written Gospel and was utilized as a source by Matthew and Luke). It further posits that, in addition to Mark, Matthew and Luke used another source ("Q") in the composition of their Gospels. While a small number of scholars still hold to "Matthean priority," and the corresponding utilization theory made famous by J. J. Griesbach (1745 –1812), most scholars have adopted the "two-source" or "Q" hypothesis as the most reasonable solution to the "Synoptic Problem." By contrast, the so-called "Griesbach Hypothesis," maintains that Luke and Mark utilized Matthew as their primary source (Luke expands Matthew, while Mark condensed him) and reject the notion of a lost second source. Though the works of J. G. Eichhorn (1753 –1827) and F. D. E. Schleiermacher (1768–1834), are often cited as important in the development of the "Q" source hypothesis, J. M. Robinson, has

maintains that James is best seen as a form of protreptic discourse and argues for its distinctiveness among writings of the Hellenistic world and also the NT; and W. H. Wachob (2000),[44] who examined the social function of the epistle in light of the conventions of Greco-Roman rhetoric. Though this brief survey of recent Jamesian research is, by no means exhaustive, it does demonstrate the current state of scholarship on the epistle and the way in which the concerns for genre, structure, and rhetoric have come to dominate the discussion. Additionally, the works of Deppe, Hartin, Johnson, and Wachob have made significant contributions to understanding the relationship between the Epistle of James and the sayings traditions of Jesus.

---

concluded that it was rather in 1838 that the argument basic to establish the existence of Q was presented for the first time by the Leipzig philosopher C. H. Weiße: Matthew and Luke used, in addition to Mark, a sayings collection (see J. M. Robinson, "History of Q Research," in *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas,* eds. J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, and J. S. Kloppenborg [Lueven: Peeters, 2000], pp. xx-xxi.). See also J.G. Eichhorn, "Ueber die drey ersten Evangelien: Einige Beyträge zu ihrer künftigen kritischen Behandlung," in *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur*, vol. 5 (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1794), 761-996; F. D. E. Schleiermacher, "Ueber die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien," in *TSK* 5 (1832) 735-768; and C. H. Weiße, *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838). Subsequent literature on Q has become voluminous. So, for reasons of brevity, a full recital of the history of the "two-source" hypothesis will remain beyond the scope of the present investigation, as it is tangential to the main inquiry. Additionally, it is not the object of this study to provide arguments sufficient for the establishment of the existence of the "Q" document. This study will rather assume the veracity of the "two-source" hypothesis, based on wide-scholarly consensus, while merely noting that apart from physical evidence, the authenticity of the hypothesis ultimately remains indeterminate (for a defense of the antithesis see P. Foster, "Is It Possible to Dispense with Q?" *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 45, no. 4. [2003], 313-337).

[43] L. T. Johnson, *The Letter of James*, (1995).

[44] W. H. Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, (2000).

James and Matthew (The Matthean Recension of "Q")

2.1 James Hardy Ropes

The relationship between James and the Jesus *logia* in the Synoptics (in particular Matthew) has been an oft noted point in Jamesian research for over two centuries. [45] The beginnings of a critical examination of these parallels, however, were not undertaken until the beginning of the last century with the work of J. H. Ropes. Ropes' 1916 commentary on James was a noteworthy accomplishment in several respects. First, as already mentioned, he emphasized the Hellenistic elements within the epistle and in so doing roundly dismissed the *Grundschrift* hypotheses of Spitta and Massebieau. Second, he examined literary parallels between James and other Greek compositions (including the Synoptics). Third, he provided a detailed account of the history of James' reception by the Church. Finally, and most significantly for our present discussion, he recognized that the period of development within the Synoptic tradition reflected in James was closer to the Q source than to the final redactions of the Gospels of Matthew or Luke.

Ropes argued that the Epistle of James was written sometime after 70 CE to Greek speaking Jewish Christians in Palestine. In the preface to his commentary, he maintained that James and the Gospel of Matthew are important sources from which we can draw knowledge of primitive Palestinian Christianity. That is, if Hellenistic Christianity is developed in the compositions of Luke, Paul, and John, then James and Matthew represent a separate line of

[45] Deppe points out that "already in 1886 Weizsäcker noted that the presence of similarities between the Epistle of James and the sayings in the Synoptic gospels was a long observed fact" (D. B. Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*), 13. See C. Weizsäcker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1886), 378. Deppe also directs the reader's attention to the works of H. J. Holtzmann (who summarized the positions of Kern, Schmid, and Bunson), A. Wikenhauser, H. Rendtorff, F. W. Grosheide, E. Reuss, R. Patry, et al.

development and expression. Ropes, however, is careful to point out that the distinctions between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity which he alludes to are not the same as those referred to by F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School. Nevertheless, he believes that "they are no less clear or far-reaching."[46]

Ropes himself characterized James as a literary tract, rather than an actual letter and assumed its authorship was pseudonymous. Notwithstanding, he maintained—in contrast to Spitta and Massebieau—that the author of the epistle was clearly Christian. He contended that this was demonstrable in several ways. First, while James' aphoristic forms certainly demonstrate knowledge of the Hebrew wisdom-tradition, they are nevertheless written in the style of Hellenistic diatribe.[47] Indeed, he concluded that there is nothing within the letter itself which could have been written by a Jew, which in principal could not have been written by a Gentile Christian.[48] Second, the few explicit references to Jesus in the epistle do not exhibit the characteristics of interpolation.[49] Finally, the apparent allusions to the words of Jesus in the epistle further remove the possibility of James originating as a non-Christian document.

He states that, "a large dependence on the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels has often been found in [James]." "Most of them, as Spitta rightly contends, have no bearing on the

[46] Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, vi.

[47] Ibid, 2-3;18-24.

[48] While he maintained this was the case, Ropes contended that the themes and emphases within the epistle made it distinct from "Hellenistic" Christianity.

[49] There are no manuscripts in which these passages referring to Jesus do not appear, therefore, there is no textual warrant for eliminating them. Additionally, one might wonder why an editor attempting to Christianize a text would provide so little in the way of alteration.

question, being merely verbal or else due only to common relation to Jewish ideas."[50] Nevertheless, he does list six parallels which he believes are noteworthy:

James	Matthew	Luke	Mark
1.5: αἰτείτω...καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ.	7.7: Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν,	11.9: Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν,	
2.5: τοὺς πτωχοὺς… κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας	5.3: Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	*cf*. 6.20: [οἱ πτωχοί]	
3.18: τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην.	5.9: μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί,		
4.4: μοιχαλίδες	*cf*. 12.39; 16.4		8.38: ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι
5.1-6: Ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, κτλ.		6.24: Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.	
5.12: [oaths]	5.34-37		

In particular, the parallels delineated by Ropes emphasize the way in which the author of James develops these Jesus *logia* in a fashion similar to the Matthean-redaction of Q. While, he admits the influence of Jesus *logia* may possibly be at work in other, less apparent parallels. Ropes is circumspect in his assessment regarding the extent of these parallels, concluding only that some of them (especially Jas 5:12) may have direct influence from a saying of Jesus.

More important for Ropes than the disputable points of these saying's origins is the manner in which these parallels follow some of the larger interest of the Synoptics, while

[50] Ibid, 38-39.

simultaneously ignoring others. For example, he highlights James' recurrent insistence on the importance of "doing", as opposed to merely saying or hearing. This, Ropes contends represents the same "type of religion" which is emphasized in the sayings of Jesus within the Gospels (especially Matthew).[51] In similar fashion, the high value James places on poverty, his indignation toward the rich, his frequent injunctions to prayer, the emphasis placed on complete devotion to God (*cf.* Matt 6:19—34), his appeals to prudent speech and the abstention of judgment, et al. are all points of uniformity between James and the Synoptics. Though these ideals are natural to and have many points of convergence with devout Judaism, Ropes thinks that what is to be noted is their "special and strong emphasis" in James and their correspondingly congenial expression among the compilers of the Gospels (or their sources).

While these affinities with the Synoptics are strong, Ropes notes that of equal importance are their myriad points of divergence. Indeed, the Epistle of James omits what may be thought of as some of the chief elements of the Synoptic tradition. First and most conspicuously, is its total lack of reference to the death, burial, or resurrection of Jesus; either as constituting a problem or as figuring in a soteriological program. In this omission, James sets himself apart from practically every other author of the NT, as well as the Apostolic Fathers. Ropes further underscores this point by stating that "the substance of his epistle forbids the explanation that [James] had no occasion to make such a reference. That the writer thought of salvation as to be brought to believers through Christ at his coming (5:7) is evident, but it is equally plain that he had…perhaps no clear thought at all, of any relation of Christ's *death* to God's saving grace."[52] James also lacks any reference to 'the Kingdom of God' or the 'Son of Man', while his

[51] Ropes points to Matt 7:21—23 = Luke 6:46; Matt 7:24—27 = Luke 6:47—49; Matt 25:31—46, etc., as examples.

[52] Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*, 33 [italics original]

eschatology also remains somewhat underdeveloped and incidental. Given these points of divergence, Ropes made the startlingly insightful observation that these distinctions, "forbid the supposition that from the same circle and age could have come both a Gospel like Matthew or Luke (to say nothing of Mark) and the Epistle of James. James was in religious ideas nearer to the men who collected the sayings of Jesus than to the authors of the Gospels, but his religious interests are not identical with those of either group."[53] Thus Ropes, inferred that James constituted an early and distinct stage within the sayings traditions of Jesus, which perhaps antedates their final redactions in the Synoptic Gospels. Further, he notes that the Gospel of Matthew, as representative of the same Palestinian provenience, develops these traditions in similar fashion to James.

2.2 Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.

This relationship was further developed in 1956 when M. H. Shepherd, Jr. published a significant article on the relationship between James and the Gospel of Matthew for *the Journal of Biblical Literature*.[54] Shepherd argued that James in several places exhibited signs of influence by the Gospels (Matthew and to a lesser extent Luke). He even went so far as to suggest that James' knowledge of the Jesus tradition was dependent upon a familiarity with Matthew's Gospel itself. While Shepherd concedes that it would be absurd to hold that the author of James had a written copy of Matthew in front of him as he compiled his discourses. He does

[53] Ibid., p. 39

[54] M. H. Shepherd, Jr., "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 75, no. 1 (March 1956), 40-51.

suggest that the author had more than a passing familiarity with the Gospel. Rather, he maintains that the author of James could have known the Gospel from hearing it read aloud in church.[55]

Shepherd contended that James was a literary epistle composed of a series of homiletic-didactic discourses each characterized by the explication of a central *macarism* or gnomic saying.[56] For each of these discourses, Shepherd noted that there was a parallel (although not a quotation) from Matthew. Most of the parallels can be found in the Sermon on the Mount/Plain (largely drawn from "Q" material), which according to Shepherd has misled some commentators into drawing closer parallels to Luke than are warranted.[57]

Contrariwise, while the majority of the parallels are to be found among "Q" and "M" material, there are two instances in which James seems to draw on material exclusive to Luke's Gospel. The first is the tradition of the three and half year drought in the time of Elijah (*cf.* 1 Kgs 17:1, 18:1) preserved in Jas 5:17 and Luke 4:25. Shepherd largely dismisses this agreement as merely incidental, which need not demonstrate any dependence.[58] Second, and much more

[55] Ibid., 47-51. In order to bolster this conclusion he compares James' use of Matthew with the Gospel's use in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (c. 35-107 CE) and the *Didache*, two works which Shepherd felt were generally contemporary with James and of the same "Syrian" provenance. As Deppe has pointed out, locating authorship in Syria expands the provenance from the confines of Antioch of the Orontes to also include the areas of Phoenicia and even Palestine. For a detailed examination of the relationship between the Epistle of James, the Gospel of Matthew, and the *Didache* see, *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, eds. H. van de Sandt and J. K. Zangenberg (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008).

[56] Deppe repudiates this claim stating that "our results indicate that James did not structure each section of his epistle around a macarism or gnomic saying either specifically drawn from the Gospel of Matthew or supported by gospel parallels in the immediate context. In fact, none of the central sayings which Shepherd discovers are allusions to the Gospel of Matthew" (Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*), 151.

