The Eschatological Framework of the Epistle of James

By

Todd Charles Penner

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Religion
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) August, 1993

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

.FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read a Master's thesis

entitled: The Eschatological Framework of the Epistle of James

....

....

submitted by ......Todd Charles Penner......................

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
             Master of Arts
....

The Thesis Examining Committee certifies that the thesis

(and the oral examination, if required) is:

Approved   ☑   Not Approved   ☐

Larry W. Hurtado
Advisor

Egil Grislis

John S. Kloppenborg
John S. Kloppenborg
External Examiner (St. Michael's College)

External Examiner

Date ......August 6, 1993......   ....

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

BY

TODD CHARLES PENNER

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

© 1993

Abstract

The nature and character of the Epistle of James, as well as its place in the development of early Christianity, have been matters of some debate in past New Testament scholarship. This thesis attempts to place some of these issues in a new perspective through an analysis of the framework of James with a view to understanding the epistle as a whole.

The first chapter of the thesis deals with four areas which, in the past, have affected the dating and interpretation of the letter. Attention is given to the language of James, to its supposed anti-Paulinism, to the issue over the placing of the epistle on Hellenistic vs. Palestinian soil, and to the problem regarding the combination of wisdom and eschatological motifs in the letter. The conclusions are that the for too long the character, nature, and date of the epistle have been decided upon a priori grounds, and that the common designation of James as a Hellenistic wisdom document must be re-examined.

The second chapter seeks to uncover the character of James. Through an analysis of the opening and closing to the main body of the epistle, it is determined that an eschatological inclusio provides the horizon for the community instruction of the main body. The epistle as a whole is then viewed as a community instruction manual which is has its

instructional material placed within the framework of eschatological denouncements of the wicked and warnings to the community of impending end-time judgment which is soon to fall upon the world.

The third and concluding chapter places the results of chapter two in the larger context of early Christianity and Judaism. It is determined that the Epistle of James has many points of commonality in both content and structure with the Community Rule (1QS) from Qumran and the Q source from early Christianity. These works appear to form an identifiable genre of literature (in form, content and function) in which community instruction is placed within an eschatological framework around which cluster the themes of impending judgment, eschatological reversal and prophetic denunciation.

Preface

I would like to thank the following for making this thesis possible: Dr. Larry W. Hurtado, my advisor, who spent much time encouraging and reading the work, providing helpful criticisms, and putting up with overextension after overextension; Drs. Rory Egan and John S. Kloppenborg, for taking time in the midst of their busy schedules to read the thesis and to provide helpful comments which have improved this work; my parents, Charles and Pauline Penner, who have been behind me in all my academic pursuits; Mr. Cameron McKenzie, for his help in technical matters great and small; and my wife, Jacqueline Mae Klassen, to whom this work is dedicated and without whose encouragement this thesis never would have gotten off the ground, never mind completed. All translations of original texts are my own unless otherwise noted. All abbreviations are standard scholarly designations usually following Journal of Biblical Literature guidelines.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introductory Issues in Jamesian Interpretation

I. Introduction: James in the Context of Early Christianity

The aim of this thesis is to examine the framework of
the letter of James, particularly focusing on the opening and
closing of the work, in order to set James more fully in the
context of early Christianity. It is my contention that the
opening and closing sections of James evince very clear es-
chatological concerns which control the way the whole book
must be read, and that this reading of James places the work
as a whole in the context of early Jewish and Christian
ethical teaching, particularly "community manuals" such as
1QS, Didache, and Q in which ethical instruction is undergir-
ded and entrenched by eschatological content.[1]

---

[1] Chapter three will deal with this relationship in a little
more detail. For the present suffice it so say that in
Jewish apocalyptic writings and early Christian texts es-
chatology is often used to undergird and enforce the ethical
content. C. Münchow's comments regarding James are apropos:
"Die Eschatologie des Jak. dient vor allem der Begründung der
Ethik. Sie ist nicht für sich Ziel der Darlegungen, sondern
stets der Paräranese untergeordnet" (Ethik und Eschatologie:
Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik
[Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981], p.172). It is
questionable, however, whether Münchow's implied distinction
between eschatology in James and in the apocalyptic writings
can be made. Also, "subordinated to" is probably not as
accurate as "undergirds" ("grounding" does not necessarily
lead to "subordination" as Münchow suggests). There is good
evidence to maintain that eschatology in James frames the
ethics in a coordinating manner. Concerning the relation
between eschatology and ethics in both early Jewish and
Christian texts, Klaus Baltzer, in his study of the covenant
formulary, has shown the way in which eschatology was used to

This study of James was originally given impetus by Richard Bauckham's book <u>Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church.</u>[2] Bauckham's success in tracing the outlines of the earliest Jewish Christian missionary propaganda in Palestine from Jude and the genealogy in Luke is still open to question, but it does emphasize how little is known about the early Christian movement, and how critical it has become to attempt some form of overall reconstruction. While we have numerous Christian documents of the first century (e.g., Acts, letters of Paul, canonical Gospels, Gospel of Thomas[3]), it is often both difficult to outline the relation-

---

ground ethics. See <u>The Covenant Formulary in the Old Testament, Jewish, and Early Christian Writings</u>, trans. David E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), esp. pp.97-180. However, as in the case of Münchow, he fails to elucidate the relationship fully and to show how intricately the two are connected.

[2] (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990).

[3] The dating of the Gospel of Thomas is a matter of some debate. A second century date has traditionally been assumed, but this has been challenged in recent times. An early first century date (50-70 C.E.) for the Gospel of Thomas is accepted by S. L. Davies, <u>The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom</u> (New York: Seabury Press, 1983), pp.16-17. In a recent article by Davies, "The Christology and Protology of the Gospel of Thomas" (<u>JBL</u> 111/4, 1992), he summarizes much of the recent literature regarding the date of Thomas and its relation to the canonical gospels (p.663, n.1). The latter issue is important regarding the date of Thomas particularly since the later the gospel's origin lies the less likely it is that it is independent of the canonical gospels. Thus, the issue of dependence/independence has as one of its focuses the dating of Thomas (the other key focus would be the value of Thomas as an independent witness to Christian origins). On the independence of Thomas see John Sieber, "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament," in

ship of the existing documents to each other, and to trace direct lines from these which would give us a clear and coherent picture of earliest Christianity. Thus, F. Gerald Downing, in his methodological study of early Christianity, has suggested that not only is there a legitimate "quest" for the historical Jesus, but that there is a "prima facie case for a quest for the historical church(es)."[4] Part of the problem is that the Book of Acts, the only first-century narrative of the development of Christianity, is open to legitimate skepticism regarding the extent to which it provides a clear and accurate picture of early Christianity.[5]

Gospel Origins and Christian Beginnings, eds. James E. Goehring et al. (Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1990), pp.65-70. In the recent treatment of the historical Jesus by J. D. Crossan, The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1991), one can see the often circular interplay at work in the discussions on independence and the early dating of the Gospel of Thomas. For more on the traditional understanding of the relation of the Gospel of Thomas to the Synoptic Gospels (i.e., dependence to a large degree, but also some independence) see R. Mcl. Wilson, Studies in the Gospel of Thomas (London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1969), pp.45-88; and H. E. W. Turner, "The Gospel of Thomas: Its History, Transmission and Sources," in Thomas and the Evangelists, SBT 35 (Naperville: Alec. R. Allenson, 1962), pp.11-39.

[4] The Church and Jesus: A Study in History, Philosophy and Theology, SBT 10 (London: SCM Press, 1968), p.23.

[5] The debate about the genre of Acts is pertinent here. Martin Hengel, Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); and Colin J. Hemer, The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History, ed. Conrad H. Gempf (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990 rpr.) are representative of those who maintain that Acts should be viewed as an historical source. R. I. Pervo has recently challenged this model of understanding Acts by com-

This naturally has left modern scholarship with many gaps in its knowledge, and thus scholars have attempted to reach the roots of early Christianity via alternative means.[6]

---

paring Acts to Greco-Roman novels (Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987]). Pervo's study has important implications for understanding Acts as an historical source, particularly in the emphasis that, contra Hemer, historical veracity in certain general aspects does not necessarily imply historical accuracy of other, less verifiable, details. For further discussion of this see David E. Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), pp.77-157; F. F. Bruce, "The Acts of the Apostles: Historical Record or Theological Reconstruction," ANRW 2.25/3, pp.2569-2603; R. I. Pervo, "Must Luke and Acts Belong to the Same Genre?," SBLSP (1989):309-316; James M. Dawsey, "Characteristics of Folk-Epic in Acts," SBLSP (1989):317-325; Gregory E. Sterling, "Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography," SBLSP (1989):326-342; David L. Balch, "Comments on the Genre and a Political theme of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Comparison of Two Hellenistic Historians," SBLSP (1989):343-361; and Susan M. Praeder, "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel," SBLSP (1981):269-292.

The attempt to use Acts as an historical source is also frustrated by the problem of sorting out Lucan theology from Lucan tradition. For recent discussion of Lucan theology see P. F. Esler, Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology, SNTSMS 57 (Cambridge University Press, 1987); and for a general, yet thorough summary of recent study, see François Bovon, Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-1983), trans. Ken McKinney (Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1987). G. Luedemann, in his study Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary, trans. John Bowden (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), set out to separate Lucan tradition from redactional elements in a systematic manner, but his admirable attempt is ultimately unconvincing, and demonstrates just how difficult it is to recover Lucan tradition. Also see his "Acts of the Apostles as a Historical Source," in The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism, eds. J. Neusner, P. Borgen, E. S. Frerichs, & R. A. Horsley (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp.109-125.

[6] A similar problem exists with the letters of Paul. In

Ever since the English translation of Walter Bauer's
Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity[7] in the early
1970's, there has been an acute awareness of the problems
surrounding the origins of Christianity. While the book is
ultimately unsuccessful in its specific reconstruction of
early Christianity,[8] it gave impetus to the attempt of recon-
structing early Christian history using alternative models
and sources.[9] In this way it was influential for the trend-

---

theory these would be invaluable for understanding early
Christian history, and to a great extent they do shed light
on many aspects of early Christian development. However,
there are enough details missing from the picture to make one
cautious about utilizing the letters in full confidence.
Even E. Larsson, who is generally optimistic about the use of
the Pauline corpus in reconstructing early Christian history,
suggests that due to the fact that the letters are often
polemical, apologetic, and occasional, one should use "cri-
tical vigilance" in their use of the Pauline historical de-
tails ("Die paulinischen Schriften als Quellen zur Geschichte
des Urchristentums," _ST_ 37 [1983]:50).

[7] Eds. Robert A. Kraft & Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1971).

[8] See the excellent critique of Bauer's thesis by T. A.
Robinson, _The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy
in the Early Church_ (Lewiston/Queenston: Edwin Mellen Press,
1988).