[57] Among the scholars who postulated a close relationship between James and Luke, see C. Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche* (Frieburg: Mohr, 1886); D. Schenkel, *Das Christusbild der Apostel und der nachapostolischen Zeit* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1879); and B. H. Streeter, "The Primitive Church: Studied with Special Reference to the Origins of the Christian Ministry," *The Hewitt Lectures* 1928 (London: MacMillan, 1930).

[58] The link between these two passages is tenuous because the agreement is with the content not the language itself. Additionally, the two authors employ the story for quite different purposes. The incidental agreement of their content may be explainable either by their knowledge of oral tradition or an otherwise unknown

significant, is the fact that James seems to follow the Lukan Beatitude formula more closely than the Matthean. These parallels are not all demonstrated with equal clarity, but some—like the binary relationship of the poor and the rich in James—appear to have closer affinity to Luke than with the "theologizing" program in Matthew (*cf.* Luke 6:20b and Matt 5:3).[59] Similarly, the blessing upon those who mourn which appears in James 4:9 corresponds to Luke's woe upon those who laugh:

James 4:9	
ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε. ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω	Lament and mourn and weep. Let your laughter be turned into mourning…[60]
Luke 6:25b	
οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.	Woe to you who are laughing now, for you will mourn and weep.

Shepherd suggests that the similarities between the way in which James and Luke each develop their material may tell us less about their sources than about the circumstances affecting authorial choice. That is, the resemblance between James and Luke can be accounted for on the grounds that "the Lukan Beatitudes have been shaped to fit the actual conditions of church life in

apocryphal source. Likewise, Shepherd dismisses parallels between Jas 4:13—5:6 and the Lukan accounts of "Rich Fool" (Luke 12:16ff) and "Lazarus and Dives" (Luke 16:19ff) as being too superficial to warrant more than a passing acknowledgment (Ibid., 46).

[59] *cf.* Luke 6:20b: Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Matt 5:3: Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ *τῷ πνεύματι*, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. As in James, "the poor" (οἱ πτωχοί) in Luke's Gospel are the poor, as such, not the poor "in spirit" (οἱ πτωχοὶ *τῷ πνεύματι*).

[60] All translations from the Greek come from the NRSV, unless otherwise noted.

Palestine; and James writes from the perspective of a Christian community living in similar circumstances."[61]

Conversely, James also makes use of Matthean Beatitudes which are not reflected in Luke's Gospel. Shepherd notes the clearest example is the blessing upon the merciful (Matt 5:7); with its parallel in the warning against the merciless judge in Jas 2:13:

James 2:13	
ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος· κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως.	For judgment will be without mercy to anyone who has shown no mercy; mercy triumphs over judgment.
Matthew 5:7	
μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται.	Blessed are the merciful, for they will receive mercy.

James also appears to be familiar with Beatitudes regarding "meekness" (3:13), "purity of heart" (4:8), and "peace-making" (3:18). This evidence would seem to suggest that the author of the epistle was aware of the Matthean formula or at least another list of Beatitudes more extensive than the one presented in Luke.

After taking account of the two apparent Lukan parallels Shepherd moves to build the case for a Matthean connection to James. He notes parallels in Jas 1:5—8 to Matt 7:7 = Luke 11:9, however, James' emphasis on "prayer in faith, without doubting" (1:6) does not appear in

[61] Shepherd, *The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew*, 44. While this suggestion is not implausible, it assumes, perhaps too much, the degree to which authorial choice is determined by provenance. As V. K. Robbins has pointed out, "We can never assume that all persons in a given context thought alike. Nor is there any necessary causality linking context and ideas" (V. K. Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*, ed. J. H. Neyrey [Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1991], 305-332).

Luke, but only in Matthew. Likewise, there are other instances in which the wording or emphasis in James appears to follow Matthew more closely than Luke:

James	Matthew	Luke
1:17	7:11	11:13
1:19—20	5:22ff	
1:23	7:21—26	6:46—49
1:27	25:35ff	
2:8—12	5:17ff	
2:1—13	19:17b	
2:14—26	7:21, 26; 21:28ff; 25:31ff	
3:1—12	7:16—20; 12:33, 36	6:43—45
3:10	15:11	
4:3	7:7	11:9
4:4	6:24	16:13
4:11—12	7:1—5	6:37—42
4:14	6:34	
5:2—3	6:19; 12:7	
5:7—18	5:33—37	

Some of the parallels delineated by Shepherd are more compelling than others, however, he is right to point out that the connections when taken in full are impressive; especially when one considers that they span the entire epistle and are reflected in nearly every major theme.

2.3 Sophie Laws

Another important commentator to consider when regarding the relationship between James and Matthew is S. Laws. Her 1980 commentary on James for *Black's New Testament Series*[62] departs in many respects from Ropes and especially Shepherd regarding the extent of Matthean influence on the epistle. While she acknowledges the existence of some parallels in content and vocabulary, she argues that the form and emphasis of many of the parallels are sufficiently dissimilar as to warrant their dismissal. Laws contends that the parallels, while initially impressive, become less compelling under scrutiny. For example, parallels in vocabulary like, δικαιοσύνην (Jas 1:20; 3:18 = Matt 3:15; 5:6, 10, 20; 6:1, 33; 21: 32) and τέλειοι (Jas 1:4 = Matt 5:48; 19:21), both represent ethical terms with considerable overlap with the LXX. James also lacks more distinctive Matthean vocabulary such as παλιγγενεσία (Matt 19:28) and συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος (Matt 24:3; 28:20). Additionally, James seems unaware of Matthew's attack on those who call themselves 'Rabbi' (*cf.* Jas 3:1 = Matt 23:9—17); she again relates the distinction between "the poor" in James and "the poor *in spirit*" in Matthew; and finally, the prohibition of oaths—which Ropes found to be the most compelling example of the relationship between the two compositions—is dismissed on the grounds that James lacks Matthew's direction of the attack as well as the theological rationale which justifies it.[63]

While Laws' reticence about letting speculation outstrip evidence should by no means be overlooked, it should be noted that her objections are not themselves beyond criticism. First, while the use of similar vocabulary is integral to recognizing such parallels, as Ropes has pointed

[62] S. Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 12-15.

[63] The attack on oaths in Matthew is aimed at "Jewish casuistry with oath formulae (Matt 5:34—36, *cf.* 23:16—22) and his theological rationale for the prohibition [is]…that man's oaths constitute an arrogant appeal to God's sphere where man has no control" (Ibid., 13-14).

out, it is the strong and sustained emphasis placed on certain words and concepts which lend credence to the texts' correlation with one another. Thus in establishing parallels, it is of less consequence that a word has strong representation in the LXX, than that it receives consistently similar treatment in the way in which it is rendered by two given authors.

Second, James' lack of expressions particular to Matthew in no way represents a compelling argument. The examples given, παλιγγενεσίᾳ[64] and συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος,[65] are both eschatological in nature and as it seems that James has little interest in developing strongly eschatological themes in the epistle, it is just as likely that he had no interest or occasion to use them, as it is that he was unfamiliar with them.

Third, the Hebraism "ῥαββί,"[66] never actually appears in James. Rather, the word used for a teacher in James is its synonym "διδάσκαλος." Laws is correct though that Matthew is quite careful to reserve the title of "Teacher" for Jesus. He makes this emphatic in Matt 23:8 when he says: Ὑμεῖς δὲ μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββί· εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος, πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοί ἐστε. [*But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have one teacher, and you are all *students*.*[67]]

---

[64] Παλιγγενεσία, ης, ἡ, 1. State of being renewed, w. focus on a cosmic experience, renewal—(a) after the Deluge (so Philo.*Mos*. 2, 65, but the idea of the Παλιγγενεσία of the κόσμος is gener. Stoic and originated w. the Pythagoreans…(b) of the renewing of the world in the time of the Messiah, an eschatol. sense (Schürer II 537f; Bousset, Rel. 280ff) ἐν τῇ παλ. in the new (Messianic) *age* or *world* **Matt 19:28**; Titus 3:5 (see BDAG), 752. See also unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, W. D. Mounce, *The Origin of the New Testament Metaphor of Rebirth*, University of Aberdeen, Scotland.

[65] Συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος, the *end of the* (present; αἰών 2a) *age* (*T.Benj*. 11:3; *T.Job* 4:6) Matt 13:39f, 49; 24:3; 28:20. See also *T.Levi* 10:2; Didy., Gen. 115, 19. Cp. in gnostic speculation (BDAG), 974-975.

[66] Ῥαββί (from רַב 'lord, master', רַבִּי 'my lord') properly a form of address and an honorary title for a distinguished teacher of the Law (see BDAG), 902.

[67] The NRSV here renders ἀδελφοί, as "Students," which attempts to tie the word to διδάσκαλος, by grounding the relationship in their mutual commitment to the teacher. I prefer, however, to render ἀδελφοί, as "brethren," which is both a more literal/conventional translation of the word and suggests a closer relationship between the actual parties by grounding the exhortation in the concrete reality of their commitments to one another, which is implied by their mutual commitments to Jesus the Teacher. Thus, they have real obligations to one another, not merely as parties under the same banner, but as brothers.

Nevertheless, the emphasis of v. 8a is couched within Matthew's larger polemic against the 'Teachers of the Law,' the Scribes and Pharisees (*cf*. 23:2—7, 13—17). [68] When taken in context, James' admonition in Jas 3:1: Μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου, εἰδότες ὅτι μεῖζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα, [*Not many of you should become teachers, my brothers and sisters, for you know that we who teach will be judged with greater strictness*.] hardly seems out of line with Matthew's concern over the pretence of the "blind-guides," who put themselves in the place of God and allow themselves to be called teacher.[69] While Matthew's language is characteristically more absolutist in tone, his underlying assumptions are not necessarily incongruous with the interests of the author of James. For example, the rational provided by Matthew for his opposition to the title 'Rabbi,' that "you have one Teacher, and you are all *brothers," finds similar expression in James' discourse against acts of favouritism (Jas 2: 1—7).

Fourth, while there is certainly a distinction in terminology between James' "the poor" and Matthew's "the poor *in spirit*," we do not know whether Matthew's addition is a reflection of authorial choice on his part or whether it is simply reflective of the tradition as he has received it. If it is a matter of authorial choice, as I believe it is, then Matthew's possible motives for such a choice need to be examined in more detail. The "spiritualization" of the passage need not present evidence of the lack of relationship between James and Matthew if, for example, it could

[68] For every occurrence of the word appearing in Matthew, Jesus is the referent. For example, Matt 10:24, when Jesus says, "A disciple is not above the teacher [διδάσκαλος], nor a slave above the master; it is enough for the disciple to be like the teacher, and the slave like the master" (NRSV).

[69] The emphasis of the warning in James is that those who teach are responsible for who and what they teach.

be demonstrated that Matthew's motives for alteration were in keeping with the general reasoning, focus, or theological-rhetorical function of the saying as presented in James.[70]

Finally, even if Laws is correct that Jas 5:12 lacks Matthew's direction and justification for a prohibition on oaths (Matt 5:34-37; 23:16—22), the relative novelty of an absolute prohibition against oath-taking warrants, at least *prima facie*, consideration that some relationship between these writings may exist.[71]

Summary

In light of this discussion we should be able to draw a few tentative conclusions regarding the relationship between James and the Gospel of Matthew. First, whatever its nature, some relationship between these two writings have historically been recognized by many, but not all, scholars. Second, this relationship rests on the perception that James and Matthew share some degree of material otherwise exclusive to themselves and/or develop shared sources in a fashion similar to one another. Third, the shared material in question corresponds to material largely recognized as Jesus *logia*.

From these tentative conclusions, we might speculate that James and Matthew, while almost certainly not dependent on one another, represent a particular stage of development within the Jesus tradition. If we seriously consider Ropes' conclusion that James' inexplicable

---

[70] The passage in Matthew, because it qualifies "the Poor," is characterized as possessing a subtext which consciously or unconsciously panders to those of means. For an alternative reading, see W. H. Wachob, *"The Rich in Faith" and "The Poor in Spirit": The Social Rhetorical Function of a Saying of Jesus in the Epistle of James* (doctoral dissertation, Atlanta: Emory University, 1993).

[71] Here Jesus seems to be in conflict with Exod 22:11; Num 5:19—22; 30:2; Deut 6:13; 10:20; 23:21—23; Ps 50:14, et al. For a discussion on the ancient practices of oath-taking, see S. Belkin, "Dissolution of Vows and the Problem of Anti-Social Oaths in the Gospels and Contemporary Jewish Literature," *JBL*, vol. 55, no. 3, (September, 1936), 227-234.

lack of reference to the *kerygma* and/or the *parousia* forbid the supposition that from the same circle and age could have come both writings, then Shepherd's speculation that James is post-Matthean and arose out of the same Antiochene Church becomes problematic. While *the Gospel of Thomas* demonstrates that a relatively late composition[72] can exist devoid of the developments of a kerygmatic formula, the impressive comparisons between James and Matthew would seem to suggest that some level of engagement with the same traditions is beyond justifiable dismissal. Thus, it may be the case that the Jesus *logia* in James represent an early stage of the development of the sayings tradition, which was later collated into "Q" in its Matthean recension (Q^M). Such speculations, however, must necessarily remain merely hypothetical.

[72] The general consensus on the dating of *the Gospel of Thomas* is a date approximate to 140 CE. See H. M. Ross, "Dating the Gospel of Thomas," in *Thirty Essays on the Gospel of Thomas*, 2nd ed. (Shaftbury: Evertype, 2008), 17-19. The difficulties, however, with determining a fixed date for *the Gospel of Thomas* are numerous. Plisch has pointed out that, as a sapiential sayings collection, the character of the material is rather timeless. It is possible that *Gos.Thom* § 68 alludes to the consequences of the Bar Kochba revolt, which would mean that, at least this section of the Gospel, could not have existed before 135 CE. It is possible that *the Gospel of Thomas* could contain material both representing periods before and after the synoptic tradition. For a more detailed discussion see, Uwe-Karsten Plisch, *The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary*, trans. G. S. Robinson (Stuggart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008), 9-36.

James and Q

3.1 Dean B. Deppe

In 1989, the first systematic examination of the parallels between James and the Synoptic tradition was undertaken by D. B. Deppe in his dissertation for the Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam. Deppe catalogued the parallels between James and the Synoptics suggested by sixty different authors, ranging in dates from 1833-1985. In the process, he tabulated one-hundred and eighty different parallels with each of the authors offering an average of fifteen-twenty suggested correlations. The sheer volume of parallels offered by Deppe is striking, especially when one considers that a similar examination of the relationship between the sayings tradition and the entire *corpus Paulinum* only resulted in ten-thirty parallels. This vast number may be misleading, however, because as Deppe has pointed out, there is very little consensus among these scholars regarding which passages actually constitute parallels. Two-thirds of the exegetes he lists only agree on six of the one-hundred and eighty suggested parallels, while three-fourths agree on only three.[73] He attempts to account for this level of disagreement by noting that many interpreters emphasize the closeness of substance and content, even where there are no reproductions of vocabulary. Deppe himself believes that James makes eight "conscious allusions"[74] to Jesus sayings with parallels in the Synoptics. They are as follows: Jas 1:5 = Matt 7:7/Luke 11:9; Jas

[73] The six most frequently cited passages are: (1) Jas 5:12 = Matt 5:33—37 [59 authors]; (2) Jas 1:22—25 = Matt 7:24—26/Luke 6:47—49 [49 authors]; (3) Jas 1:5 = Matt 7:7/Luke 11:9 [45 authors]; (4) Jas 2:5 = Matt 5:3/Luke 6:20 [43 authors]; (5) Jas 5:2 = Matt 6:19—20/Luke 12:33b [42 authors]; (6) Jas 2:13 = Matt 5:7/Luke 6:36 [40 authors]. For a full listing of parallels, see Appendix I, § 2, of Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, 231-250.

[74] Deppe defines a "citation" or "quotation" as "a reference to another source containing a *formula citandi* and/or nearly exact verbal affinity with the original text. An allusion or reminiscence, on the other hand, is here defined as a deliberate reference to another source without the use of an introductory formulation and only containing a degree of verbal affinity. A parallel (here posited as a third distinct category) contains similar terminology and/or content, but no certainty of dependence upon preexistent material can be established" (Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, 43).

4:2c—3 = Matt 7:7/Luke 11:9; Jas 2:5 = Matt 5:3/Luke 6:20b; Jas 5:2—3a = Matt 6:19—20/Luke 12:33b; Jas 4:9 = Luke 6:21, 25b; Jas 5:1 = Luke 6:24; Jas 5:12 = Matt 5:33—37; Jas 4:10 = Matt 23:12/Luke 14:11 and 18:14b.

In order to reach this conclusion, Deppe began his analysis by examining the way James appropriates passages from the OT, as a window into the way in which he might be expected to use other authoritative material, such as Jesus *logia*. His method for detecting preexistent material imbedded within the epistle began with identifying the presence of introductory formulations. He concludes there are six such *formulae citandi* in the Epistle of James (Jas 2:8 = Lev 19:18b LXX; Jas 2:11 = Exod 20:13/Deut 5:17 LXX; Jas 2:23 = Gen 15:6 LXX; Jas 4:5 = Gen 6:1—7?/Num 11:29?; Jas 4:6 Prov 3:34 LXX; Jas 1:10b—11 = Isa 40:6b—8 LXX), either introduced in the form of a word γραφή (2:8, 23; 4:5) or a verb of saying (ὁ εἰπών 2:11; εἶπεν καί 2:11; διὸ λέγει 4:6) with the implied subject being either God or Scripture. For example, the identification of James' use of Lev 19:18b LXX in Jas 2:8 begins with an introductory formula κατὰ τὴν γραφήν.

Jas 2:8	Lev 19:18b LXX	Lev 19:18 MT
Εἰ μέντοι νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικὸν κατὰ τὴν γραφήν· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε·	καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν· ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος.	וְאָהַבְתָּ לְרֵעֲךָ כָּמוֹךָ אֲנִי יְהוָה׃

This passage in Jas 2:8 is perhaps the clearest case of James' use of the OT. It is identifiable as such, not simply from its formula citation, but also its verbatim agreement with the LXX.[75]

Another less obvious introductory formula is the use of the recitative ὅτι and/or the explicative ὅτι (when used with verbs of mental perception, e.g. γνώσκω and οἶδα) may serve to indicate the use of preexistent sayings.[76] Deppe points to five such instances in James (1:3 γινώσκοντες ὅτι; 3:1 εἰδότες ὅτι; 4:4 οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι; 5:11 εἴδετε, ὅτι; 5:20 γινωσκέτω ὅτι). Outside of the detection of such formula citations Deppe is skeptical about the possibility of speaking confidently concerning allusions to preexistent material. Nevertheless, he does propose that it may be possible in some cases to detect parallels by other means. For example, the use of stitch-words (alliterations where traditional sayings have been applied in new contexts); the use of Μακάριοι, "blessed," as a preamble to a traditional wisdom saying may indicate use of preexistent material (e.g. Jas 1:12, 25; 5:11); additionally, the use of awkward grammatical constructions, vocabulary divergent from the main text, or the presence of terminology corresponding to well-known sources (such as the LXX) may all be indicators of the insertion of traditional material.

---

[75] Deppe concludes, however, that this quote alone does not offer enough information for us to make a determination as to whether James is quoting from memory or is following the LXX or MT. For a detailed treatment of James' use of Lev 19, see L. T. Johnson, "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James," in *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2004), 123-135.

[76] Ibid., 31-32. Ὅτι *Recitativum*, is used for direct discourse. It is a direct object clause which follows a verb of perception. In such instances the ὅτι should not be translated but should function as a quotations marker. See D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 454-455, 748. In a footnote, Deppe notes that εἰδότες ὅτι is the standard means by which Polyc.*Phil*. refers to Paul's letters: 1:3, 4:1; 5:1; 6:1; 11:2 (in Latin), and 9:2 with πεπεισμένους ὅτι (Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, 31). See also (BDAG, 731-732).

As already mentioned, Deppe rejects the claim of Shepherd that James was structured around *macarisms* drawn from Matthew's Gospel. According to Deppe, far from being the axis on which James pivots, the Jesus *logia* in James are rather "sprinkled randomly throughout the epistle." "To be sure, Jesus' sayings are important to the epistle, but they are always situated in the background, wedded to ecclesiastical teaching material or combined with traditional Jewish wisdom. They are never utilized to provide an authoritative source to ground Jesus' teaching as with the OT quotations."[77] Of the list of central sayings given by Shepherd, Deppe only recognizes Jas 2:5 as a legitimate reference to the Gospels. He notes further that this verse itself is closer to Luke's gospel than Matthew's and is couched within a section exclusive to Luke, the Woes (Luke 6:24-26).Through the course of his analysis, moreover, he denies that the relationship which is generally intimated between James and Matthew (or Luke for that matter) result from any form of literary dependence. Deppe ultimately concludes that there are no clear indicators that James knew either the completed Synoptic Gospels or the pre-Synoptic Q document. In order to bolster this conclusion, Deppe points to the fact that James never cites the sayings of Jesus in the same manner in which he references the OT (i.e. through introduction formula). He also distinguishes James' transmission of the Jesus tradition from the objective manner in which the Gospels employ Jesus *logia* through the use of narrative. Deppe maintains rather that James' use of the Jesus *logia* is more akin to James' "allusions" to the OT. That is, a reference to another source (in this case the Jesus tradition) without the use of introductory formulation and only a degree of verbal affinity. He believes that it is probable that the epistle originated with James of Jerusalem, and thereby represents an independent attestation to the sayings of Jesus apart from the Synoptic tradition. The apparent antagonism toward Jesus' ministry by his brothers during his lifetime (Mark 3:21, 31; John 7:5), however, would seem to

[77] Ibid., 151.

preclude the notion that James knew the material from hearing the preaching with his own ears. Deppe maintains therefore that the most equitable solution is the thesis that "the author was transmitting the paraenetic tradition of the church which included both specific sayings of Jesus as well as ethical themes extracted from Jesus' preaching." The Epistle of James therefore adapts the teaching of Jesus to new situations, serving as a type of "thematic raw material for the church's ethical paraenesis."[78]

3.2 Patrick J. Hartin

P. J. Hartin has devoted both his dissertation for the University of South Africa Pretoria as well as a subsequent monograph to exploring the relationship between James and the sayings traditions in Q. In contrast to Deppe, Hartin locates James within the developing Synoptic tradition as represented by Q. In the course of his examination, Hartin's investigations bifurcate to focus attention on two related spheres of compositional analysis. Following Ropes, part I of his investigation explores the relationship of James and Q to that of the wider tradition of wisdom literature. Part II of the examination focuses specifically on the relationship of James to the Jesus tradition vis-à-vis Q. In the process, Hartin attempts to situate James within the context of a developing wisdom tradition in early Christianity, whose locus was the sayings of Jesus. In particular, Hartin follows R. Bultmann and J. M. Robinson, in accepting the view that the *Gattung* of Q is analogous to the genre of 'the sayings of the wise.' [79] Thus, affinities with other wisdom literature can be seen to resonate in James and Q, because as Hartin says, "the aim of all wisdom literature…is to provide instruction for the art of living, or the mastery of life itself. The

[78] Ibid., 223.

[79] Hartin, *James and the 'Q' sayings of Jesus*, 55. See also R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1963), 69; and J. M. Robinson, "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q," *Zeit and Geschichte*, ed. E. Dinkier (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964), 77-96.

ethical teaching of the wisdom writings aims at the correct ordering of life so that one can live happily under the sovereignty of God."[80] He points to two characteristics which run "like golden thread" throughout the Jewish wisdom tradition, including James and Q.