[9] The comments by H. Koester concerning contemporary
research in the light of Bauer are indicative here: "...a
thorough and extensive reevaluation of early Christian his-
tory is called for...the task is not limited to a fresh
reading of the known sources and a close scrutiny of the new
texts in order to redefine their appropriate place within the
conventional picture of early Christian history. Rather, it
is the conventional picture itself that is called into ques-
tion" ("Gnomai Diaphoroi: The Origin and Nature of Diver-
sification in the History of Early Christianity," rpr. in
Trajectories through Early Christianity [Philadelphia: For-
tress Press, 1971], p.114).

setting work, <u>Trajectories Through Early Christianity</u>, by J.
M. Robinson and H. Koester. This now classic collection of
articles was at the forefront of modern Q research, as well
as one of the first to suggest the importance of the Gospel
of Thomas for reconstructing early Christian origins. The
book's attempt to carry on Bauer's program of the re-
evaluation of early Christianity set the tone for a genera-
tion of scholarship, which is evidenced by the plethora of
recent studies on the Q document,[10] the "Q community,"[11] other

[10]   The recent work on Q is immense. For a summary of past
research, and for a treatment which has achieved enormous
influence, see John S. Kloppenborg, <u>The Formation of Q:</u>
<u>Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collection</u> (Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1987). For a challenge to the position ad-
vocated by Kloppenborg see Richard A. Horsley, "Questions
about Redactional Strata and the Social Relations Reflected
in Q," <u>SBLSP</u> (1989):186-203; and "Logoi Propheton?: Reflec-
tions on the Genre of Q," in <u>The Future of Early Chris-</u>
<u>tianity</u>, ed. Birger A. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress Press,
1991), pp.195-209. Also see the discussion by M. Sato, <u>Q</u>
<u>und Prophetie</u>, WUNT 2.29 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988).
Most of this research noted here is now documented in the
most recent study of Q by Arland Jacobson, <u>The First Gospel:</u>
<u>An Introduction to Q</u>, (Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1992),
pp.19-60.
[11]   For the most recent treatments of the Sitz im Leben of Q
(the "Q community") see John S. Kloppenborg, "Literary Con-
vention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q
People," <u>Semeia</u> 55 (1991):77-102; and R. A. Horsley, "Q and
Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses," <u>Semeia</u> 55
(1991):175-209. For treatments which reflect more tradi-
tional views see Ivan Havener, <u>Q: The Sayings of Jesus</u> (Col-
legeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990), pp.91-104; as well as
the older studies by P. D. Meyer, "The Community of Q," (Ph.
D. diss., The University of Iowa, 1967); and G. Theissen,
<u>Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity</u> (Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1978). Also see G. Theissen's most recent
discussion in <u>The Gospels in Context</u>, trans. L. M. Maloney

purported early sources,[12] and Jewish Christianity.[13]   These

---

(Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp.203-34.

[12]   One example is J. D. Crossan's attempt to show that the
Gospel of Peter contains a pre-canonical passion narrative
which the present canonical Gospels have utilized. See his
The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative
(San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988). His basic suggestions
appear to be unfounded, however. On this see the careful
studies by S. E. Schaeffer, "The Gospel of Peter, the Cano-
nical Gospels, and Oral Tradition" (Ph. D. diss., Union Theo-
logical Seminary [New York], 1991); and "The Guard at the
Tomb (Gos. Pet. 8:28-11:49 and Matt 27:62-66; 28:2-4, 11-16):
A Case of Intertextuality?," SBLSP (1991):499-507. Schaeffer
argues that the Gospel of Peter is orally dependent on the
canonical Gospels. Also see the study by Jay C. Treat, "The
Two Manuscript Witnesses to the Gospel of Peter," SBLSP
(1990):391-399, which fundamentally undercuts Crossan's basis
for his dating of the Gospel of Peter.
    In a similar vein scholars such as Ron Cameron have
suggested that the Gospel of Thomas offers unique insight
into the origins of Christianity, and that its material is
independent, in part, of the Synoptic Gospels. See his "The
Gospel of Thomas and Christian Origins," in The Future of
Early Christianity, ed. B. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress
Press, 1991), pp.381-392.

[13]   The literature on this subject is immense. Most of the
works deal with the Jewish-Christianity of the second-fourth
centuries C.E.. The most balanced studies in this area are
R. A. Pritz, Nazarene Jewish Christianity (Leiden: E. J.
Brill, 1988); and R. E. Van Voorst, The Ascents of James:
History and Theology of a Jewish-Christian Community, SBLDS
112 (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1989). Two large questions
revolve around the continuity of later Jewish-Christianity
with that evidenced in the New Testament (Pritz argues for
continuity; J. Munck, "Primitive Jewish Christianity and
later Jewish Christianity: Continuation or Rupture?," in
Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme [Presses Universitaires de
France, 1965], pp. 77-93, argues against continuity) and the
precise definition of the term "Jewish-Christianity" (R. E.
Brown's short study, "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile
Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity," CBQ
45 [1983]:74-79, is still helpful as a model for understan-
ding the diversity in the use of the category "Jewish Chris-
tianity"). For a summary of much of the research on these
and related questions see G. Luedemann's Opposition to Paul
in Jewish Christianity (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989),
pp.1-32. His own definition of Jewish-Christianity as con-
sisting of "law-observing Jewish Christians" (p.30) is less
than adequate however.

studies attest to the fact that efforts are being made to bridge the historical gap that exists between the accounts contained in the Gospels and Acts, written thirty to seventy years after Jesus, and the early Christian movement.[14]

This thesis has consciously been placed within the renewed interest in the reconstruction of Christian origins outlined above. It is my belief that James has much to contribute to our understanding of the formation and development of Christianity. Particularly, my contention is that James may be a factor in elucidating the role and place of Q and other collections of Jesus material in early Christianity, and may be especially helpful in examining the proposal of Mack, Koester, Robinson, Kloppenborg and others that the earliest Christian material formed within a sapiential horizon, and only later did there develop the apocalypticization

---

[14] One result of this recent discussion is that a so-called "paradigm shift" is said to be in progress. The new understanding suggests that the Gospels radically recast Jesus and his early followers in an apocalyptic mode, one which was lacking in the incipient stages of the Christian movement. See especially J. M. Robinson, "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew via Jesus," in The Future of Early Christianity, pp.173-194; and Burton L. Mack, A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988). For a critique of Mack's approach see L. W. Hurtado, "The Gospel of Mark: Evolutionary or Revolutionary Document?," JSNT 40 (1990):15-32. The application of the term "paradigm shift" to this area of New Testament studies was made by Robinson, "The Q Trajectory," p.194.

(or re-apocalypticization)[15] of Jesus by the early church.[16]
In some senses, then, this thesis uses James as a window on
modern reconstruction of Christian origins, and is an at-
tempt to challenge what has been deemed a "paradigm shift"
in contemporary understanding of the early Christian church.
My argument is that James combines sapiential, prophetic, and
eschatological themes in a way which is closely related to

---

[15] The notion of a "re-apocalypticization" of Jesus by the
early church is the particular contribution of Robinson ("The
Q Trajectory," p.190). He suggests that the line from John
the Baptist to Matthew began with apocalyptic, experienced a
"sapiential deviation" with Jesus and the Q community's foun-
ding members, and was latter re-apocalypticized by the early
church.

[16] This of course is in conscious opposition to the classic
position of Albert Schweitzer who, in his book The Quest for
the Historical Jesus (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co, 1968
rpr.), suggested that apocalyptic was the grounding of Chris-
tian origins. This view permeated most of twentieth century
scholarship and reached its peak in the remark (and now
cliché) by Ernst Käsemann: "Apocalyptic is the Mother of all
Christian theology" (see his essay "The Beginnings of Chris-
tian Theology," rpr. in New Testament Questions of Today,
trans. W. J. Montague [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969],
pp.82-107; also see his essay "On the Subject of Primitive
Christian Apocalyptic" in the same volume). By "apocalyptic"
Käsemann meant essentially "end-time expectation." This
particular viewpoint was both an overstatement and fairly
simplistic, ignoring the complex structure of early Christian
theology (see the critique by I. Howard Marshall, "Is Apoca-
lyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?," in Tradition and
Interpretation in the New Testament, eds. Gerald F. Haw-
thorne & Otto Betz [Grand Rapids/Tübingen: Wm. B. Eerdmans/J.
C. B. Mohr, 1987], pp.33-42). None the less, it is my con-
tention that eschatology did play a crucial role in early
Christianity, and that it must be considered as one aspect
which contributed greatly to the formation and development of
Christian thought (for further discussion see "Excursus One"
of this thesis).

the manner in which other early Jewish and Christian community documents have utilized these same themes. It is thus hoped that this study will not only provide fresh insight into the letter of James, but also some new perspectives on early Christian documents and their significance in reconstructing Christian origins.

II. James in Contemporary Research: Caveats and Criticisms

The purpose of this section is not to summarize contemporary research on James, since that has been done many times over and need not be repeated here.[17] Rather, several caveats will be discussed which have, in my view, hampered contemporary Jamesian research. These caveats have affected not only the dating of the epistle, but also its religions-

---

[17] See the introductions in the standard commentaries, especially P. H. Davids, The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGNT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982); Martin Dibelius, James, rev. H. Greeven, trans. M. A. Williams (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975; R. P. Martin, James, WBC 48 (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1988); Franz Mußner, Der Jakobusbrief, HKNT XIII, 5th ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1987); and F. Vouga, L'Épitre de Saint Jacques, CNT XIIIa (Genéve: Labor et Fides, 1984). Also see the brief, but helpful introductions by W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, rev. ed., trans. H. C. Kee (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975), pp.403-16; P. Vielhauer, Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur, 4th ed. (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975), pp.567-80; and the summaries of recent research by B. A. Pearson, "James, 1-2 Peter, Jude," in The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters, eds. E. J. Epp & G. W. MacRae (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), pp.371-376; and P. H. Davids, "The Epistle of James in Modern Discussion," ANRW 2.25/5, pp.3621-45.

geschichtliche interpretation and tradition-historical under-standing. This section will begin by analyzing two par-ticular aspects which have had an especial influence on the dating of the epistle (language and anti-Paulinism in the letter), and will be followed by examining two matters which have strongly controlled the understanding of the framework of the epistle (the distinction between Hellenistic and Palestinian Christianity, and the understanding of the relation of wisdom and eschatology in early Christianity).

A. Aspects of the Dating of James

1. Language in the Epistle and Larger Questions

The Greek of the Letter of James has been a major prob-lem and focus for contemporary research into the background of the book. Ever since de Wette's introduction to James, the language of James has been one of the two main keys to its date and place of composition. As Kümmel states, "de Wette demonstrated that the letter was not authentic chiefly on the ground of its language: the fluent Greek is hardly to be attributed to James the brother of the Lord."[18] Kümmel has aptly summed up the majority view on this subject. It should be noted that this particular understanding has greatly af-fected the dating and locating of James. The way it has done

---

[18] Kümmel, Introduction, p.406.

so is fairly simple: the Greek of James is viewed as too sophisticated to have been written by any Palestinian Christian in the early church, and therefore it must have been written outside Palestine (location). This being the case, it is then often assumed that the writing is post-apostolic (date), since the development of the church in the Diaspora was chronologically later than the Palestinian development.[19]

One could of course circumvent this theory and its logical outcome - that James is a document of the Diaspora[20] - by asserting, as does Mußner, that "vielleicht stammt das

---

[19] This is the implied argument in its most basic form, even though one never sees it stated quite like this. Up until recently, most documents showing particular "hellenistic" features (language being one example) were placed outside of Palestine (recent Q research, however, presents an exception to this). The result of this approach was that all documents in the New Testament were viewed to have originated outside Palestine, and, with the exception of the true Pauline letters, were dated toward the end of the first century (for standard dates and locations of the various writings see Kümmel, Introduction). One can see this model at work, for instance, in the article by S. Sandmel ("Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity: The Question of a Comfortable Theory," HUCA 50 [1979]:144). Few scholars have been persuaded by J. A. T. Robinson's radical redating of the New Testament books (Redating the New Testament [London: SCM Press, 1976]), and consequently modern scholarship has tended to continue in the same vein. This is not to imply that there are not good reasons for dating some books late and outside Palestine, for indeed there are. However, once a particular model for understanding has implicitly been accepted, this often controls the evidence in a particular direction.