The first principal theme is that practical dimensions are given to ethical demands (right actions issue in propitious results). This theme may appear in either wise sayings or admonitions to act in accordance with wisdom. The second recurrent theme within such literature, is that wisdom is approached reflectively (often even becoming personified).[81] Examples of admonitions and ethical sayings abound within Q and James (e.g. Q 6:31, 37—38, 40, 45; 10:2—3; Jas 1:2, 4—6, 19—27; 2:1, 13, 26; 3:1, 16, 18; 4:1, 7—10; 5:20, etc.).[82] While reflections on wisdom itself are not as prominent within James and Q, as are admonitions, Hartin does point to

[80] Ibid., 35. Hartin points to the affinities between James and Proverbs (Jas 4:6 = Prov 3:34; Jas 4:13-16 = Prov 27:1; Jas 1:19 = Prov 17:27), the Wisdom of Solomon (Jas 1:5 = Wis 9:6; Jas 4:14 = Wis 2:4; Jas 5:6 = Wis 2:10—20), as well as many of the themes of Sirach (Sir 1:1—10, 27; 10:7—18; 11:16; 15:11—20; 17; 19:6—12; 20:5—8, 18—20; 22:27; 28:13—26; 35[32]:7—9; and 27:11). The personifications of wisdom, found for example in "Dame Wisdom" in Prov 1—9, serves to instantiate an abstract ideal, like "Wisdom" or "the Good," into a concrete exemplar. Both themes given by Hartin, however, place emphasis on obedience vis-à-vis either the didactic element of wisdom admonitions or simply in reflection upon wisdom itself. That is, wisdom issues in right action, whether the emphasis placed is consequentialist (appealing to right action on the grounds of its good/bad result) or deontological (focusing axiomatically on right action as such).

[81] Ibid., 44. The genre of wisdom literature is broad and variegated. Nevertheless, it is possible to broaden Hartin's characterization into five facets of such literature which have been routinely identified as characteristic of the genre and recurrent within its many representatives. 1. Reflection upon lived experience (often of a mundane nature); 2. These mundane experiences have concrete ethical significance and issue in ethical outcomes; 3. Speech serves to discern and mitigate lived experience; 4. Wisdom reflection is an intellectual enterprise (it is not "common sense" but is rather studied reflective judgment about reality); 5. It is theological literature, in so far as God acts as guarantor of the enterprise of wisdom (i.e. that living wisely leads to a good end). For an explication of these points, see *A Theological Introduction to the Old Testament*, 2nd ed. Eds. B. C. Birch, W. Brueggemann, T. E. Fretheim, and D. L. Peterson (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005), 381-424. For ancient NE parallels consult, *Readings from the Ancient Near East: Primary Sources for Old Testament Study*, eds. B. T. Arnold and B. E. Beyer (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 175-191. It is not difficult to see from the list the affinities between the genre and the Epistle of James.

[82] Quotations from "Q," here follow, *The Critical Edition of Q*, which employs the scholarly convention of quoting Q by Lukan chapter and verse designations, except where determinations have been made that Matthean sequence should apply (see J. M. Robinson, et al., *The Critical Edition of Q*, lxxxix). Such determinations are necessarily tentative and largely subjective (for delimitation on the usefulness of reconstructing Q, see P. M. Head and P. J. Williams, "Q Review" *Tyndale Bulletin*, vol. 54, no. 1 (2003), 119-144).

(Matt 23:34—36 = Luke 11:49—51; Matt 23:37—39 = Luke 13:34—35; Matt 12:42 = Luke 11:31) as examples. Hartin notes that the Beatitudes are indicative of this relationship with wisdom, with the primary distinction between the representation of OT wisdom and its NT equivalent being the couching of the latter within an eschatological *Weltanschauung*.[83] Hartin postulates that the role that wisdom plays within the *Sitz im Leben* of the similar communities of Q and James was to provide direction to the lives of their respective members as they await the fulfillment of the eschaton.

In Part II of Hartin's monograph he lists 26 possible links between James and the Synoptics; 21 of which are drawn from the Sermon on the Mount/Plain.

James	Matthew	Luke	Source	Location in Q	Topic
1:2	5:11—12	6:22—23	Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Joy under persecution
1:4	5:48		M		Call to perfection
(a) 1:5 (b) 1:17 (c) 4:2—3	7:7 7:11 7:7—8	11:9 11:13 11:9—10	Q Q Q	Prayer (E)	Asking
1:6	21:21		Mark 11:23		Faith and doubting
(a) 1:22 (b) 1:23	7:24 7:26	6:46—47 6:49	Q Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Doers of the word Doers of the word
2:5	5:3, 5 (11:5)	6:20 (7:22)	Q Q	Sermon on Mount (B) John the Baptist (C)	Poor
2:8	22:39—40	10:27	Mark 12:28—34		Law of Love
2:10	5:18—19	16:17	Q	Parables (I)	Obligation to keep the whole law

[83] Interestingly, Hartin maintains that a distinct development has transpired in James and Q, whereas traditional wisdom saw one's actions issuing in benefits in the present world, Q and James have transposed those expectations into an eschatological hope of future reward. While this is perhaps the case with Q, as well as other compositions within the NT, the emphasis which Hartin places on the eschatological hope within James' admonitions to ethical behavior, however, does not seem to be sufficiently supported by the evidence. That is not to say that the expectation of future reward and punishment do not play a role in James, nevertheless, the relative emphasis placed on them within the epistle does not seem sufficiently disproportionate as to warrant Hartin's proposed contrast.

2:11	5:21—30		M		Do not kill or commit adultery
2:13	5:7	6:36	M Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Mercy
2:15—16	25:34—35	3:11	M L		Clothe the naked
3:12	7:16—18	6:43—44	Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Fruit of good works
3:18	5:9		M		Peace-makers
4:4	(a) 12:39 (b) 6:24	11:29 16:13	Q Q	Controversies (F) Parables (I)	Unfaithful creatures Serving two masters
4:8	5:8		M		Pure in heart
4:9	(5:4)	6:25 (6:21b)	L Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Mourn and weep
4:10	23:12	14:11; 18:14	(?) Q	Possibly Q	Humility and exaltation
4:11	7:1—2	6:37—38	Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Do not judge
5:1		6:24—25	L		weep
5:2--3	6:19—21	12:33—34	Q	On proper concern (H)	Treasure in heaven
5:6	(7:1)	6:37	Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Do not condemn
5:9	24:33		Mark 13:29		Judge at doors
5:10	5:11—12	6:23	Q	Sermon on Mount (B)	Suffering prophets
5:12	5:34—37		M		Oaths
5:17		4:25	L		Elijah example
5:19—20	18:15	17:3	Q	On the responsibilities of disciples (J)	Relation to sinful brother

Hartin endorses the view of R. Bauckam that the Q source "developed from blocks of material that were originally independent of one another. The Q Sermon [on the Mount/Plain], according to this argument, would have independent development as an entity or block of material in its own right before it formed part of the Q source itself."[84] What can be known concerning Q would seem to support this contention that, "Q is not to be viewed as static, but as undergoing further development within the communities where it had taken root, namely within the

[84] Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 147. See also R. Bauckham, "The Study of the Gospel Traditions," *Gospel Perspectives*, vol. 5: *The Jesus Traditions outside the Gospels*, ed. D. Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 378-379.

communities of Matthew and Luke, where it produced Q^M and Q^L."[85] This can be assumed through the relative freedom through which the authors of Matthew and Luke adapted the Q material to their own authorial purposes as well as through the intimations of Q felt in other works, such as James' epistle. If such a relationship is postulated, then the question becomes for Hartin, at what stage of development from oral tradition, collation, and redaction is James' use of Q to be located?

Through his investigation, Hartin notices how James seems to be more familiar with the form of a Q tradition developing within the Matthean community. Rejecting Shepherd, he follows general scholarly consensus that James was unfamiliar with the final redactions of Matthew or Luke's Gospels. He postulates rather that the Jesus *logia* in James represent a pre-gospel stage of development as the sayings were evolving within the Matthean context. Hartin, therefore, locates James somewhere between Q and the final redaction of Matthew. In support of this contention, he notes that James freely adapts the sayings material in Q to his own purposes and makes no distinction between his teachings and those of Jesus. The fact that James betrays an awareness of a pre-synoptic layer of Jesus' teachings suggests to Hartin that James is a perhaps among the earliest texts in the New Testament.

At the time of the writing of Hartin's monograph he seems to have been unaware of the work done by Deppe, as he neither cites him, nor does he critically engage his objections to the notion that James made use of a Matthean recension of Q. Though Hartin makes a single reference to Deppe in his more recent commentary on the epistle for the Sacra Pagina Series (2003), he still fails to address Deppe's criticisms. Nearly all of Deppe's arguments against

[85] Ibid., 49.

Shepherd, Gryglewicz,[86] and others[87] who maintained that a Matthean source lay behind James, disappear when one removes the idiosyncrasies of their respective arguments,[88] as well as their contention that James knew the Gospel of Matthew itself (either from a written copy or from hearing it read aloud in worship service). Nevertheless, there are two objections given by Deppe which remain especially relevant to a discussion of Hartin's modified form of the same argument: (1) James' parallels with Luke stand as visibly prominent as those of Matthew and (2) the wording of the prohibition against oaths in Jas 5:12 = Matt 5:34—37 is sufficiently dissimilar as to give different meanings to the two pericopes.[89] In the following section, I will attempt to address Deppe's objections, as well as draw into question his conclusion that James preserves an independent attestation of the Jesus tradition apart from the Synoptic tradition.

[86] F. Gryglewicz, "L'Épître de St. Jacques et l'Évangile de St. Matthieu," *RTK*, vol. 8, no. 3. (1961), 33-55.

[87] H. Riesenfeld. *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings* (London: Mowbray, 1961); C. C. J. Bunson, *Vollständiges Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde*, 8 vols. (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1866), 588; J. B. Adamson, *The Epistle of James*. NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1976), et al.

[88] By idiosyncrasies, I refer to elements of their argument which are themselves ancillary to the establishment of the central claim of a relationship between Matthew and James. For example, Deppe devotes considerable attention to dismissing Shepherd's insistence that perceived similarities in usage between James, Ignatius and the Didache place James within the Syrian Church.

[89] Deppe's second criticism here largely repeats the same points made by Sophie Laws (*cf.* Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, 136-149, and Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 233).

Testing the Hypothesis

4.1 Luke Timothy Johnson & Wesley Hiram Wachob

In 1999, L. T. Johnson and W. H. Wachob co-authored an article in which they tested the hypothesis that James made use of the Jesus tradition in the construction of his epistle.[90] Johnson and Wachob listed the 8 "conscious allusions," distilled by Deppe, along with pertinent parallels from the gnostic *Gospel of Thomas* to produce the following chart:

James	Q^M	Q^L	*Gos.Thom*
1:5	7:7	11:9	§92, §94
4:2c—3	7:7	11:9	§92, §94
2:5	5:3	6:20b	§54
4:9	5:4	6:21b	§69b
4:10	23:12	14:11	
5:2—3a	6:20	12:33b	§76b
5:12	5:34—37		
5:1		6:24—25	

Of the 8 conscious allusions drawn by Deppe, Johnson and Wachob limited their analysis to 4, namely, Jas 1:5; 2:5; 4:2c—3; 5:12, as well as two other allusions among the 25 most cited, Jas 2:8 and 2:13.

At the outset of their investigation, they cautioned that such an endeavor is rife with pitfalls, as James "appropriates cross-cultural traditions without explanation, apology, or explicit

[90] L. T. Johnson and W. H. Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 136-154. Originally published in, *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, ed. B. Chilton and C. A. Evans, *New Testament Tools and Studies* 28: I (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 431-450.

citation."[91] Nevertheless, following Deppe, they see James' verifiable allusions to the OT, in particular Lev 19, as the key to establishing the relationship between James and the sayings tradition. As they note, methodologically, "the clear and explicit citation of one passage legitimates the search for others and makes the detection of each incrementally more plausible."[92] Thus, this method accounts for the delimitation of their analysis to only 6 of the surest parallels between James and the sayings traditions of Jesus, because securing the establishment of the clearest parallels thereby provides warrant for the notion that others are present. Throughout their analysis of these passages they remain circumspect and even "deliberately minimalist" in their conclusions. In summation of their argument, they determine that there are 4 instances in which not simply an echo to a saying of Jesus appears, but a specific use of his words as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels. They contrast the strength of these parallels with Jas 2:8 and 2:13, which they reject on the grounds that they provide insufficient evidence so as to assert their derivation from Jesus *logia*. This is not to say that such a relationship does not exist, but simply that the evidence in its favor is too circumstantial to assure an adequate degree of certainty. They note that there is no intrinsic reason why the author of James could not have internalized the teachings of Jesus, to the point that he echoes him throughout the epistle, however, such echoes do not provide sufficient evidence to constitute clear parallels.

[91] Ibid., 136.

[92] Ibid.

4.2 The Case of James 2:5

> Jas 2:5: "Listen my beloved brothers, has God not chosen the poor of the world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom, which he promised to those who love him?"[93]

Jas 2:5 is one of the clearest examples of the relationship of the Epistle of James to the Synoptic tradition. Johnson and Wachob conclude that, "James 2:5 is one of James's most important parallels to a Jesus *logion*. From a rhetorical perspective, it appears that James has adapted a Jesus beatitude (Matt 5:3 = Luke 6:20b) and partially recited it for his own persuasive purposes."[94] In our examination of this passage we will begin with an overview of the context of v. 5 before narrowing in on the verse itself. The first verse of the James Ch. 2 introduces the two principal concerns addressed in this portion of the letter: favoritism (developed in 2:1-13) and faith (2:14-26). These apparently disparate topics are tied together by the author through the conviction that if the Lord does not show partiality, then favoritism should be anathema to those who claim the faith of Jesus Christ. To this end, the author of James utilizes a series of what have been described by Dibelius and others as diatribe-like segments extending from Ch. 2—4.[95] These "diatribal" sections are characterized by an opening rhetorical question or prohibition (*cf.* 2:1; 2:14; 3:1; 3:12a; 3:13; 4:1; 4:11) and a closing aphorism, encapsulating the author's main

---

[93] [My own translation]

[94] Besides James 2:5, there are four other performances of the saying in question. These are Matt 5:3; Luke 6:20b; *Gos.Thom* §54; and Polyc.*Phil*. 2:3. All five performances share two key terms: "the poor" and "the kingdom." Moreover, all five performances exploit the common terms to produce sentences that feature one common denominator—"God's kingdom is promised to the poor" (Johnson and Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 146-147).

[95] Dibelius, *James*, 124.

point (*cf*. 2:13; 2:26; 3:12b; 3:18; 4:10; 4:12). For our purposes we will here be focusing on Part 1 (2:1—13)[96] of James' "First Discourse" (2:1—26), with particular emphasis on v. 5.

Part 1 of James' First Discourse (2:1—13)

James 2:1 begins with an apotreptic[97] appeal to act in a manner consonant with "genuine faith" (i.e. the faith of Christ[98]). This section of James consists of an impassioned argument against showing partiality in the assembly. The author contends that such acts of favoritism constitute both a denial of the faith of Christ (2:1) and a clear contravention of the "royal law" (2:8). Further to the point, those who act without such mercy in judgment should not expect to receive mercy themselves (2:13; *cf*. Matt 5:7; Luke 6:36). On this account, Christians should be expected to exhibit the Lord's character, as God's children begotten through the word (1:18). Therefore, if the Lord demonstrates no partiality to those of a higher economic/social status, neither then should his children (*cf*. Deut. 1:16—17; 10:17; Lev 19:15). Here James addresses a problem (alluded to in Jas 1:9—10), namely, that wealth itself can become a barrier to the practice of genuine faith. James, therefore, stands firmly within the tradition of both the Hebrew

[96]Although pointing to the diatribe-like nature of these sermonic portions of James, Dibelius admits that James itself is not properly a diatribe, but rather possesses elements which resemble many common features of the genre (such as apostrophes, rhetorical questions, and examples). Indeed, 2:1-13 might be said to be the *least* diatribal *Abhandlund* ("treatise") within the unit (Dibelius, 39-50). For more on the nature of James' rhetoric, see (Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*).

[97] Rhetorical device, designed to dissuade.

[98] Though the majority of translators would render the phrase in 2:1 as an objective genitive, both Wachob and Johnson render the phrase as a subjective genitive, pointing to the "theocentric" nature of the letter as being incongruent with interpreting the phrase as "faith *in* Christ." According to this interpretation, James' audience is being "admonished to hold (ἔχειν) a faith that in quality is like the faith-obedience of Jesus Christ" (Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, 65; Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 220). This may be more appropriate given James' definition of genuine faith as that faith grounded in acts of obedience (e.g. 1:21, 25, 27; 2:14, 17, 22, 26; 4:12a; 5:19-20).

Scripture [99] and Jesus [100] in his contention that God shows a special concern for the poor; for it is they who will be heirs of the kingdom (2:5). Thus, by delineating the terms of what instantiates "genuine faith," the author sets the stage for his attack on the hypocrisy of "dead faith" which James famously develops in 2:14—26.

Section 1: Faith and Favoritism (2:1—7)

Chapter 2 follows the prohibition in v. 1 with a hypothetical scenario[101] and a series of rhetorical questions. The directive given in 2:1 is a general prohibition which his audience would have, no doubt, found difficult to confute.[102] Thus, this imperative becomes the basis of the author's remonstrance of his audience and the call to alter their behavior. Here the author continues with the theme of behavioural consistency introduced in the former chapter by moving to demonstrate the incompatibility of holding the faith of Jesus Christ together with προσωπολημψία, "acts of *partiality/favouritism.*"[103]

---

[99] E.g., Exod 22:21—26; Prov 18:23; 19:17; 22:9, 16, 22, 27; 28:3, 6, 8, 11, 15, 20; Job 29:12—16; 31:14—28; Isa 1:17; 10:1—4; Zech 7:10; Amos 4:1; 5:11; 8:6; Jer 2:34; Ezek 18:17; etc.

[100] E.g., Mark 10:21; 12:41—44; Matt 11:5; 19:21—24; Luke 4:18; 6:20—21; 11:41; 14:12—13; 21:1—3; 16:19—31; etc.

[101] The conclusion that this scenario is hypothetical rather than actual stems from its general or encyclical nature. If James is in fact a letter addressed to a specific community, it betrays none of the typical characteristics which we might expect of such a letter, including a more specific salutation, some indication of the purpose for writing (*i.e*. community circumstances; *cf.* 1 Cor 5), valediction, etc. Indeed, the flagrant example of partiality—no doubt meant to shock the sensibilities—fits better within a hypothetical framework, than as a report of an actual instance.

[102] This is the case, because the author does not present this conviction as a thesis to be defended but as a truism to be recognized and enacted. The deficiency of the audience, therefore, does not lie in their cognitive acquisition of the principal, but rather in their failure to act in accordance with its implications.

[103] *Cf.* Rom 2:11; Eph 6:9; Col. 3:25; Polyc. *Phil*. 6:1; *T.Job* 43:13. Προσωπολημψίαις is a compound formed from the LXX translation of the Hebrew idiom, נָשָׂא פָּנִים, which rendered literally means, 'receive the face.' Among its meanings within the HB, the phrase came to denote, "Respect of persons," which could possess a positive/indifferent connotation or a negative connotation, as in improper partiality. Προσωπολημψίαις, as well as its

In this hypothetical scenario in vv. 2:2—3, members of the assembly show προσωπολημψία towards ἀνὴρ χρυσοδακτύλιος ἐν ἐσθῆτι λαμπρᾷ, "a man with gold rings, [dressed] in splendid apparel," while showing disrespect to πτωχὸς ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι, "[a] poor [man dressed] in filthy rags."[104] James presents the two visitors occasioning the gathering in starkly different terms. The former is extravagantly bedecked with the exterior trappings of worldly success, while the latter appears destitute in filthy/soiled rags. The adjective χρυσοδακτύλιος, more than merely signifying affluence, may be an indicator of aristocratic rank.[105] In which case, social convention would customarily dictate preferential treatment. Thus, James is not merely appealing to common courtesy in his entreaties for equality, but may be rather calling for a fundamental break with the traditional civic order. Additionally, it is interesting that the adjective λαμπρᾷ, meaning "radiating light," or "glistening,"[106] used to describe the rich man's clothing, is the same word used to describe the robes of angels in Acts 10:30 and Rev 15:6. This description juxtaposed to the πτωχὸς ἐν ῥυπαρᾷ ἐσθῆτι could not be more abrupt. Πτωχὸς, usually indicates one living in extreme poverty, a beggar.[107] The imagery

---

closely related cognates προσωπολημπτέω and προσωπολήμπτης, have so far only been found amongst Christian writers, thus it would appear to be a part of early uniquely Christian nomenclature (*cf.* Jas 2:9; Acts 10:34; 1 Pet 1:17; 1 Clem 1:3; *Barn*. 4:12). James' warnings against contempt for the poor also carries over a theme common in the HB and the Deuterocanonical writings (*cf.* Lev 19:15; Prov 22:22; Mal 2:9; Sir. 10:23, etc.). These texts additionally demonstrate the incompatibility of partiality with God (*cf.* Job 34:19, Sir. 35:13, etc.).

[104] [My own translation]

[105] Laws has pointed out that the gold ring was part of the insignia of the equestrian order, the second rank of Roman aristocracy. Equestrians were customarily wealthy because there was a property qualification for the acquisition of the rank and they oftentimes were recipients of civil offices such as procurator. Such persons would have been covetable patrons for a minority group such as the Christians, who might be seeking legitimization and recognition (Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 98). This of course is speculative, because the text itself offers no additional implication as to the rich man's specific rank or social standing, be it equestrian or otherwise.

[106] *Cf.* Luke 23:11; Acts 10:30; Rev 19:8 (*cf.* Jos.*A.J.* 8,72); Od. 19, 234; Polyb. 10, 4, 8; 10, 5, 1; Philo.*Ios.* 105 A; (Jos.*Vita* 334; *T.Sol* 10:28 C; *Jos.As.* 14:15).

[107] E.g. 16:20, 22; 2 Cor 6:10; Aristot., *Rhet.* 27 in contrast to πλουτεῖν.

occasioned by the proximity of the word ῥυπαρᾷ, meaning, "vile," "defiled," to ἐσθῆτι, "clothing," is to provide a picture of one clad in befouled rags;[108] in this case, contrasted to a man dressed in shimmering robes.

The rich man is shown to a seat of honor, while the poor man is relegated to a seat on the floor. James then asks contemptuously, οὐ διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐγένεσθε κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν; [Have you not made a distinction amongst yourselves and become judges with evil designs?][109] James' use of διεκρίθητε, the second person aor. act. indicative form of διακρίνω ("to differentiate" "pass judgment," "render a decision"), depicts his audience as unscrupulous judges passing unjust judgment on the poor. James deftly employs this imagery in v.6 when he reminds his audience that it is the rich who exploit them and drag them into "court" (κριτήρια, from the word κρίνω, "to judge," "to prefer").[110] Here James creates a contrast in which he identifies the victims of such treatment—namely, the poor—as "heirs of the kingdom," while identifying the perpetrators with the exploitative rich. Thus, he makes it clear that to show favor to the rich—and thereby pass judgment on the poor—is to exclude one's self from the kingdom.

The Jesus Logion (v. 5)

[108] See BDAG, 908.

[109] [My own translation]

[110] Ibid., 567-568.

As has been demonstrated, the content of v. 5 plays a pivotal function in the construction of James' argument in this first discourse.

James 2:5	Q^{M} 5:3	Q^{L} 6:20b	*Gos.Thom* § 54
Ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί· οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς □τῷ κόσμῳ□ πλουσίους ἐν πίστει καὶ κληρονόμους τῆς □βασιλείας ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν;	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.	pEJE•=I=C JE h=N•MAKARIOc NE N•hYKE JE tw•t=N TE t•M=NTERO•N•=M•PYUE`[111]

Though Deppe includes Jas 2:5 among his list of James' conscious allusions to a Jesus *logion*, he points out that there are some initial difficulties with the assumption that this is a dominical saying. First, James makes no indication that he is relating a saying of Jesus (*cf.* 1 Cor 7:10). Second, the words do not exactly parallel any known Jesus *logion*. For example, James does not use the Μακάριοι preamble of Q^{M}, Q^{L}, *Gos.Thom*, or Polyc.*Phil* 2:3, despite the fact that such an introductory formula is not unfamiliar to James (*cf.* Jas 1:12, 25; 5:11). Other differences between the passage in James and its parallel occurances is that all of the aforementioned parallels are enthymemes.[112] James also inserts the additional contrast of those who are poor before the world as being those who are rich in faith. Moreover, God the Father is the subject of

[111] The Coptic text of the *Gospel of Thomas* is preserved in 4th century manuscript CG II. The Greek text of § 54 of the *Thomas*, assuming it existed, has not been preserved among the Oxyrhynchus papyri fragments, which only include: P. Oxy. 1 = fragments of *logia* 26 through 33, with the last two sentences of *logion* 77; P. Oxy. 654= fragments of the beginning through logion 7, *logion* 24 and *logion* 36; P. Oxy. 655= fragments of *logia* 36 through 39.