[20] This position was given classic formulation in Dibelius' commentary (see his various comments throughout pp.1-50) and adequately reflects the most common view encountered in postwar critical scholarship.

sprachliche und stilistische Kleid des Briefes von einem

griechisch sprechenden Mitarbeiter..."[21] Few post-war

scholars have maintained a secretary hypothesis however, and

the majority of writers would still affirm these comments by

Dibelius: the language of James does not point "to an author

who spent his life as a Jew in Palestine. The author writes

Greek as his mother tongue."[22]

The particular problem of the language of James was the

driving force behind the study by J. N. Sevenster on the use

of Greek in Palestine.[23] His oft-cited conclusion, based on

literary and archaeological evidence, was that a Jew in

Palestine could write and speak fluent Greek. These sen-

timents were reinforced by Martin Hengel in his justly famous

study on the impact of Hellenism in Palestine.[24] His con-

---

[21] Der Jakobusbrief, p.8. Mußner sharply separates his view
from any form of a "secretary hypothesis," however this
seems merely to be a matter of semantic equivocation on his
part.

[22] Dibelius, p.17. More recent comments by Ernst Baasland
are also apropos: "Viele Einzelheiten des Briefes, die
Sprachform wie auch die gehobene Rhetorik des Jak. sprechen
eindeutig für eine Diasporasituation" ("Literarische Form,
Thematik und geschichtliche Einordnung des Jakobusbriefes,"
ANRW 2.25/5, p.3676). Baasland goes on to affirm Dibelius'
view that the letter is to be connected with a Jewish-
Christian group linked to the Hellenistic synagogue.

[23] Do You Know Greek?: How Much Greek Could the First Jewish
Christians Have Known?, NovTSup 19 (Leiden: E. J. Brill,
1968), esp.pp. 3-21 where he discusses the problems with the
language of James.

[24] Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in
Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period, trans. John

clusion that the Judaism of Palestine was in essence Hel-

lenistic Judaism fueled the argument of those who suggested

that Hellenistic elements in the New Testament need not be

indicative of Diaspora origin, but could have originated

within the early Christian community in Palestine.[25] These

particular observations obviously have ramifications for

Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), esp. pp. 58-106.

[25] Hengel's recent study, The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in
the First Century after Christ, trans. John Bowden (London:
SCM Press, 1989), also contains a section on the linguistic
background of the New Testament (pp.7-29). However, it
should be noted that for Hengel there is still a distinction
between the Greek-speaking Diaspora Hellenists in Jerusalem
and the bilingual Palestinian Christians, at least as far as
language and culture were concerned. It was the former who
provided the basis of the continuity between Jesus and Paul,
and who were main factors in the spread of Christianity from
Jerusalem to the Greco-Roman cities of the Diaspora (see his
"Between Jesus and Paul," in Between Jesus and Paul, trans.
John Bowden [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983], pp.1-
29,133-156). For Hengel, any differences which existed be-
tween the groups were not theological in nature, but consis-
ted of their respective fluency with Greek and Aramaic. One
was "cultured" while the other was more "rustic" (p.26). It
should be noted, however, that Hengel is not always consis-
tent in maintaining the lack of theological distinction, for
he understands the "Hellenists" of Acts 7 as being more uni-
versalistic and less tied to the law and temple than the more
conservative Palestinian community (p.25; but cf. p.18).
Hengel's problematic stance is corrected by the recent study
by Craig C. Hill. He has taken Hengel's thesis, that all
Jews of the first century were Hellenized Jews, even farther
by applying it to the early Christian community in Jerusalem.
Hill suggests that the traditional distinctions made between
Hellenists and Hebrews in Jerusalem are not valid, and that
the phenomenon of Jewish-Christianity in the formative period
of Christianity was multi-faceted and not reducible to simple
dichotomies. See his discussion in Hellenists and Hebrews:
Reappraising Division within the Early Church, (Minneapolis:
Fortress Press, 1991).

understanding the language of James. The ability of Jews in Palestine to write and read Greek cannot be denied.[26] However, the real question is still unanswered: could a Jew in Palestine have written such a highly polished Greek, characterized by rhetorical technique and style?[27] Sevenster never really addressed this larger issue of James' highly polished nature and its use of Greek rhetoric. Hengel, on the other hand, has attempted to show, through his various studies, that Jerusalem was a fully Hellenized city and that many Jews

---

[26] For further discussion on the languages of Palestine and the importance of Greek in the Palestinian Jewish milieu, see E. M. Meyers & J. F. Strange, Archaeology, the Rabbis & Early Christianity (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981), pp.62-91; H. C. Kee, "Early Christianity in the Galilee: Reassessing the Evidence from the Gospels," in The Galilee in Late Antiquity, ed. L. I. Levine, (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992), pp. 20-22; G. Delling, "Die Begegnung zwischen Hellenismus und Judentum," ANRW 2.20/1, pp.22-26; and J. Barr, "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in the Hellenistic Age," in The Cambridge History of Judaism, eds. W. D. Davies & L. Finkelstein (Cambridge University Press, 1989), esp. pp.110-14.

[27] In tandem with the polished Greek of James, other aspects such as style and use of rhetoric have been put forth as evidence that the writer of James was fluent in Greco-Roman technique. These other aspects include such things as the use of diatribe (see James Ropes, The Epistle of St. James, ICC [Edinburgh: T&T Clark], pp.10-18); the use Hellenistic rhetorical devices (see D. F. Watson, "Can a Fig Tree Yield Olives or a Grapevine Figs? Rhetoric of James 3:1-12," paper presented at SBL Seminar, Kansas City, 1991, forthcoming in NovT); the use of catchword connections (see Dibelius, James, pp.7-11); and the use of particular themes and motifs (see Luke T. Johnson, "James 3:12-4:10 and the Topos περι φθονου," NovT 25 [1983]:327-347; "The Mirror of Remembrance," CBQ 50 [1988]:632-645; and "Taciturnity and True Religion: James 1:26-27," in Greeks, Romans, and Christians, eds. D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson, & W. A. Meeks [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990], pp.329-339).

in Palestine could write a highly polished Greek with ora-
torical style.[28] The question, however, is whether the early
Christians partook fully of the larger Hellenistic ethos
existing in Palestine (particularly Greek education and
literature), or whether they experienced a less concentrated
and direct experience of Hellenism. There is little doubt
that all Jews of the common era were Hellenized, yet at the
same time a great many resisted overt Hellenization and
refused to partake directly in Hellenistic cultural institu-
tions.[29]

---

[28] See Hengel, The 'Hellenization' of Judaea, pp.19-29.

[29] I Maccabees clearly records such a relationship to Hel-
lenism in Palestine. Some Jews fully embraced it, others
experienced it only indirectly while resisting its main in-
stitutions. Thus, a group like the Qumran community, which
radically resisted Hellenism in Palestine, was also indirec-
tly influenced by the phenomenon (see M. Hengel, "Qumran und
der Hellenismus," in Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son
milieu, ed. M. Declor [Paris, 1978], pp.333-372). At the
same time, even though Greek fragments have been found at
Qumran, no scholar suggests that the members of the community
could and did write highly polished Greek, even though other
Jews in Palestine no doubt could and did. Thus, a balance
must be struck between the extremes.
      In considering the ability of a first century Jew in
Palestine to speak and write Greek one should also add the
point that in a region like Palestine there would have been
different types of bilingualism. There would have been both
primary (no formal instruction) and secondary (systematic)
bilingualism. The comments by G. H. R. Horsley are appro-
priate here: "...there were people in Palestine who attained
to bilingualism by different routes. While it should not be
taken as an exact equation there may be some appropriateness
in seeing upper-class, urban Jews as those more likely to be
secondary bilinguals, primary bilinguals being those with
less access to formal education or who lived in rural areas"

16

The recent studies on the origin of the early Jesus movement in Galilee have attempted to fill out in more detail than Hengel, the possibility of early Christian contact with Hellenism. What appears to be emerging is the understanding that Jesus and his followers may have had a greater contact with the Hellenism of the cities of Lower Galilee than has usually been assumed.[30] This might well explain many of the connections with Hellenism which are evidenced in some early Christian documents, such as the use of components of

---

("The Fiction of 'Jewish Greek,'" New Docs, Vol. 5, p.24.). The study by Meyers and Strange on the languages of Palestine would support this assertion (Archaeology, pp.90-91).

[30] See the studies by J. Andrew Overmann, "Who Were the First Urban Christians? Urbanization in Galilee in the First Century," SBLSP (1988):160-168; Douglas R. Edwards, "First Century Urban/Rural Relations in Lower Galilee: Exploring the Archaeological and Literary Evidence," SBLSP (1988):169-182; and D. R. Edwards, "The Socio-Economic and Cultural Ethos of the Lower Galilee in the First Century: Implications for the Nascent Jesus Movement," in The Galilee in Late Antiquity, pp.53-73. E. M. Meyers has argued a similar line for the Judaism of Lower Galilee: it was much more clearly in contact with Hellenistic influences than has often been assumed (see "The Cultural Setting of Galilee: The Case of Regionalism and Early Judaism," ANRW 2.19/1, pp.697-698). Also see I. W. J. Hopkins, "The City Region in Roman Palestine," PEQ 112 (1980):19-32, which clearly shows that even small villages could not have been isolated from the influence of the larger urban centers.

Greco-Roman rhetoric in Q,[31] the affinities of Q to Cynicism,[32] and the alarming fact that the earliest Christians may in fact have spoken and written in Greek,[33] rather than in Aramaic as has usually been assumed.[34] Alongside this, Gerd Theissen has suggested that the earliest Christians in Palestine were not from the lowest segment of society, but from a middle stratum which consisted of tax collectors, fisherman, artisans, and more insignificant people who, none the less,

---

[31] See John S. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People," Semeia 55 (1991), esp. pp.81-94. It is interesting to note that the importance of Greco-Roman rhetoric is becoming increasingly relevant for understanding the way in which the synoptic gospels utilized and expanded the Jesus tradition (see Burton L. Mack & Vernon K. Robbins, Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels, [Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1989]). What is apparent is that Greco-Roman rhetoric played an integral part at all levels in the formation of the Gospels, and this may seriously revise existing theories about the relation of New Testament writers to Hellenistic literary patterns.

[32] See the recent studies by F. Gerald Downing, Cynics and Christian Origins, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992); and Leif Eric Vaage, "Q: The Ethos and Ethics of an Itinerant Intelligence" (Ph. D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1987). One should be careful, however, not to confuse the affinities and parallels with direct influence. Early Christian documents such as Q, for instance, are not Cynic in essence (see R. Horsley, Sociology and the Jesus Movement, [New York: Crossroad, 1989], pp.116-19; and C.M. Tuckett, "A Cynic Q?," Biblica 70 [1989]:349-376).

[33] See the stimulating articles by Heinz O. Guenther, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins," Semeia 55 (1991):41-76; and "Greek: Home of Primitive Christianity," TJT 5 (1989):247-279. The comment by Kee is apropos: "the dominant medium of communication in the Jesus tradition seems to have been Greek" ("Early Christianity," p.21).

[34] Hengel, "Between Jesus and Paul," p.9.

owned some land.[35] This may have some implication for under-
standing the phenomenon of the so-called "first urban Chris-
tians" of Lower Galilee, however this is still far from main-
taining that the followers of Jesus, and Jesus himself, had
access to a cultured Greco-Roman education.[36]

To this above discussion should be added the further
caveat that while studies on the language of James have
varied in their particulars,[37] all have emphasized the

---

[35] See his "We Have Left Everything...(Mark 10:28)," in
Social Reality and the Early Christians, trans. M. Kohl
(Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), pp.66,91. Theissen refers
to this group as a "social class halfway down the scale," a
"petit bourgeoisie."

[36] Most of the recent sociological study of the New Testament
has concentrated on the Pauline mission churches in the
Greco-Roman cities. Very few studies have been done on the
Jesus movement from a sociological angle, and even fewer have
taken into account the new data arising from studies of Lower
Galilee. A recent exception is John P. Meier, A Marginal
Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus (New York: Doubleday,
1991), pp.251-315, who deals with some of the linguistic and
socioeconomic questions. His conclusions as to social status
are similar to Theissen's. For the most part, however,
scholars still maintain the customary distinction between the
socioeconomic levels of the Hellenistic churches and those of
the Palestinian:
    The region to which Jesus belonged was notoriously
    backward by the standards of contemporary civili-
    zation....His followers, if not He Himself, were
    thoroughly out of sympathy with the sophisticated
    classes of the cities...[on the other hand] the
    [Pauline] Christians were dominated by a socially
    pretentious section of the population of the big
    cities (E. A. Judge, The Social Pattern of the
    Christian Groups in the First Century [London: The
    Tyndale Press, 1960], pp.10,60).

[37] See the studies by Nigel Turner, A Grammar of New Tes-
tament Greek: Vol. IV: Style (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark,
1976), pp.114-120; Albert Wifstrand, "Stylistic Problems in

peculiar character of the language: it is highly polished,

yet at the same time has a large number of Semitic in-

trusions.[38] This peculiar fact has elicited several ex-

planations: it is due to the traditional nature of

paraenesis, in that paraenesis is formed from diverse strands

of tradition (Dibelius); it is due to the phenomenon of

"Jewish Greek" (Turner); it is the result of the influence of

the "hellenized" Jewish synagogue homily (Wifstrand);[39] or it

results from a two stage composition process (Davids, Mar-

tin).[40] All of these theories, however, have serious flaws

---

the Epistles of James and Peter," ST 1 (1948):170-182;
Dibelius, James, pp.34-38; and the detailed study of the
character of James' language by K. F. Morris, "An Inves-
tigation of Several Linguistic Affinities Between the Epistle
of James and the book of Isaiah" (Th. D. diss., Union
Theological Seminary [Virginia], 1964), esp. pp.199-256.

[38] Probably the most detailed and exhaustive study of Semi-
tisms in the New Testament in general is that of Klaus Beyer,
Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament, SUNT 1, 2nd ed. (Göt-
tingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968). Throughout his study
he makes numerous references to the Semitic character of
James. His final tally is that James contains 29 Semitisms,
a rate of 4.14 per page, which places James third highest in
the New Testament behind Luke and Matthew (p.298).

[39] H. Thyen, Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie
(Göttingen, 1955), was one of the first to suggest that James
itself was an example of a Hellenistic synagogue homily.

[40] This last theory is particularly important since two major
English commentators in the last ten years, Davids and Mar-
tin, have both maintained that James was composed in stages.
Both suggest that an original document from the Palestinian
church (Semitic in character) was taken up and re-edited by a
writer who could produce a more refined and polished Greek.
This theory, which is more systematic than Dibelius' fragmen-
ted one, would account for both the polished Greek (which
both writers obviously feel was not possible in the early

and cannot account, in my opinion, for the unique character

of the epistle of James.[41]

---

church) as well as the real "Semitic mind and thought pat-
tern" (Davids, p.59). Other theories related to this are
that the canonical text of James is a translation from
Aramaic (see the important study by J. Wordsworth, "The Cor-
bey St. James [ff] and its Relation to Other Latin Versions
and to the Original Language of the Epistle," StBib 1
[1885]:113-123); that James is a revision of a Jewish Grund-
schrift (this achieved classic formation in Arnold Meyer's
study, Der Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes [Gießen: Alfred Töpel-
mann, 1930]); and any form of the secretary hypothesis (such
as one finds in Mußner). All of these theories, in their own
way, suggest a stratified formation of the letter wherein
more than one writer is imagined (whether it be via incor-
poration and redaction of another source, through trans-
lation, or simply through the use of a "Mitarbeiter"). How-
ever, the degree of stratification may vary from one scholar
to another (for Meyer it is only slight; for others such as
Morris ["Linguistic Affinities"], Davids, and Martin, it is
more thoroughgoing).

[41]   The theory that suggests James is composed of "Jewish
Greek" suffers from the same criticisms levied against the
phenomenon of "Jewish Greek" as a whole. That is, there
appears to have been no particular dialect of Greek which was
specific to Jews in this time period. See the excellent
essay by Horsley, "The Fiction of 'Jewish Greek,'" pp.5-40.
    Dibelius' particular understanding of James as parae-
nesis is also flawed. Dibelius' argument rests upon the view
that James consists of a series of isolated admonitions
strung together without any inherent connection (cf. James,
p.13) and hence there is a haphazard mixture of language
influences. The book of James, however, has much more co-
herence than has generally been assumed and, in light of
this, the explanation for the linguistic character of the
letter must be sought elsewhere. For good discussions of the
coherence and structure of the letter see E. Fry, "The Tes-
ting of Faith: A Study of the Structure of the Book of
James," BT 29 (1978):427-435; W. H. Wuellner, "Der Jakobus-
brief im Licht der Rhetorik und Textpragmatik," LingBib 43
(1978):5-66; and Hermann von Lips, Weisheitliche Traditionen
im Neuen Testament, WMANT 64 (Neukirchener Verlag, 1990),
pp.412-427.
    The theory of stratification in James, especially as it
is promoted by Davids, Martin, and Morris, also has its prob-

In the final analysis it is apparent that there are still many unanswered questions about the language and style of James. However, there are several conclusions which I would like to draw from the foregoing discussion that are pertinent to this paper. 1) The suggestion that the language and style of James must mean that it was written by a Hellenist Christian in the Diaspora is questionable. The latter may actually be the case, but language is not the criterion upon which to base such a view. As well, questions regarding the social status of the early Christians in Palestine, their socio-economic background, their relation to the Hellenism in the cities of Lower Galilee, their mother tongue and ability to speak and write Greek, are still open to discussion and older theories are in the process of revision .

---

lems. What may sound good on paper has never been systematically tested in James. Outside of the older study by Meyer, one in which he himself was not really concerned with the language of the epistle per se, no attempt has been made in these studies to reconstruct the hypothetical original Semitic document which was later redacted, and for good reason since there is no consistent pattern to the so-called Semitisms in James; they appear throughout the document in a variety of places and ways and bear little overall relation to one another. As well, while the writer may have used traditional material, the letter itself is a tightly-crafted piece, characterized by word plays, catchword connections, and thematic links throughout. The sole reason why these various scholars have proposed this view is simply that James presents to us a linguistic problem: it has both a highly polished Greek style as well as definite Semitic influence in language, thought and style. This, however, is not grounds in and of itself to erect an hypothesis of stratification in the text, and may in fact be a problem which modern scholarship has created for itself.

In light of this it is difficult to make any hard and fast rules about the language of the New Testament, especially in regards to what is and what is not possible..

2) There is no quantitative basis for dating and placing James through an analysis of its language. While dating on the grounds of language is possible, there is no systematic basis of comparison for James. One canot date on the bases of orthography or of comparison with other letters by the same writer (such as in the case of Paul) or with other New Testament documents. The latter point is especially important: since no New Testament document, outside of the genuine Pauline epistles, can be dated and placed with certitude, comparison on the basis of language with other books in the New Testament is precarious.[42] Even if one widens the net and includes writers who, like Paul, Josephus, and the early church fathers (e.g., Ignatius), are more accurately placed and dated, there are still too many factors which cannot be predicted in making quantitative comparison. It is difficult to know, for instance, how representative any writer or writing is of the region or area from which he/she comes (i.e., whether he/she is the norm or an exception), or what other factors may have come to play in the process (such

---

[42] This is one of the major flaws of the stylistic and content analysis approach to the dating of James by G. G. Bolich, "On Dating James: New Perspectives on an Ancient Problem" (Ed. D. diss., Gonzaga University, 1983).

as social status, linguistic variations within different regions, or other special circumstances like, in the case of Josephus, acquiring some knowledge of Greek in Rome). Consequently, in the area of language in first-century Palestine modern scholarhship lacks a systematic basis which can be related both diachronically and synchronically in order to assure accuracy in comparison, as well as the ability to produce a controlled method which can be applied uniformly and consistently.

There is thus no quantitative nor qualitative basis for evaluating the language of James in order to more securely date and place the epistle.[43] The lack of sufficient data and controlled, adequate methodology naturally leads to the suggestion that one cannot date (and here, also place) the epistle with any precision on the basis of language (and here, also style). There is not enough of the right type of evidence to make any assertion in this regard. The syncretistic nature of Hellenism in the first century makes the task all the more difficult; for so many factors and elements are intermingled, mutated, and syncretized, that it is dif-

---

[43] Even where style and language analysis is used in comparison such as in the recent book by K. J. Neumann, The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis, SBLDS 120 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), one is not likely to be able to draw too many conclusions about the date or the location of that particular document.

ficult to establish strict guidelines which can delimit cul-
tural, linguistic, and social aspects of the various cultures
which encountered the Hellenistic onslaught.[44]

2. Anti-Paulinism in James

That James evinces an anti-Paulinism has become a stan-
dard assertion in modern scholarship.[45] It has also become
one of the focal points around which the dating of James has
taken place. One of the most recent studies on James illus-
trates this well:

> Wichtigstes Kriterium für die Datierung ist und
> bleibt das Verhältnis zu Paulus und, im Gefolge
> dieser Frage, die Einschätzung bestimmter theo-
> logischer Aussagen und Begriffe...Insgesamt er-
> scheint es m.E. wahrscheinlicher daß Jakobusbrief
> auf paulinische Aussagen bzw. deren Auswirkungen
> reagiert, also im Sinn der relativen Chronologie
> später als das missionarische, theologische und
> literarische Werk des Paulus anzusetzen ist.[46]

This assertion has tremendous ramifications for understanding
the place of James in early Christianity, and therefore it

---

[44] For a good discussion of the nature of Hellenism, besides
the studies by Hengel already mentioned, see Moses Hadas,
Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion (New York: Columbia
University Press, 1959).

[45] On the phenomenon of anti-Paulinism in early Christianity
see the full study by Luedemann, Opponents. The discussion
of anti-Paulinism in the Sermon on the Mount is also relevant
for the discussion in James, since the data is quite similar.
On this see W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the
Mount, BJS 186 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989 rpr.), pp.316-
341.

[46] Wiard Popkes, Adressaten, Situation und Form des Jakobus-
briefes, SBS 125/126 (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibel-
werk, 1986), pp.32-33.

deserves some attention.

There have been many studies of the relation between Paul's letters and the Epistle of James,[47] but three particularly stand out in recent years. The older of these is J. T. Sanders' chapter on James in his monograph on ethics in the New Testament.[48] Building on the study by Dibelius,[49] Sanders argues that the language of James 2 undeniably reflects and reverses the language of Paul in Romans 4. Sanders maintains that, out of all early Christian literature, the phrase ἐκ πίστεως is used in the particular context of "faith vs. works" only in the letters of Paul and in James 2. As well, the language of Rom 3:28, which is reflected in James 2:24, is connected with the example of Abraham (Rom 4), as it is in James 2. Sanders suggests that this connection (i.e., the connection between the Abraham example and faith/works) could

---

[47] I leave aside studies which deal with the relationship of the two historical figues - Paul and James of Jerusalem - (e.g., Walther Schmithals, Paul and James, SBT 46 [Naperville: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1965]), and focus upon the literary relationship between the documents associated with these two figures.