[112] "Enthymemes [are] rhetorical syllogisms: each consists of a conclusion (a *macarism*) and a premise (a ὅτι clause), with, as is typical of enthymemes, one premise unstated and tacitly assumed" (Johnson and Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 147).

the sentence rather than Jesus. Finally, Deppe points to the fact that the election of the poor was a commonly held conviction during this period of Judaism. Note that James makes appeal to his audience's perceived familiarity with the conviction, "has God not chosen the poor of the world…?" He even notes that "Spitta is so convinced by the similarities with Jewish thought that he confidently asserts that if one could somehow show Jas 2:5 to be dependent upon a *logion* of Jesus, then one could legitimately be convinced that James throughout his epistle alludes to Jesus' saying."[113]

Deppe does not attempt to address all of these difficulties, but does note that despite its affinities with commonly held convictions of Jewish antiquity, there are no references in the OT, deutercanonical writings, nor instances in the Talmud which say that God is going to give his kingdom to the poor. It is unlikely therefore that James is merely relying on an instance of Jewish piety or making use of a non-Christian tradition. Likewise, Johnson and Wachob conclude that this reason alone would be sufficient to demonstrate a relationship to Jesus. To make the point clearer, however, they further adduce that this is the only instance in James where the term "kingdom" (βασιλεία) occurs. The term, which as they point, is so distinctive to Jesus's language, here "appears in a statement about God that is marked by, subsumed under, and intimately connected to Jesus' own faith (Jas 2:1)."[114] Here they recall the previous work of Wachob in advancing the idea that "Jas 2:5 achieves its rhetorical meaning and function by recalling Jesus' own faith as the measure for the elect community's faith."[115] Thus, Jas 2:5 is not,

---

[113] Spitta, *Zur Geschichte*, II: 164, quoted in Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, 90. See also Meyer, *Rätsel*, 85.

[114] Johnson and Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 148.

[115] Ibid. See also Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* and his earlier, *"The Rich in Faith" and "The Poor in Spirit"*.

as Deppe curiously concludes, simply an "afterthought" appended to the text, but is rather a central element in the rhetorical presentation of James' first discourse (2:1—13).[116] This is because 2:5 enforces and refines (*expolitio*) the theme of the preceeding argument.[117]

Johnson and Wachob utilize the work done by H. Koester[118] and J. S. Kloppenborg Verbin[119] on Q in order to further examine this intertextual relationship between the performances of these sayings in James and its parallels in the Synoptic tradition. In 1987, J. S. Kloppenborg Verbin had proposed that Q 6:20b—49 is the first and most prominent in a series of speeches addressed to the Q community "in support of their radical mode of existence."[120] These blocks of speeches in Q 6:20b—49; 9:57—62 + 10:2—16, 21—24; 11:2—4, 9—13; 12:2—12; 12:22—34; 13:24—30 are significant because they are in most instances untouched or only marginally influenced by the themes which predominate the rest of Q.[121] Additionally, he concludes that of these sapiential instructions, only 6:23c betrays any characteristics of a secondary level of redaction. From an analysis of these sapiential speeches, Kloppenborg Verbin

---

[116] The structural importance of v. 5 to James' argument in chapter 2 is more than sufficient to undercut Deppe's general characterization of James' use of Jesus *logia* as merely, "sprinkled randomly throughout the epistle…[and] always situated in the background."

[117] Here Wachob references *rhet. Her*. 4.42.54 and 4.43.56 (Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, 85).

[118] H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* [London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 73-75.

[119] J. S. Kloppenborg (Verbin), *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, SAC (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987).

[120] Ibid., 171.

[121] Kloppenborg Verbin lists these controlling motifs as, the coming of the Son of Man, judgment of the impenitent, conflict and polemic against outsiders, the rejection of the preaching of the kingdom and corresponding reliance on a deuteronomistic understanding of history to rationalize this failure, a subsequent negative view of Israel and a correlatively optimistic view of Gentiles. By contrast, the characteristic motif which underlies the speeches directed to the Q community demonstrates a "high religious and symbolic value on poverty" (Ibid., 171, 240-241).

thereby postulates that they represent an early stage in the development of Q and also that a complex compositional-history lay behind many of these clusters of *logia*.[122] Corresponding to this insight is the hypothesis of Koester that a cluster of sayings belonging to Q, although not Q itself, appear to have been known and used by Paul, the author of 1 Clement, perhaps even the *Gospel of Thomas*.[123] Johnson and Wachob, note that "this is significant because Polyc.*Phil*. 2:3 also suggests an intertextual relation to 1 Clem. 13:2 (and probably also to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke). If these scholarly hypotheses regarding the development of the Jesus tradition are correct, then the Jesus logion alluded to in Jas 2:5 is an early, widely known and exploited saying of Jesus."[124]

As already noted, a recurrent objection to establishing a relationship between James and the Gospel of Matthew is the manner in which Matthew is thought to "spiritualize" Q 620b (Matt 5:1-3 = Luke 6:20b).

Q 6:20b	Matt 5:3	Luke 6:20b

[122] Ibid., 238-245.

[123] Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 137.

[124] Johnson and Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 149.

[] λεγ[< >]· μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί (), ὅτι ([ὑμετέρα]) ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τ[οῦ θεοῦ].	[] λεγ[ων]· **5:3** Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ (τῷ πνεύματι), ὅτι (αὐτῶν) ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τ(ῶν οὐρανῶν).	[ἔ] λεγ[εν]· Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί (), ὅτι [ὑμετέρα] ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τ[οῦ θεοῦ].

Wachob, however, has demonstrated through intertextual research that the different parallels to Jas 2:5: Q^M 5:3, Q^L 6:20b, *Gos.Thom* § 54, and Polyc.*Phil*. 2:3 each reflect distinct perspectives. In the process of his analysis he separated Jas 2:5 and Q^M 5:3 as distinct from the other respective passages.[125] While every one of the parallels to Jesus' words recall the Jewish conception of the piety of the poor, James and Matthew alone among the parallels offer the kingdom as incentive, or reward, for those whose actions conform to the royal law (2:8). "Though in different ways, both sayings address the 'Poor of God,' that is, those who in their actions love God by observing God's law. In neither…are the socially and economically impoverished, promised the kingdom *on the basis of their situation* (as they are in Q^L 6:20b and *Gos.Thom* § 54)."[126] This in no way suggests that the conditions of socio-economic inequality are of any less concern to James and Matthew than to Luke or the author of *Thomas* (see Matt 25:40 and Jas 1:10; 5:1-6). They have, however, clarified that God's kingdom belongs to the poor, not as a compensation for economic hardship, but that they might be rich in faith (for which the kingdom is the just reward). In summation, Johnson and Wachob note that "in their respective contexts, "the poor of spirit" (Q^M 5:3) and the "rich in faith" (Jas 2:5) designate people (not of an ascribed status but) of an achieved status."

[125] Wachob, *"The Rich in Faith" and "The Poor in Spirit"*, 326-327; Johnson and Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 149.

[126] Ibid., 326. [Italics mine].

4.3 The Case of James 5:12

> Jas 5:12: "Above all, my beloved, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or by any other oath, but let your "Yes" be yes and you "No" be no, so that you may not fall under condemnation."

In his analysis of the text of v. 12, Dibelius rather unsurprisingly concludes that the verse "has no relationship with what precedes [it] or what follows [it]."[127] Nevertheless, his conclusion, at least in this instance,[128] seems indicative of the problem that most commentators have in grounding this particular saying within the context in which James locates it. Johnson notes that most commentators treat the verse as if it is an isolated saying, with little connection to the sections which bracket it. Unlike Dibelius, however, Johnson holds the minority position that 5:12 actually represents the transition to the final section of the letter (as opposed to being either a "bridge-verse" or simply an isolated saying).[129] Laws articulates this view in her commentary by noting that "such an isolation of the prohibition is unnecessary, since its substance harmonizes well with what follows it: there are wrong, and right, ways of addressing or calling upon God."[130] Further, it is difficult to image that the prohibition against oaths acts as the

---

[127] Dibelius, *James*, 248.

[128] Unlike in other verses where he makes similar statements, but for less clear reasons (see for example his treatment of 2:13 and its relationship to the treatise which proceeds it) [Ibid., 147-148].

[129] See Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 326. Other representatives of this view include S. Laws and R. P. Martin (see S. Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 218-224, and R. P. Martin, "The Life-Setting of the Epistle of James in Light of Jewish History," *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of W. S. LaSor*, ed. G. A. Tuttle [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977].

[130] Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 220.

summation of Part 1 (5:7—11) of James' fourth discourse (5:7—20).[131] This is because Part 1 deals with faith and patience. It would thus seem odd to introduce a different theme at the close of the section, especially as its apparent climax (note the use of πρὸ πάντων).

This view possesses an intuitively desirable conclusion. Otherwise, we might wonder about the phrase's isolated placement within the letter if, in fact, it had no particular relationship to what comes before or after it. Certainly, it would be reasonable to conclude that, at least in the mind of its author, the phrase did not stand as an isolated maxim marooned betwixt two structured discourses. Rather, given the structural consistency of James' other discourses, it seems likely that it must have served some purpose in furthering the argument. Accordingly, Johnson concludes that the argument which is furthered concerns positive modes of speech within the community.[132]

Part 2 of James' Fourth Discourse (5:12—20)

James' final discourse is largely an exhortation to the community concerning the efficacy of prayer and the importance of mutual intercession. D. G. McCartney organizes James' "Fourth Discourse" (5:7—20) under the rubric of "looking to God," manifested through endurance in the face of testing and faithful prayer. Part 1 of the discourse (vv. 7—11) is focused on faith and patience, while Part 2 (vv. 12—20) is concerned with faith and prayer.[133] James is concerned

[131] While not developed here, it is interesting to note that Deppe characterizes the final discourse (5:7—20) as a primitive church order roughly parallel with the order in the *Didache* (7—16) [Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, 131-149.

[132] Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 326.

[133] It should be noted that McCartney does not include v. 12 in Part 2, but views the verse as an isolated bridge-verse connecting the two sections of the fourth discourse. Likewise, he maintains that vv. 19—20 constitute a closing exhortation to mutual responsibility and blessing and are thus separated from the final discourse. This separation, however, is somewhat arbitrary since this section has no clear valediction. Thus the final two verses

throughout the epistle with the manner in which faith qua faith is cashed out in terms of an appropriate disposition towards God, issuing in right speech and right action. It is important to see however that the locus of this disposition concerns the faithful community, thus the modes of speech intimated by James are those of the community, not simply those of the individual.

Following the imperative in v. 12, the discourse moves to a general exhortation to pray in all circumstances (5:13) and then to the specific examples of prayers for the sick (5:14—15a), for the forgiveness of sin (5:15b), as well as prayers of intercession and confession (5:16). The author of James then provides the prophet Elijah as an exemplar, who being an ordinary man, performed mighty acts through earnest prayer (5:17—18). Finally, the concluding exhortation closes the fourth discourse and the letter as a whole. It is concerned primarily with the efficacy of intercession, mutual responsibility, and the interconnectedness of all believers (5:19—20).[134]

Jas 5:13—14, is structured with three paratactic units each consisting of two clauses in a rhetorical asyndeton.[135] In 5:14, James says, ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, προσκαλεσάσθω τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἀλείψαντες [αὐτὸν] ἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου. [Are any among you sick? They should call for the elders of the church and have them pray over them, anointing them with oil in the name of the Lord.] Oil (ἔλαιον) was a ubiquitous element within all facets of ancient life, including the medicinal and the religious. The

---

could just as easily be included as the summation of the final discourse—as I have chosen to do—(*cf.* to the abrupt ending of 1 John).

[134] D. G. McCartney, *James*, in the *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament Series*, ed. R. W. Yarbrough and R. H. Stein (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009), 264.