[48] Ethics in the New Testament: Change and Development (London: SCM Press, 1975, 1986), pp.117-122.

[49] Dibelius himself was never extreme regarding anti-Paulinism in James. He suggested that many of the similar themes were mediated to James via Jewish tradition (e.g., the faith and works discussion; and Abraham as an example). However, he also believed that it was inconceivable to have James without first having Paul (cf. pp.174-180). That Dibelius was slightly inconsistent in his understanding of the relation between Paul and James is pointed out by Sanders, Ethics, p.118.

not have suggested itself from Jewish tradition, but in-
dicates that James was familiar with Paul's previous connec-
tion of the two elements.[50]

These above arguments are discussed in even more detail
by Luedemann, in his treatment of the anti-paulinism in
James.[51] Luedemann suggests that there are several key

---

[50] The language of Rom 3:28 (also cf. Gal 2:16) appears to be
a Pauline summary of Rom 3:20, which is itself a quote from
Psalm 143:2 (LXX 142:2): οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς
ζῶν.

[51] See Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity, pp.140-149.
His inclusion of James in the book is somewhat curious how-
ever, for he does not consider James to be a Jewish-Christian
work (p.148) since James, like Paul, has dispensed with the
ceremonial law (according to Luedemann), which is the cri-
terion which Luedemann considers essential for regarding a
group as Jewish-Christian. Whether one considers James
Jewish-Christian or not largely depends on the definition one
utilizes for "Jewish-Christianity." Some scholars have con-
sidered James to be a "Jewish-Christian" document largely
based on the content of the letter (presence of Jewish themes
and traditions): D. L. Bartlett, "The Epistle of James as a
Jewish-Christian Document," SBLSP 1979 Vol 2:173-186; P.
Sigal, "The Halakhah of James," in Intergerini Parietis
Septvm (Eph. 2:14), ed. D. Y. Hadidian (Pittsburgh: The Pick-
wick Press, 1981), pp.337-353; and P. H. Davids, "Themes in
the Epistle of James that are Judaistic in Character" (Ph. D.
diss., University of Manchester, 1974). It should be noted
that all three of these studies analyze James' contact with
Jewish traditions, technique, etc..., and thus rely on a
definition of "Jewish-Christianity" which is close to that
espoused by J. Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity,
trans. J. A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964).
However, his definition is not without its problems, es-
pecially the fact that almost any document of early Chris-
tianity could be considered to be Jewish-Christian to one
degree or another according to his model (a point which makes
the definition meaningless). For further discussion of the
problems involved in defining "Jewish Christianity," besides
the study by Brown mentioned earlier, see R. A. Kraft, "In
Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and its 'Theology': Problems

Pauline passages which are used by James in a polemical man-
ner. It is worth noting the main ones:

Jm 2:24: ὁρᾶτε ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ
πίστεως μόνον.

Rom 3:28: λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς
ἔργων νόμου.

Gal 2:16: εἰδότες [δὲ] ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων
νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς
Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως
Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ
δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ.

There is little doubt over the surprisingly similar use of
language, especially between Gal 2:16 (ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται
ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων) and James 2:24 (ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται
ἄνθρωπος). A parallel to this utilization of similar lan-
guage is evident in both Paul and James' employment of the
Abraham tradition:

Jm 2:21: Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη
ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον...

Rom 4:2: εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη, ἔχει καύχημα,

---

of Definition and Methodology," RSR 60 (1972):81-92; B. J.
Malina, "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism: Toward a
Hypothetical Definition," JSJ 7 (1976):46-57; R. Murray,
"Defining Judaeo-Christianity," HeyJ 15 (1974):303-310; R.
Murray, "Jews, Hebrews, and Christians: Some Needed Distinc-
tions," NovT 24 (1982):194-208; S. K. Riegal, "Jewish Chris-
tianity: Definitions and Terminology," NTS 24 (1977/78):410-
415; and Luedemann, Opposition to Paul, pp.1-32.

ἀλλ᾽ οὐ πρὸς θεόν.

Again, this parallel is quite striking, as is the next one:

Jm 2:23: καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα· ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην καὶ φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη.

Rom 4:3: τί γὰρ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει; ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

Once again, the linguistic parallels are remarkable, and in this last example it should also be noted that both Paul and James quote from Gen. 15:6, and that both agree against the LXX in their spelling of Ἀβραάμ, and in the use of δὲ after ἐπίστευσεν rather than the LXX's καὶ. Except for very few cases, most contemporary scholars maintain that James presupposes Paul's formulations and that the letter reflects reaction against Paul's presentation of faith/works. It may be a misunderstanding of Paul, it may be a reaction to extreme forms of Paulinism which appeared after Paul, it may result simply from anti-Paulinism existing in the tradition which James uses; but most scholars do agree that one cannot have the statements in James without those in Paul.

Recently, M. Hengel has continued the discussion by suggested that the entire letter of James is a polemic against Paul. In his study, "Der Jakobusbrief als anti-

paulinische Polemik,"[52] Hengel systematically analyzes the letter for any trace of opposition to Paul, and he manages to find a great deal. His conclusion is that the epistle is a "circular letter" addressed to a predominantly Gentile congregation outside Palestine, written sometime between 58 to 62 C.E. He suggests that:

> ...enthält der Brief im weisheitlich-paränetischen Gewande und vielfältig variiert eine gezielte antipaulinische Polemik, die mit dem persönlichen Verhalten des Paulus, seiner Missionspraxis und gefährlichen Tendenzen seiner Theologie abrechnet. Der Verfasser setzt voraus, daß die Gemeinden, die Paulus kennen bzw. gar von ihm gegründet sind, diese Polemik sehr wohl verstehen und sich dadurch warnen lassen.[53]

The evidence which Hengel adduces, however, is not very convincing, and often times is pushed unnecessarily into an anti-Pauline framework.[54]

---

[52] In _Tradition_ _and_ _Interpretation_ _in_ _the_ _New_ _Testament_, pp.248-278.

[53] "Der Jakobusbrief," p.265. See pp.252-265 for a detailed presentation of the evidence. Hengel is one of the few who assume both a Jacobian authorship for the epistle and an anti-Pauline polemic. As with Luedemann, Hengel adopts, in part, the Tübingen Tendenz Criticism which suggests that Paul was in a struggle with the Jewish Christians of Palestine during his missionary period. Luedemann has outlined this understanding in his book _Opposition_, pp.35-115.

[54] There are many examples one could choose to criticize in Hengel's rather speculative and tentative study, but one will suffice. Hengel suggests, for instance, that...

> Jak 4.13-16 wird so m.E. in seiner Rätselhaftigkeit als paränetisches Unikum in der frühchristlichen Literatur dadurch am besten verständlich, daß es auf das plötzliche Scheitern der Missionpläne des Apostels durch seine Gefangennahme und seine anschließende lange Haftzeit mit der drohenden Todesstrafe hinweist (p.259).

The real issue, then, is whether or not James 2, and that chapter only, presupposes prior Pauline formulations, and indeed consciously or unconsciously reverses the Pauline slogans of Romans and Galatians. Since this particular issue has become key for not only the dating of James, but also for understanding the epistle as a whole, it is deemed necessary to make a few general observations on this aspect of Jamesian research.

a) Polemic was an integral aspect of many writings - Jewish, Christian, and pagan - in the Greco-Roman world.[55] Early Christian writings partook of this larger ethos, and thus one finds figures such as Jesus, James, and Paul used in apologetic and polemical contexts by different Christian groups.[56] As well, there is no doubt that a strong strand of

---

This suggestion is of course mere speculation, and it hardly makes sense in the larger context of 4:11-5:6. The epistle, outside of James 2, appears to contain no other "attacks" on Paul or Pauline communities. Luedemann, in his study, also recognizes this fact, and thus suggests that the anti-Paulinism in James was "tacked on" (p.148) through James' use of tradition. It appears that Luedemann is at least correct in suggesting that anti-Paulinism in James, if it occurs at all, is limited to James 2.

[55] This has now received adequate attention by Hans Conzelmann, Gentiles/Jews/Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).

[56] For the use of James, the brother of Jesus, in early Christian polemics see esp. S. K. Brown, "James: A Religio-Historical Study of the Relation Between Jewish, Gnostic, and Catholic Christianity in the Early Period Through an Investigation about James the Lord's Brother" (Ph. D. diss., Brown University, 1972); and M. I. Webber, "'IAKOBOS HO DIKAIOS:

31

anti-Paulinism developed in some quarters by the second cen-
tury.[57] However, while there is doubtless continuity between
the later Christian communities and the earlier ones, one
must be cautious about reading back into the early first
century conflicts, polemics, and apologetics which belong to
a later period. Thus, for instance, despite the fact that we
know that Paul experienced some forms of opposition in his
missionary work, one should be circumspect in pinpointing the
nature of the groups involved. It is difficult to ascertain
if there was, as Luedemann seems to suggest, a consistent and
thoroughgoing anti-Paulinism originating out of Jerusalem
around the time of the so-called "Jerusalem Conference," or,
as others have suggested, an opposition to Paul by a fairly
wide-spread monolithic Jewish-sectarian segment of the early
church.[58] One of the dangers which is encountered at this

Origins, Literary Expression and Development of Traditions
About the Brother of the Lord in Early Christianity" (Ph. D.
diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1985), pp.183-312.
    For the fate of Paul in the literature of the period see
Luedemann, Opposition to Paul; and for a different picture of
the conflict over Paul's image in the early church see D. R.
MacDonald, The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for
Paul in Story and Canon (Philadelphia: Westminster Press,
1983).
[57] One need only refer to the passage in Clementine Recog-
nitions 1.66-71 where the "enemy" who kills James and halts
the mission to the gentiles is Paul, a provocative and less
than subtle image. For comments on this passage see Van
Voorst, Ascents of James, pp.160-161.
[58] As is argued by John J. Gunther, St. Paul's Opponents and
Their Background, NovTSup 35 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973). He
suggests that all of Paul's opponents fit a general perspec-

32

point for both Paul and James is the phenomenon of "mirror

reading." Essentially this consists of reading a seeming

polemical text and attempting to reconstruct the nature of

the charge or problem the writer was addressing.[59] However,

the nature of rhetoric is such that it is precarious to use

diatribes, antithetical statements, and other forms of ap-

parent polemical and apologetic nature to reconstruct con-

crete situations out of which, or to which, these texts were

intended to respond. Consequently, in James 2 for instance,

it is difficult to know if the letter was actually responding

to an opponent, or simply using rhetoric to make a homiletic

point.[60] Without an a priori assumption of anti-Paulinism in

---

tive of one segment of the early church, namely a Jewish
apocalyptic element much like the Essenes.

For a good summary of the research in the area of Paul
and his opponents see E. E. Ellis, "Paul and his Opponents:
Trends in the Research," rpr. in Prophecy and Hermeneutic in
Early Christianity, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), pp.80-
115.

[59] On the phenomenon of "mirror reading," and criticism of
this method, especially as it relates to Paul and his op-
ponents, see George Lyons, Pauline Autobiography: Toward a
New Understanding, SBLDS 73 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985),
pp.96-105. Klaus Berger has also treated the problem of
recovering "implicit" opponents in the New Testament, but his
methodology appears to be less than satisfactory since he
primarily utilizes the phenomenon of "mirror reading." See
"Die impliziten Gegner: Zur Methode des Eschließens von 'Geg-
nern' in neutestamentlichen Texten," in Kirche, eds. D.
Lührmann & G. Strecker (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1980),
pp.373-400.