[135] P. H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 191; D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 658; H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York: American Book Co., 1920), 484-486.

anointing of the sick was thus a relatively common practice in the antiquity (cf. Mark 6:13).[136] Nevertheless, Dibelius maintained that in this passage, "the healing is not effected by the oil as a medicine, but by the oil applied along with prayer and the pronouncing of the name." Indeed he goes further and characterizes the whole practice as "an exorcism," whose purpose was the absolution of sins rather than the actual healing of a sick person.[137] While a connection between sickness, sin, and salvation appears to be evident in vv. 15—16, it is not at all clear that actual healing is not in view or that the ritual was a form of exorcism as Dibelius claims. It is possible that Dibelius drew the former conclusion from the use of anointing the sick in the Last Rites, [138] where preparation for death, not necessarily healing, is the principal motive for the action.[139] Such an assessment if true, however, would seem largely anachronistic and ultimately unhelpful when considering the text itself.[140] It is important to note, however, that the use of Jas 5:14—15 as a justification for the anointing of the sick in the sacrament of extreme unction (*unctio*

---

[136] See Celsus *De Medicina* 2.14.4; Sen.*Ep*. 53.5; Pliny.*Nat*. 15.4; 23.39; Philo.*Somn*. 2.58; Jos.*A.J*. 17.172; *J.W*. 1.657. See Isa 1:6 and Luke 10:34. For an examination of the different uses of oil in the ancient world see H. A. Hoffner, Jr., "Oil in Hittite Texts," *The Biblical Archaeologist*, vol. 58, no. 2, *Anatolian Archaeologist: A Tribute to Peter Neve* (June, 1995), 108-114.

[137] Dibelius, *James*, 252.

[138] The Last Rites include the final Eucharist (viaticum), Reconciliation (Penance/Confession), and the Anointing of the Sick (extreme unction).

[139] "By the sacred anointing of the sick and the prayer of the priests the whole Church commends those who are ill to the suffering and glorified Lord, that he may raise them up and save them. And indeed she exhorts them to contribute to the good of the People of God by freely uniting themselves to the Passion and death of Christ" ("Article 5: Anointing of the Sick," 1499, *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1994).

[140] Dibelius here seems to be drawing on Mark 6:13, in which exorcism occurs in the same sentence as anointing and healing, but the syntax of the sentence would suggest that these events should be decoupled and not seen as interchangeable occurrences (Ibid). Following M. Albl, Hartin contends that one may deduce that James believed demonic forces are responsible for sin and sickness, which would seem to lend credence to Dibelius' treatment of the text. In order to justify this claim Hartin points to James' dualism between friendship with the world and friendship with God (4:4) as providing evidence for the inference. While, I do not discount the possibility that James held such views, it is important to remember that James never directly discusses the etiology of sickness. Thus, if exorcism is in view, then the text is irresolute in providing definitive corroboration of it (see M. C. Albl, "'Are Any Among You Sick?' The Health Care System in the Letter of James," *JBL* 121 (2002) 123-143; and Hartin, *James*, 277).

extrema)[141] has played a pivotal role in the interpretation of James' Epistle throughout its history, particularly, since the Reformation. For Luther especially, the rejection of the Catholic sacramental system as the vehicle for the impartation of grace had significant implications vis-à-vis his perception of James (the principal proof-text for the practice of unction).[142]

As already mentioned, Jas 5:17—18 parallels Luke 4:25 in relaying a tradition concerning the prophet Elijah. In which, the prophet is said to have prayed a drought upon Israel which lasted three and a half years. By the first century, many stories and traditions concerning Elijah had developed from the accounts of his life and ministry in 1 Kgs 17:1—2 Kgs 2:12. In the canon there are references to the prophet in 2 Chr 21:12—19; Mal 3:1—4, 4:5; Sir 48:1—12; 2 Macc 2:58; Luke 1:16—17; John 1:21, et al. Additionally, there are numerous references to him later in the Mishnah and Talmud, as well as in Kabbalistic and Pseudepigraphic literature.[143] Given the number of such references, it is reasonable therefore to postulate that James and Luke may have both been familiar with a tradition concerning Elijah, otherwise unknown to us.

---

[141] Extreme Unction is one of the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church. The practice of anointing the sick and praying for their recovery was a practice carried from the early church into the medieval period, where it underwent fundamental changes (see Venerable Bede's commentary on James, *In Epistulas VII catholicas libros singulos*). Changes to the practice occurred during the Carolingian period and the Gregorian reforms, whereby it became associated with the rite of viaticum. The later formalization of the practice coincided with formative developments in sacramental theology largely in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (see J. R. Ginther, "Extreme Unction," in *The Westminster Handbook to Medieval Theology* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009], 64). These developments can be seen principally in the works of Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, Peter Lombard, Odo of Lucca, Albert Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Hugh of St. Victor, et al. Until Vatican II the church pronounced, under papal authority, *anathema sit* on anyone who denied the sacramental nature of the practice. This pronouncement issued at the Council of Trent (1551) was directed primarily at Luther, Calvin, and Melanchton (see § on the Doctrine on the Sacrament of Extreme Unction (1551), J. Neuner, S. J. and J. Dupuis, S.J., "Reconciliation and the Anointing of the Sick," in *The Christian Faith: In the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*, ed. Jacques Dupuis (New York: St. Pauls/Alba House, 2001) 653-703).

[142] Luther, *Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude,* 36. Erasmus also, rejected the notion that justification for the practice could be made through appeals to James (see D. Erasmus, *Annotationes in Epistolam Jacobi* (1516) in *Opera Omnia* 6 [Leiden: Vanden, 1705], 1025-1038; see also Dibelius, *James*, 254).

[143] see *Apoc.El*.; *y.Šeb*. iii., end; *Yalḳuṭ Reubeni, Bereshit*, 9a; *Tg.Yer*. on Num. xxv; *b.Sanh*. 113a; *y.Sanh*. X; *Aggadat Bereshit*, lxxvi, et al.

The closing verses of the epistle (Jas 5:19—20), reiterate the themes of God's mercy, mutual responsibility, and walking in the truth of the Gospel. The vocative, "My brothers," (ἀδελφοί μου) which James elsewhere employs to introduce new sections, begins v. 19. The phrase's use here probably accounts for its usual bracketing by commentators as a separate section apart from the final discourse. While the phrase indicates the final turn of the section, it does not appear to be a true valediction, neither is the material sufficiently dissimilar from what precedes it, so as to warrant bracketing it off as its own separate section.

As Johnson points out, "the misuse of speech has been a constant theme running through this composition" (see 1:19, 26; 2:3, 7; 3:1—12; 4:4, 11, 13; 5:9).[144] But, whereas, James 3 discusses the tongues' power to destroy, here in the close of the letter the constructive power of speech is brought forth in its fullest display through the restoring of a brother or sister who has gone astray. The corporate character of the message in James is expressed in the community's concern for the sinner and their responsibility to restore them to the truth (*cf.* Matt 18:10—20). The verb ἐπιστρέφω, *to turn, to cause a person to change belief or conduct*, which James uses twice in vv. 19—20, is commonly used to translate the Hebrew word שׁוּב, *to turn, return, repent*, which can also mean, *to be transformed, to be made healthy again, to be restored*.[145] The truth from which the sinner has strayed should not be seen merely as doctrinal in nature, but as reflective rather of one's life before God and the community. In this regard ἀλήθεια, "*truth*," is reminiscent of אֱמֶת, "*truth, reliability, dependability, trustworthiness, faithfulness, and constancy*,"[146] which semantically has connotations of practical import. Therefore, it is not

[144] Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 340.

[145] BDAG, 382. D. J. A., *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009) 450-452.

[146] Clines, *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, 26.

simply a matter of doctrinal accuracy but, of an applied righteousness. Thus, insofar as speech is an extension of the self, James' appeals to truthfulness, mutual correctness, mutual responsibility, and faithful prayer are all components of his polemic against "double-mindedness" (Jas 1:8) and his commendation of "true and undefiled religion" (Jas 1:27).[147] Seen in this light, James' prohibition against oaths seems appropriate in context. It stands as an appeal to "plain speech in the community of faith," with the conviction towards "simplicity and truthfulness" in one's life in the community and one's relationship with God.[148]

The Jesus Logion (v. 12)

Quite apart from its usual characterization as an isolated saying, it has been demonstrated that v. 12 constitutes an important dimension within James' final discourse.

James 5:12	
Πρὸ πάντων δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ ὀμνύετε μήτε τὸν οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μήτε ἄλλον τινὰ ὅρκον· ἤτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν πέσητε.	Above all, my beloved, do not swear, either by heaven or by earth or by any other oath, but let your "Yes" be yes and you "No" be no, so that you may not fall under condemnation.

[147] Søren Kierkegaard develops this theme at length in his "Purity of Heart is to Will One Thing" (see S. Kierkegaard, *Upbuilding Discourses in Various Spirits*, ed. and trans. H. V. Hong and E. H. Hong [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993], 3-154).

[148] See Johnson, *The Letter of James*, 340-346.

Q^M 5:34-37	
34 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὅτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ, 35 μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὅτι ὑποπόδιόν ἐστιν τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ, μήτε εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, ὅτι πόλις ἐστὶν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως, 36 μήτε ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ σου ὀμόσῃς, ὅτι οὐ δύνασαι μίαν τρίχα λευκὴν ποιῆσαι ἢ μέλαιναν. 37 ἔστω δὲ ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ· τὸ δὲ περισσὸν τούτων ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἐστιν.	34 But I say to you, Do not swear at all, either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, 35or by the earth, for it is his footstool, or by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. 36And do not swear by your head, for you cannot make one hair white or black. 37 Let your word be 'Yes, Yes' or 'No, No'; anything more than this comes from the evil one.

As already mentioned, Ropes concluded in his commentary that Jas 5:12 was the most compelling of the suggested parallels between a Jesus *logion* and James' epistle. Ropes is joined by fifty-nine of the sixty commentators listed by Deppe in affirming 5:12's relationship to a saying of Jesus. This particular parallel is so compelling because, as Johnson and Wachob have noted, besides James and Jesus there are no other Jewish sources in the OT or the NT which categorically prohibit the use of oaths.[149] Though there was frequent condemnation of the casualness with which people made such oaths, the practice itself was very common in antiquity and generally viewed as acceptable.[150]

[149] Johnson and Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 137.

[150] Ibid. Gen 22:16; Exod 13:5; 22:10—11; Num 14:16; Luke 1:73; Rom 1:9; Phil 1:8, etc. For criticism of casual oath-making see Lev 5:4; Num 30:3; Deut 23:22; Sir 23:9—11; Philo, *Decalogue* 84-95; *m.Nedarim*; *m.Šebu*. 4:1; Epictetus, *Enchridion* 33.5; Diogenes Lærtius 8.2; Iamblichus, *Vita Pythagorae* 47. According to Iamblichus, the Pythagoreans prohibited the use of oaths. One sect of the Essenes prohibited oaths, despite the fact that they had to swear an oath upon entrance into the community (Jos.*J.W.* 2.8.6 § 137; 2.8.7-8 § 139-143; Jos.*A.J.* 15.10.4 § 370-372, etc.). See also Dibelius, *James*, 248.

By an oath, it is meant "an appeal to God as a witness on some disputed matter" (Philo, *Sacra.* 91).[151] Thus, by swearing an oath, one is calling upon God to be witness or guarantor of one's fidelity to the matter sworn. The risk of profanation implicit in such an oath, however, led some to propose alternative oath formulas which did not mention God directly but are rather linked to him indirectly (e.g. through aspects of God's creation standing in as proxy).[152] Jesus in Matthew, however, rejects even such alternative formulas. Matthew lists four such oath formulas which he follows with a ὅτι clause indicating the reason for the rejection of the oath as being impermissible.[153]

The force of the prohibition in Matthew, as well as in James, is that the necessity for a person to make an oath at all is indicative that their word is otherwise untrustworthy. If the word of such a person cannot be trusted apart from appeals to God, then that person is already exhibitive of behavior in discord with the kingdom. A simple "Yes" or "No" should be all that is required in order to assure the other agreeing party that you will fulfill your word. Thus, oaths

---

[151] F. H. Colson, *Philo* (10 vol. and 2 suppl. vols; LCL; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1929—1953), quoted in M. Vahrenhorst, "The Presence and Absence of a Prohibition of Oath in James, Matthew, and the Didache and Its Significance for Contextualization." in H. van de Sandt and J. K. Zangenberg, *Matthew, James, and Didache*, 361-377.

[152] Vahrenhorst notes that "not every formula can be an oath." In order for an oath to be valid "God must by definition be involved" in some way. Appeals to proxies on God's behalf involve God insofar as he stands behind the created order (Vahrenhorst, *The Presence and Absence of a Prohibition Oath*, 366.

[153] Deppe notes that some commentators have suggested that Matthew is not actually rejecting oaths but is rather himself offering a surrogate oath formula (ναὶ ναί, οὒ οὔ) in lieu of certain prohibited oaths. The strongest support for this notion comes from parallels with Jewish literature. 2 Enoch (Slavonic Enoch) says, "I swear to you, my children, but I swear not by any oath, neither by heaven nor by earth, nor by any other creature which God created. The Lord said: 'There is no oath in me, nor injustice, but truth.' If there is no truth in men, let them swear by the words "yea, yea" or else "nay, nay." Additionally, in the Rabbinic tractate *b. Shebuoth*, R. Eleazar concludes that an oath has been made if someone said, "'No! No!' twice; or he said 'Yes! Yes!' twice" (Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*, 136-137). According to Philo's definition, such a formula would not technically be an oath, precisely because it makes no appeal to an external guarantor directly or indirectly. Further, Deppe notes that there are compelling reasons not to take 2 Enoch as supporting an alternative oath formula (Ibid., 140). Indeed, a much more likely explanation is that the doubling ναὶ and οὒ in Matt 5:37 is simply a Semitism indicating distribution (i.e. "in each instance") which also adds emphasis to the reiterated word or phrase, similar to the rendering of a Hebrew superlative.

add nothing to the truthfulness or intent of a promise, but merely open the parties up to the additional charge of profaning the name of God. While appeals to truthfulness in promises are certainly not incongruous with traditional Jewish notions of ethical conduct, the novelty of an absolute prohibition suggests that James and Matthew are both preserving a *verbum Christi*. Thus, the criterion of dissimilarity, as well as the saying's early recognition as originating with the words of Jesus, is sufficient to establish with all probability that Jas 5:12, in fact, preserves a Jesus *logion*.[154]

Now that we have demonstrated the likely connection to Jesus, it is necessary to examine the link between Jas 5:12 and its parallel in Matt 5:33—37. The clearest connection to Matthew's gospel is the absence of any parallel to the saying in either Mark or Luke. Hartin notes that from the absence of the saying in Luke we may infer that the *logion* was not part of the original Q tradition.[155] Additionally, Dibelius concludes that the saying appears to have been current in at least two forms. The simpler form of the saying in James, in which, "a single prohibition is reduced to a precept, and this is reinforced with a threat" should be considered the earlier of the two forms.[156] The expanded version in Matthew is more reflective and seems to anticipate attempts to evade the prohibition through the use of a substitute formula. Hartin points out that it is unnecessary to argue for a direct linear connection between these verses. The connection can be accounted for through envisaging the relationship as part of the ongoing conversation within

[154] In addition to its parallel's attribution to Jesus in Matthew there are also early ascriptions of the words to Jesus in Justin Martyr (*Apol*., 1.16.5), Clement of Alexandria (*Strom*., 5.99.1), The Pseudo-Clementine Homilies (19.2.4; 3.55.1), and Epiphanius (*Haer*., 19.6.2) [see Dibelius, *James*, 250].

[155] Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 190.

[156] Dibelius, *James*, 251. Johnson and Wachob note that "although we cannot always argue that the briefer version is the more original, the specific elements of Matthew's longer version support the conclusion that his redactional interests are at work and that the form of Jas 5:12b may be closer to Jesus' original saying" (Johnson and Wachob, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James*, 142).

the Matthean community and its engagement with the Q tradition. He says that, "James shows an earlier knowledge of the saying as it is being handed on within the Matthean community, while Matthew's form demonstrates how it has been further developed or expressed by the Matthean community and the evangelist himself when it was inserted in the context of the Sermon on the Mount." [157] Thus, Laws' criticism that James 5:12 lacks the direction of Matthew's polemic against oath-taking, namely "Jewish casuistry with oath formula," does not represent a compelling argument against the establishment of a relationship between the two documents. The fact that Matthew couches the saying within the larger interests of the Sermon on the Mount, merely points to the fact that the authors employ the *logion* to different ends. In her commentary, Laws also says that, "their wording of the positive ruling is sufficiently dissimilar as to give a different meaning to the whole."[158] Following Laws, Deppe articulates this same position as evidence for the distinctiveness of these verses. While he does not in principal discount the possibility of James' relationship with the Q tradition, based on his assessment of the apparent dissimilarities between Jas 5:12 and Matt 5:33—37, he does conclude that James could not have been aware of Q^M.

The principal dissimilarity to which Laws refers is the presence or absence of the direct article τό in the construction of the *logion*. James has an articular construction: τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ, whereas Matthew's is anarthrous: ναὶ ναὶ, οὒ οὔ. Laws maintains that "this slight difference in fact alters the content of the two alternatives. James counsels truth-telling, speaking in such a way that 'yes' should mean yes and 'no,' no, and thus no oath should be necessary;

[157] Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, 190-191.

[158] Laws, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 13.

Matthew advocates plain speech, simple 'yes, yes' or 'no, no' without elaboration of oaths."[159] Nevertheless, even if this were the case, it is difficult to see how plain speech is categorically different from truthful speech or why such a distinction should militate against the conclusion that Matthew and James reference the same tradition for this particular *logion*.

Conclusion

The words of Jesus permeate the Epistle of James. The letter's author, whether James the brother of the Lord or some other early Christian, was someone for whom Jesus' words seem to have been both resonant and palpable. The informal manner with which the author employs these dominical sayings, however, can often create immense difficulty for anyone who wishes to nail down where exactly Jesus' voice is to be heard in the epistle. Nevertheless, there are clear instances where the voice of Jesus reverberates through the pages of James' letter. Among those clear instances are my two test cases: Jas 2:5 and Jas 5:12. In both instances, shared vocabulary, theme, and purpose point overwhelmingly to a relationship with the Jesus tradition as preserved within the Synoptics. It has been suggested by Deppe that James preserves an independent attestation of the words of Jesus apart from the Synoptic tradition, but it is difficult to find adequate justification from the evidence to warrant that claim. While, it is recognized by most scholars that James does not know the final redactions of any of the gospels, his engagement with the Q material at a formative stage of development does seem likely. Additionally, the strength of the parallels to Matthew's Gospel in James 5:12 in particular offer evidence of the possible context for James' engagement with the Jesus sayings material in Q.

[159] Ibid., 223.

Through the course of this paper I have attempted to demonstrate the degree to which the author of James engages, interprets, and relates certain Jesus *logia* within his epistle. The thesis which I have endeavored to establish is that James reflects a pre-gospel stage of development within the sayings tradition of Jesus, reminiscent of the form found in the Q source (particularly its Matthean recension). I have maintained throughout this discussion that the Epistle of James stands as an early witness to the Synoptic Tradition as it developed within the primitive church and more specifically the Matthean community. Viewed in this way, the Epistle of James offers us a valuable insight into our understanding of the Synoptic Tradition and the myriad ways in which the words of Jesus continued to be remembered, preserved, absorbed and proclaimed among the faithful community of believers.

Bibliography

Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.

Aland, Kurt, Barbara Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, . *The Greek New Testament.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; United Bible Societies, 2008.

Batten, Alicia J. *What Are They Saying About the Letter of James?* New York: Paulist Press, 2009.

Bauer, Walter, W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, and F.W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* 3rd. Edited by Frederick William Danker. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings; A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. 2nd edition. London: Williams & Norgate (Republished in 1 vol. by Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.), 1873-1875.

Belkin, Samuel. "Dissolution of Vows and the Problem of Anti-Social Oaths in the Gospels and Contemporary Jewish Literature," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 55, no. 3, (September, 1936), 227-234.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1963.

Clines, David J. A. *The Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.

Danker, Frederick William. *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Davids, Peter H. *The New International Greek Testament Commentary: The Epistle of James.* Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1982.

Deppe, Dean B. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James* (Dissertation; Amsterdam). Chelsea, MI: Bookcrafters, 1989.

Dibelius, Martin. *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James.* 11th edition. Edited by H. Koester. Translated by M.A. Williams. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Elliger, Karl and Wilhelm Rudolph. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

Fleddermann, H.T. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, in Biblical Tools and Studies Series, vol. 1. Edited by B. Doyle, G. Van Belle, J. Verheyden and K.U. Lueven. Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2005.

Harner, Philip B. *What Are They Saying About the Catholic Epistles?* New York: Paulist Press, 2004.

Hartin, Patrick J. *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus.* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

—. *Sacra Pagina Series: James.* Edited by Daniel J. Harrington, S. J. vol. 14. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.

Jacobson, Arland D. "The Literary Unity of Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 101, no. 3 (1982), 365-389.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. "A Survey of the History of Interpretation of James: Studies in the Letter of James." in *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004, 39-44.

—. "The Social World of James: Literary Analysis and Historical Reconstruction." in *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004, 101-122.

—. *The Anchor Bible: The Letter of James, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. vol. 37A. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

—. *The Real Jesus: The Misguided Quest for the Historical Jesus and the Truth of the Traditional Gospels.* San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996.

—. "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James." in *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

—. *The Writings of the New Testament.* 3rd. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.

Johnson, Luke Timothy, and Wesely Wachob. "The Sayings of Jesus in the Letter of James." in *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James*, by Luke Timothy Johnson. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 2004, 136-154.

Kenny, Anthony. *A New History of Western Philosophy: The Rise of Modern Philosophy.* vol. III. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* 10 vols. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.

Kloppenborg (Verbin), John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

—. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

—. "James 1:2—15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy." *Novum Testamentum*, no. 52 (2010), 37-71.

Laws, Sophie. *A Commentary on the Epistle of James.* San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers, 1980.

—. "The Letter of James." *In The HarperCollins Study Bible, Revised and Updated*. Revised by Walter T. Wilson, Edited by Wayne A Meeks, et al. (San Fransisco: HarperSanFransisco, 1989), 2052-2053.

Levine, Amy-Jill. "Who's Catering this Q Affair? Feminist Observations of Q Paraenesis." *Semeia*, no. 50 (1990), 145-161.

Lindberg, Carter. *The European Reformations.* 2nd edition. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell Publishing, 2010.

Luther, Martin. "Preface to the New Testament (1522)," In *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings,* edited John Dillenberger (New York: Anchor Books, 1962), 18-19.

—. "Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude," In *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings,* edited John Dillenberger (New York: Anchor Books, 1962), 36.

McCartney, Dan G. *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament: James.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.

McKnight, Scot. *The New International Commentary on the New Testament: The Letter of James.* Edited by Gordon D. Fee. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2011.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft United Bible Societies, 1971.

Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration.* 4th edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Mounce, William D. *The Analytical Lexicon to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993.

Nestle, Eberhard, and Kurt Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* 27th edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Perrin, Norman. *What is Redaction Criticism?* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Plisch, Uwe-Karsten. *The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary*, translated by G. S. Robinson. Stuggart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008.

Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta,* revised and amended by Robert Hanhart (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, . *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas.* Lueven: Peeters, 2000.

Ropes, James Hardy. *The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and NewTestaments: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James.* Edited by Francis Brown and Alfred Plummer. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1916.

Shepherd, Jr., Massey H. "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* vol. 75, no. 1 (March 1956), 40-51.

Van de Sandt, Huub and Jürgen K. Zangenberg, *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in their Jewish and Christian Setting*. no. 45 in the SBL Symposium Series. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

Wachob, Wesley Hiram. *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James.* Cambridge University Press, 2000.

—. *"The Rich in Faith" and the "The Poor in Spirit": The Social Rhetorical Function of a Saying of Jesus in the Epistle of James* (doctoral dissertation, Atlanta: Emory University, 1993).

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 1996.

Zerwick, S.J., Max, and Mary Grosvenor. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament, Unabridged.* 3rd edition. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1988.