[60] The usual suggestion has been that James must be replying
to someone or some group which has expressed that "faith
without works is acceptable." However, there is little basis
in the text to suggest that James 2 is polemicizing against

33

James 2, one has little basis for reconstructing such opposition from the existing text.[51]

b) If James 2 is dependent on Paul, then one must maintain that the writer thoroughly misunderstood Paul. This is quite clear from the context of James 2 since it presupposes definitions of "faith" and "works" which are obviously different than Paul's use.[62] Yet, if James 2 polemicizes against

---

another view, or that there is a real opponent in mind (Dibelius, for instance, maintained that the opponent was imaginary and used for the sake of promoting James' argument; p.156). Recently, Scot McKnight, on the basis of "mirror reading," has attempted to elucidate more fully "the interlocutor's assertion according to the response of James..." See "James 2:18a: The Unidentifiable Interlocutor," WTJ 52 (1990):355-364. Also see the discussion by C. E. Donker, "Der Verfasser des Jak und sein Gegner: Zum Problem des Einwandes in Jak 2,18-19," ZNW 72 (1981):227-240.

[61] It is of course plausible that there may be other evidence which would back up the results of "mirror reading" an anti-Paulinism in James. However, it seems methodologically more appropriate to have other indisputable evidence present first before one attempts to reconstruct the "opposition" from the existing text, rather than vice versa.

[62] See the discussion by Richard N. Longenecker, "The 'Faith of Abraham' Theme in Paul, James and Hebrews: A Study in the Circumstantial nature of New Testament Teaching," JETS 20 (1977):203-212. The fact that both Paul and James reflect entirely different understandings of "faith" and "works" has usually been the ground for the assertion that James misunderstood Paul and his theological expression. Cf. John Reumann, Righteousness in the New Testament, (New York/ Philadelphia: Paulist/Fortress Press, 1982), pp.156-157. The traditional argument for a "misunderstanding" of Paul in James is that the writer of James has understood Paul to be rejecting "the works of faith" in Paul's emphasis on faith over works. The writer of James, in this view, would not have perceived the nuances in Paul's use of "works" and "faith" (the former specifically relating to "works of the law"). Thus, the argument of James 2, according to this perspective, indicates the writer's failure to understand the

a "misunderstood Paulinism," it would be the only example in early Christianity that we know of in which such a misunderstanding took place in this form.[63] The anti-Paulinism of the second century clearly shows that not all Pauline antagonists

---

true Pauline argument and thus the writer has unintentionally (most likely) distorted it. This latter view should be separated from the one which suggests that James reflects a reaction against a misunderstood Paulinism by some other Christian group (cf. Mußner, Der Jakobusbrief, pp.18-19). Here it is not the writer of the letter who has misunderstood Paul but another Christian group. This view is fairly common since it does not place Paul and James at odds and thus provides continuity for biblical theology. For example see Hans Joachim Schoeps, Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949), p.346, who suggests that "gnostische Hyperpaulinisten" appear to be the opponents in view; and Martin, James, p.lxxii, who argues that the writer polemicizes against "an ultra-Pauline emphasis that turned faith into a slogan...and thereby led to a position close to an antinomian disregard for all moral claims." E. Trocomè, "Les Eglises pauliniennes vues du dehors: Jacques 2,1 á 3,13," SE 2 (1964):660-669 also follows this line; as does Popkes, Adressaten, p.91: "Wir könnten dann, sogar in Verbindung mit dem Jakobusbrief, eine zusätzliche und gewiß extreme Linie des Hyperpaulinismus verfolgen." In any case, regardless of what line of argument is followed, the writer of James has understood either Paul or interpreters of Paul to be advocating an antinomian position in the realm of morals (i.e., that this was unimportant for the Christian faith) and has reacted against it. The position taken in this thesis, however, is that there is no need to postulate a reaction by the writer to either Paul or a later hyper-Paulinism.

[63] This point is made by Davids, James, p.21. While he himself argues that James 2 reflects a misunderstanding of Paul, he also suggests at the same time that "there is no evidence other than this epistle that such a position ever actually existed in the shape found here." It appears that there was some misunderstanding of Paul and aspects of his teaching during his ministry by both opponents (Rom. 3:8) and his own congregations (I Cor 5:9ff.), but the manner and content of the so-called "misunderstanding" formulated in James 2 appears no where else.

misunderstood Pauline theology.[64] While the details of Paul's discussion are obviously open to debate, it is highly unlikely that James could have misunderstood Paul so thoroughly as to divorce ἔργα from its connection with νόμος. If James were acquainted with either oral or written[65] Pauline tradition, it is difficult to fathom how the writer managed to misrepresent Paul's view to such an extent. One possible explanation could be that the writer deliberately distorted Paul's position in order to make him look reprehensible, something which was not uncommon in antiquity. However, if this situation were imagined, one would also expect a more

---

[64] This is an important point, since it evinces that Jewish Christian groups in the second century could and did understand Paul's teachings, at least in essence. The anti-Pauline passage in the Clementine Recognitions (1.66-71) previously mentioned indicates that Paul was responsible for the failure of the Christian mission to the Jews. The reason for this was that he did not maintain the status of the Jewish law as they viewed it should be maintained. One can debate the exact nature of Paul's understanding of the law (especially as it functioned within a covenantal nomistic framework: see E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977]; and James D. G. Dunn, "The New Perspective on Paul," in Jesus, Paul and the Law [Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox, 1990], pp.183-214), but the basic thrust could hardly be misunderstood: circumcision and other culture-specific aspects of the law were not a requirement for Gentiles. It is clear that the writer(s) of CR understood the basic direction of Paul's theology. The Pauline connection of ἔργα with νόμος was not missed by these later Jewish-Christians, and it is therefore at least questionableto maintain that the writer of James failed to understand the same connection.

[65] Luedemann suggests that the writer of James had read at least portions of Galatians and Romans (Opposition, p.145).

36

thoroughgoing attack on Paul throughout the epistle (much
like what Hengel suggests), but outside of James 2 there is
no further evidence of sustained polemic against Paul. It
thus appears unlikely that the writer of James has misunder-
stood Paul.

c) If the writer of James 2 did not misunderstand Paul,
perhaps he then responded to another group which misunder-
stood or deliberately distorted the Pauline discussion of
faith and works. At first glance this seems a real pos-
sibility, and for this reason is advocated by many scholars.[66]
However, the strongest argument against this theory is that
the context of James 2 does not favor this interpretation.
D. F. Watson, in a recent article, has set forth an under-
standing of James 2 in the light of Greco-Roman rhetoric.
His basic argument is that the logical rhetorical progression
indicates that the last half of chapter 2 relates back to the
first half: partiality in the assembly. Thus, the "faith
without works" problem relates specifically to partiality in
the Jamesian community, and thus becomes a part of the larger
community instruction of James 2-3. The Abraham example and
the argument in 2:14-26 is part of the rhetorical strategy of

---

[66] The most recent comments in this regard have been made by
E. E. Ellis, The Old Testament in Early Christianity (Grand
Rapids: Baker, 1991): "the targets of James polemic are not
Paul and his faithful followers, but rather the same kind of
libertine elements, in Paul's churches and elsewhere, whom
Paul himself condemns (pp.135-35)."

the deliberative argument which is not intended as polemical, but hortatory in nature: the point is to persuade the hearers to begin to demonstrate their confession of faith within the community through good works toward the poor. In the final analysis the argument appears to be aimed not at some group which has misunderstood Paul, but at the writer's own community which has misunderstood its own faith confession.[67] The argument of James 2 as a whole makes less sense if it is viewed as a polemic directed against Pauline theology, misunderstood or otherwise.[68]

---

[67] See Watson, "James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation," NTS 39 (1993):94-121. The setting of James 2 is most likely a judicial Christian court (Watson agrees, p.99; see R. B. Ward, "Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4," HTR 62 [1969]:87-97). The reference to the wealthy person in James 2:2 is most probably a community member (James appears to use circumlocutions to describe the wealthy in the community, but the term πλούσιος with the article to denote the outsider. See the excursus to chapter two for further discussion). Thus, the situation of the first half of James 2, in which partiality is a threat to community life, is addressed by the writer in the second half of James 2 through an emphasis on the necessity of outward manifestation of the works of one's faith in the community.

[68] One could argue, however, that particular members of James' community have misunderstood Paul and that the writer responds to these individuals. But, again, in light of the argument of James 2, the issue addressed is community responsibility, not Pauline theology per se. The community members the writer addresses do not appear to have misunderstood a particular theology, but have themselves failed to live according to the community covenant. The use of diatribe is an artificial device and in no way implies that there is an actual opponent in view who advocates the exact opposite of the writer. Rather, the writer uses the contrast to make a practical point to his readers/hearers.

d) Having rejected the view that the writer of James is combating Paul or that he is combating a distorted Paulinism, I tentatively suggest that the linguistic parallels between Paul and James can be accounted for on the basis of their use of a common tradition. A couple of factors should be considered at this juncture: i) In part of the residue of the old religionsgeschichtliche approach to the study of the New Testament, it is often assumed that Paul was the first and greatest theologian of the early church. While it is true that Paul had a distinctive contribution to make, we do not know for certain that he was the first to make such a contribution, or whether his specific insight was shared by the majority of first-century Christians.[69] Regardless of the decisions on these larger questions, what has become clear is that Paul was not completely original in his theology; that is, as he himself asserted, he passed on received tradition[70]

---

[69] There may in fact be evidence that originally Paul's position was not overwhelmingly embraced in the early church, and that later writers/editors made an attempt to rehabilitate Paul at the end of the first century. See the discussion of the textual evidence by G. Zuntz, The Text of the Pauline Epistles (London: Oxford University Press, 1953). For another slant on the "rehabilitation" of Paul in the early church see A. J. Mattill, "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered," in Apostolic History and the Gospel, eds. W. W. Gasque & R. P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1970), pp.108-122.

[70] Cf. Paul's use of παραλαμβάνω (Gal 1:9; I Thess 2:13), παραδίδωμι (Rom 6:17; I Cor 6:11), and παράδοσις (I Cor 11:2).

and lay in continuity with early Christian leaders (cf. Gal. 2:7ff.). Both in forms and in tradition,[71] Paul was dependent on the early church. As well, he was dependent upon apostolic tradition/halakah,[72] Jesus tradition,[73] and early Christian paraenesis. Thus, it should come as no surprise that Paul relied on Christian tradition in his theological and ethical fomulations.[74]

---

[71] Cf. P. Fannon, "The Influence of Tradition in St. Paul," SE 4/TU 102 (1968):292-307; and James L. Bailey & L. D. Vander Broek, Literary Forms in the New Testament (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), pp.23-87.

[72] See the excellent discussion by Peter J. Tomson, Paul and the Jewish Law, CRINT (Assen/Minneapolis: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 144-149: "...from his earliest letters onwards, Paul appeals to Apostolic tradition without hesitation and refers to it by means of terminology which is both characteristic of that tradition and directly related to Jewish halakhic usage (p. 148)."

[73] On Paul and Jesus tradition see the important studies by David Wenham, "Paul's Use of the Jesus Tradition: Three Samples," in Gospel Perspectives Vol. 5: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels, ed. David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), pp.7-37; D. L. Dungan, The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul (London: Oxford University Press, 1971); M. Thompson, Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1- 15.13, JSNTSup 59 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); Davies, The Setting, pp.341-366; and D. C. Allison, "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gospels: The Pattern of the Parallels," NTS 28 (1982):1-32. For the view which stresses the lack of importance of the logia of Jesus for Paul see Peter Richardson and Peter Gooch, "Logia of Jesus in 1 Corinthians," Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels, pp.39-62.

[74] E. Earle Ellis, in his excellent study on Paul's exegesis (Paul's Use of the Old Testament [Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1957]), has shown that not only does Paul owe a large debt to Judaism for his exegesis and understanding of biblical texts (pp.45-76), but he also owes a great debt to early Christian tradition (pp.85-113). Thus, for example,

ii) The use of Abraham as an example in both Paul and
James is a good illustration of how both writers may be de-
pendent on common tradition rather than one on the other.
The use of Abraham traditions was particularly common in the
Judaism of the period.[75] As well, the utilization of Abraham
tradition in the New Testament and early Christian writings
was also frequent, and thus on the surface one should not be
too surprised to find mention of this figure in both James
and Romans/Galatians.[76] Consequently, The use of Abraham in
James is quite possibly something which was mediated to the
writer from Jewish and/or Christian traditions.[77] However,

---

the use of the Abraham example, while originating in Jewish
exegesis, may have already been given a particular Christian
context by the time Paul (or the writer of James for that
matter) received the tradition.

[75] See the excellent accumulation of data in Samuel Sandmel's
study, Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of
Abraham in Jewish Literature (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College
Press, 1956); the list of examples in Str-B Vol. 3, pp.186-
201,755; and the discussions in Dibelius, James, pp.168-74;
and M. Moxnes, Theology in Conflict, NovTSup 53 (Leiden: E. J.
Brill, 1980), pp.117-206.

[76] For a detailed study of the use and development of Abraham
traditions in early Christianity see Jeffrey S. Siker, Disin-
heriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy,
(Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991). His basic ap-
proach is to trace the trajectory of the use of Abraham in
early Christianity. His argument is that initially Abraham
rhetoric included both Jews and Gentiles in "God's people"
(Paul), but developed to the point where it excluded the Jews
(Justin Martyr).

[77] Cf. Dibelius suggestion, pp.168-174: James is essentially
dependent on the Jewish synagogue for his Abraham traditions;
traditions which existed before the first century C. E., and
which were from the same stock as those used by Jubilees and

since both Paul and James connect Abraham with the "faith and works" discussion, it is has generally been assumed that James has utilized the Abraham example in a way which shows that the writer is relying on Pauline traditions.[78] The suggestion here, however, is that the use of Abraham in James 2 arises out of Jewish and Christian tradition and does not presuppose the Pauline contexts. As well, the pairing of Abraham and Rahab appears to have been a traditional one (cf. I Clement 10-12; Heb. 11) based upon the fact that they were both prominent proselytes.[79] This alerts one to the pos-

---

Philo. Roy Bowen Ward also suggests that the Abraham tradition in James is from Jewish influence, and particularly that James is influenced by the connection of Abraham's "works" with his hospitality. See "The Works of Abraham: James 2:14-26," HTR 61 (1968):283-290. That the letter of James relies on Jewish tradition should not be taken to mean, however, that there was no interpretation on the part of the writer (contra Dibelius who suggests that the writer played no part in the process).

[78] Most treatments of the use of Abraham in James 2 assume some form of Pauline dependence by James. Consequently, the use of Abraham traditions by James has received less than adequate attention. The recent treatment by M. L. Soards, "The Early Christian Interpretation of Abraham and the Place of James Within that Context," IrishBS 9 (1987):18-26, reflects the sad state of affairs. As well, in an otherwise fine study, Siker's discussion of Abraham in James is rather underdeveloped (Disinheriting the Jews, pp.98-101). He essentially suggests that James is indebted to Jewish tradition for his use of Abraham, but uses Abraham in a context which presupposes the theology of Paulinist circles (p.101). This mid-way position is probably the most common one taken in contemporary scholarship and it has not developed much beyond Dibelius.

[79] See the discussion in Martin, James, pp.96-97. Dibelius argues that the pairing of Abraham and Rahab stems from Jewish lists of heroes of the faith (James, pp.166-67).

sibility that use of the examples in James 2 may indicate a traditional type of argument entirely explainable on the basis of Jewish/Christian tradition, and does not require borrowing from a Pauline context.

It is true that this above suggestion only accounts for the use of the Abraham tradition, and not its connection with faith/works. To draw the suggestion out further, there is no reason to discount the real possibility that the verbal similarities which appear may also have been mediated orally and based upon common tradition rather than being a mark of borrowing. The verbal agreements are so exact in some places (cf. Gal 2:16, Rom 3:28, Jm 2:24), however, that one is obviously dealing with a fairly well entrenched oral tradition. One interesting factor which points towards this understanding is the observation that James generally tends to use the article with nouns, but in the sections with Pauline parallels the writer lapses into an anarthrous style.[80] Soards, in fact, has suggested that in the entire section of James 2:14-26 the writer has lapsed into an anarthrous style much like Paul's. However, this is not accurate. What appears to be the case is that the only time that πίστις and ἔργα occur without the article together is when they are used in James 2:24; the parallel to Gal 2:16. In Jm 2:22, for instance,

---

[80] Soards, "The Early Christian Interpretation," p.24, has drawn attention to this.

the article is used twice with both πίστις and ἔργα. Of course, here particular works and faith are in mind (i.e., Abraham's), while in vs. 24 a more generic sense of πίστις and ἔργα is in view (i.e., humankind's in general). While this may weaken the argument somewhat (since one might expect anarthrous nouns in vs. 24), it is important to note that vs. 20, which is also generic, does have the articles, while ἔργα, which is definite in vs. 25, lacks the article (Ρααβ ἡ πορνη οὐκ ἐκ ἔργων...). All this is to say that the anarthrous usage in vs. 24 is distinctive in the larger context of James 2 and the letter, and may reflect the fact that the writer of James is citing a tradition which was known to him. That is, there was a preexistent tradition which went as follows: ὁρᾶτε ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον. The key connection was the use of πίστις and ἔργα with δικαιόω. The mediated tradition used these words in combination without the article. In light of this it is interesting to note that wherever πίστις and ἔργα are connected with δικαιόω either together or independently in James 2, the anarthrous noun is always used, as it is in Paul (cf. Jm 2:21, 24, 25).[81]

---

[81] The observation that the context of James 2 does not appear to contain a polemic against Paul, makes it less likely that the anarthorous style of James 2 is derived from Paul's use. As well, there is some evidence in the use of vocabularly in James 2 that the text does contain a certain amount of tradition, particularly in James 2:20,22,24 where

iii) In the epistle of James one finds many literary

connections with other early Christian writings.[82] These have

often been noticed, and in recent scholarship have not usual-

ly led to the assertion of dependence of James on the litera-

ture with which it has linguistic parallels (or vice versa):

it is generally held to be part of the phenomenon of shared

and common paraenesis and tradition in the early church.

Yet, while other linguistic parallels have not usually been

---

the formulae γνῶναι ὅτι and ὁρᾶτε ὅτι (and even possibly
βλέπεις ὅτι) appear to suggest the employment by the writer
of commonly recognized material (on this see Dean B. Deppe,
"The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James" [Ph. D. diss.,
Free University of Amsterdam, 1989], p.32).

[82] James has various literary connections with I Peter for
instance. See the treatment by P. Carrington, The Primitive
Christian Catechism (London: Cambridge University Press,
1940), esp. pp.23-65. For the linguistic connections between
James and I Clement, see F. W. Young, "The Relation of I
Clement to the Epistle of James," JBL 67 (1948):339-345;
between James and Hermas, see O. J. F. Seitz, "The Relation-
ship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James," JBL
63 (1944):131-140; between James and Matthew, see M. H. Shep-
herd, "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew," JBL
75 (1956):40-51; and C. N. Dillman, "A Study of Some
Theological and Literary Comparisons of the Gospel of Matthew
and the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., University of Edin-
burgh, 1978); and between James and the Jesus tradition, see
P. H. Davids, "James and Jesus," in Jesus Outside the Gospels,
pp.63-84; P. J. Hartin, "James and the Q Sermon on the Mount/
Plain," SBLSP (1989):440-457; P. J. Hartin, James and the Q
Sayings of Jesus, JSNTSup 47 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991),
pp. 140-217; Deppe, "The Sayings of Jesus;" and H. Koester,
Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development
(London/Philadelphia: SCM/TPI, 1990), pp.71-75.. For a full
list of the parallels between James and other New Testament
writings see the extensive list given by Joseph B. Mayor,
The Epistle of James (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1990
rpr.), pp.lxxxv-cix.

an issue in dating James, the Pauline ones have. This should

not be the case, however, for the parallels with Paul ought

to be treated no differently than the parallels with other

early Christian writings.[83]

iv) From the above points I suggest the following ten-

tative conclusion: both Paul and the writer of James indepen-

dently rest on a common tradition, which prior to either of

them had already connected πίστις and ἔργα with δικαιόω.

Pre-synoptic blocks of material were important for early

Christian writers such as Paul, and no doubt the writer of

James can be included here as well.[84] It is not hard to ima-

gine a pre-Pauline context for the tradition in James 2; for

---

[83]   An interesting example in this regard is the parallel
between James 1:2-4 and Romans 5:3-5 (cf. I Peter 1:6-7):
JM 1:2-4 Πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν πειρασμοῖς
περιπέσητε ποικιλοις, γινωσκοντες ὅτι τὸ δοκίμιον υμων της
πιστεως κατεργαζεται ὑπομονην.   η δε υπομονη εργον τελειον
ἐχέτω, ινα ητε τελειοι και ολοκληροι εν μηδενι λειπόμενοι.
RM 5:3-5 οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν,
εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργαζεται,   η δε υπομονη
δοκιμην, η δε δοκιμη ελπιδα.   η δε ελπις οὐ καταισχυνει, οτι
η αγαπη τοῦ θεοῦ εκκεχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ
πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν. The parallels evidenced
here include not only general paraenetic overlap, but also
some very specific extended linguistic parallels (such as Jm
2:3 and Rom 5:3b). Taking the further parallels of I Peter
1:6-7 into account, it is apparent that this particular paral-
lel is simply due to the nature of oral paraenetic tradition
(Luedemann agrees with this assessment, Opposition, p.141).
The fact that this occurs at least once in James should
alert the attentive scholar to the possibility of the same
phenomenon happening again in the epistle.

[84]   For this particular view as it relates to the Pauline
Epistles see D. C. Allison, "The Pauline Epistles and the
Synoptic Gospels."

instance, one could plausibly place it in the life and minis-
try of Jesus/early Christians, especially in his/their con-
flict with the scribes. The pre-synoptic unit of Mark 2:1-
3:6[85] or Matthew 23:13-36 would provide an excellent back-
ground for the connection of faith and works, and even though
in these examples that connection is not directly made, it
certainly could provide a framework for interpretation. If
this proves to be the case, it would then appear that James
is closer to the original context in the Jesus tradition, and
Paul has changed the saying in order to use it in his own
polemical context.[86]

If this particular argument is accurate, then the

---

[85] On Mark 2:16-3:6 as a pre-synoptic unit see the essay by
James D.G. Dunn, "Mark 2.1-3.6: A Bridge between Jesus and
Paul on the Question of the Law," in Jesus, Paul, and the
Law, pp.10-36.

[86] It may be important to note that in the gospel passages
cited a disparity is recognized between commitment to a
creedal expression of faith and a faith which encompasses
community concern. One of course can quickly land on the
slippery slope of traditional distorted Luther-like
categories of "faith" vs. "works," however, clearly a state-
ment such as ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ
ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν (Matt. 23:23) shows that at least some
first century Christians were recognizing categorical dis-
tinctions in this regard. This understanding reflected in
Matthew comes very close to James' view: πίστις is a work of
the law alongside justice and mercy. Thus, the negative use
of πίστις in James could easily be seen as a creedal expres-
sion of faith, one which lack expressed communal concern (on
the importance of communal concern in James R. B. Ward, "The
Communal Concern of the Epistle of James" [Ph. D. diss., Har-
vard University, 1966]). Clearly faith in the sense used
here is defined from James' community perspective, and is not
always consonant with Paul's use of the same terminology.

alleged anti-Paulinism in James 2 does not exist, and it
cannot provide a basis for dating James, or for interpreting
the content of the letter.[87]

The conclusion of this first section is that one cannot
use the linguistic parallels between Paul and James in order
to date the latter. Viewed in conjunction with the remarks

---

[87] One should also mention the discussion by Andreas Lin-
demann in this connection. In his book Paulus im ältesten
Christentum, BHT 58 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1979), pp.240-
252, Lindemann makes a fairly extensive argument for James'
opposition to Pauline theology. His conclusion is that
> Der Vf des Jak hat Paulus durchaus verstanden.
> Gerade deshalb protestiert er gegen die paulinische
> Theologie. Er tut dies nicht im Namen des Juden-
> christentums, nicht im Namen einer "Gesetzes-
> frömmigheit". Sondern er tut es im Namen einer
> weisheitliche orientierten christlichen "Religion"
> (p.250).
His discussion is followed quite closely by Luedemann, but
neither author, in my view, essentially overturns the ar-
guments presented here. Lindemann adopts a fairly standard
German approach to James as originating in the Diaspora at a
late date under wisdom influences. He identifies James 2:14-
26 as the "theologische Zentrum" of the letter (p.240), which
by no means is completely clear. Rather, the section seems
to be one paraenetic element set in among several others;
that is, one aspect of community instruction among others.
As well, Lindemann adopts the standard view that James is
directing this polemic against a circle in which Pauline
theology was "undisputed:" "...zur Zeit der Abfassung des Jak
ganz offensichtlich kirchliche Kreise gab, in denen die
paulinische Theologie im wesentlichen unumstritten war"
(p.251). However, as we argued previously, the section
under scrutiny is directed not at another community but the
author's own. This being the case, one would have to argue
that the author's own community was standing within the
Pauline tradition or coming under Pauline influence. Yet,the
real issue in the passage concerned is not the intrusion of a
foreign theology, but the lack of community concern for other
members of the community. It is hardly clear from the pas-
sage that some community members are actually condoning their
actions through the use of Pauline theology.

made in the earlier section, it is clear that neither the
language of the epistle nor its alleged anti-Paulinism are
sufficient grounds upon which to date and place the letter.
Evidence for its date and setting must be sought elsewhere.
Since these modern scholarly assumptions often control the
reading of the epistle, it has been necessary to undercut
some of them before proceeding to the second chapter of this
thesis. In the coming section, a similar task will be under-
taken, namely, to examine some assumptions which have con-
trolled the way in which the content and framework of James
have been understood and interpreted.

B.   The Framework and Content of James

1.   James and Hellenistic/Palestinian Christianity

The old religionsgeschichtliche school's distinction
between a Hellenistic and a Palestinian Judaism/Christianity
was quite influential in modern biblical studies up until
recently.[88] With the publication of Hengel's magisterial

---

[88]   There are many studies which have utilized this under-
standing of Judaism in the study of the New Testament period.
One good representative example from older scholarship would
be Wilhelm Bousset. He maintained, as have many, that in
regards to Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism "die Unter-
schiede sind mannigfach und tief" (Die Religion des Judentums
im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter, 3rd. ed., rev. Hugo Gress-
mann [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926], p.432).

studies on the subject however,[89] the older distinction between Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism has been brought into question. Hengel's position is essentially that Hellenistic language and culture permeated Palestine to the degree that modern scholars cannot legitimately distinguish between theologically and culturally different Judaisms, but must recognize that all Judaism after Alexander (and certainly in post-Maccabean times) was "hellenized." Thus, though one can maintain geographic distinctions between Diasporic and Palestinian Judaism, one should be wary about making other distinctions between these two phenomena.[90] The other factor which has contributed to the decline of the older theory was the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the impetus they gave, at least as far as modern scholarship is concerned, toward increasing recognition of the complexity of Judaism in Palestine in the first century C.E. It is ap-

---

[89] Besides the studies by Hengel already mentioned, see Jews, Greeks and Barbarians: Aspects of Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).

[90] For a brief discussion (including some minor criticisms) of Hengel's thesis see Lester L. Grabbe, Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian: Volume One: The Persian and Greek Periods (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992) pp.148-153. For Grabbe's own discussion of Jews and Hellenization see pp.147-170. In essence Grabbe does not differ greatly from Hengel's proposals, though he believes that Hengel has over emphasized the thoroughness of Hellenization in all quarters. For a more vehement attack on Hengel's theory see L. H. Feldman, "Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism in Retrospect," JBL 96 (1977):371-382; and "How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine," HUCA 57 (1986):83-111.

parent that one cannot speak of a single Jewish monolith at the time of the New Testament, but must speak of various Jewish sects and varieties of Judaism.[91]

In the context of the older distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity, the Christian faith was viewed as having been given its strongest theological thrust

---

[91] A good case study in the diversity of various Jewish groups (both in Palestine and abroad) is the book Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era, eds. J. Neusner, W. S. Green, & E. Frerichs (Cambridge University Press, 1987), which examines different Jewish views of the Messiah and clearly demonstrates the lack of uniformity in practice and belief.

This more recent shift in understanding early Judaism was furthered by the various studies of Jacob Neusner. He was able to show that the orthodox consolidation under the rabbis was essentially a post-70 C.E. phenomenon, and could not be read back into the period prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. In his From Politics to Piety, 2nd ed. (New York: KTAV, 1979), Neusner undercut the long standing assumption that knowledge of the Pharisees could be derived from the literature of the later period. Essentially what this resulted in was a restructuring of pre-70 Judaism in the mind of modern scholarship. What has become apparent is that the assumption that the monolith of a rabbinic or proto-rabbinic structure was the basis for Palestinian Judaism in New Testament times is patently false. The Jewish phenomenon before 70 C.E. was much more diverse and complex then the older paradigms allowed. For a further discussion on the use of rabbinic sources for reconstruction of Judaism see J. Neusner, "The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100," ANRW 2.19/2, pp.4-16.

One should also note that even after 70 C.E., with the consolidation of Judaism under the rabbis, the actual situation was, in practice, as diverse and complex as before 70 C.E. For instance, the observations on the role of superstition and magic by M. Simon clearly challenge the view that even after 70 C.E. there existed a Jewish monolith which controlled the expression of Judaism (see Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (AD 135-425), trans. H. McKeating (Oxford University Press, 1986), pp.339-368.

in the Hellenistic sphere. Since this led to a different

type of Christianity than in Palestine, scholars set out to

compare the Christianity (and Judaism) of the Hellenistic

world with the larger framework of Hellenistic thought, life,

and religion.[92] On this model Paul became the "hellenizer" of

the primitive Palestinian Christian faith.[93] As well, the

important innovations which led toward the worship of Jesus

of Nazareth were all made on predominantly Gentile Hellenis-

tic soil.[94] Hengel attempted to undercut the assumptions

involved in this distinction between different types of

Christianities, itself based upon the assumption that there

existed two basic types of Judaisms.[95] However, the fate of

---

[92] For excellent insight into this larger process of com-
paring Christianity with religions of late antiquity see the
study by Jonathan Z. Smith, Drudgery Divine (Chicago: The
University of Chicago Press, 1990).

[93] See the important essay by E. R. Goodenough (with A. T.
Kraabel), "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity," in
Religions in Antiquity, ed. J. Neusner (Leiden: E. J. Brill,
1968), pp.23-68. For a more recent discussion see Hyam Mac-
coby, Paul and Hellenism (London/Philadelphia: SCM/TPI,
1991).

[94] See the classic expression of this view by W. Bousset,
Kyrios Christos, trans. J. E. Steely (Nashville: Abingdon
Press, 1970). For a critique of Bousset's theory see L. W.
Hurtado, "New Testament Christology: A Critique of Bousset's
Influence," TS 40 (1979):306-317. The recent study of Chris-
tology by Maurice Casey, From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God
(Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), appears to
continue this basic tradition of interpretation.

[95] The views which were developed regarding Christianity were
essentially based upon prior ones pertaining to Judaism. The
religionsgeschichtliche approach to Judaism, in essence,
viewed Palestine Judaism as reflecting rabbinic perspectives
and Hellenistic Judaism as a fairly unified system of belief

the letter of James in contemporary research demonstrates
that the residual affects of the religionsgeschichtliche
approach to early Christianity are still being felt.

Dibelius set the trend for modern scholarship by
situating the letter of James in the context of the Hel-
lenized Jewish synagogue of the Diaspora. One of the stron-
gest reasons for doing so, according to Dibelius, was that
James evinced an approach to the law which was non-
ritualistic in nature.[96] In suggesting this, Dibelius was
relying upon the older religionsgeschichtliche assumption
that Christianity developed out of a Diaspora Judaism which
was already moving in the direction which Christianity would
later take. Bousset gave classic expression to this view:

> Christianity is Diaspora-Judaism become universal,
> freed of all its limitations, but it is also
> Diaspora-Judaism in spite of the removal of its
> limitations. It continues the development which

---

and practice which was deeply influenced by the larger con-
text of Hellenistic life and thought. Goodenough gave ex-
pression to one form of this understanding of Judaism wherein
Hellenistic Judaism was profoundly influenced by the mystery
religions. In this view the Judaism of the Diaspora was
qualitatively distinct from the Palestinian expression (and
in the way it was conceived, it also had remarkable
similarities to Pauline Christianity!). Goodenough believed
that all Jews of the Diaspora shared the same essential
religious outlook, one which was expressed most adequately
and definitively by Philo. On Goodenough's thesis see Gary
Lease, "Jewish Mystery Cults since Goodenough," ANRW 2.20/2,
pp.864-868. The impact and residue of Goodenough is still
apparent in modern scholarship, as is evident by the recent
essay by David M. Hay, "The Psychology of Faith in Hel-
lenistic Judaism," ANRW 2.20/2, pp.881-925, which clearly
builds upon Goodenough's work.

[96] See James, pp.17-18,117-120.

had already successfully begun in Diaspora-Judaism,
in the same direction. It developed into the
religion of monotheism....of the spiritual morality
free from all particular obligatory character and
from all ritual essence, of belief in responsibility
and retribution after death, of confidence in the
sin-forgiving divine mercy, of worship in spirit and
in truth.[97]

This quote is important for understanding contemporary Jame-
sian research because it clearly reveals several assumptions
which have been central.

First of all, and most importantly, James' view of the
law has been seen as evidence that James originated in the
Diaspora. The older religionsgeschichtliche scholarship
understood the Judaism of the Diaspora to have adopted a less
ritualistic approach to the law, particularly because the
Jews of the Hellenistic world were intensely interested in
propagandizing the Gentiles.[98] Thus, these Jews, unlike the
ones in Palestine (i.e., the rabbinic type), were willing to
emphasize the "moral" aspects of the law over the "ritual"

---

[97] Kyrios Christos, p.369. On p.367 Bousset identifies James
as one work which clearly belongs to this Diaspora Jewish
synagogue background.

[98] On the phenomenon of Jewish propaganda literature and
technique, see the older study by E. Norden, Agnostos Theos
(Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956 rpr.),
pp.125-140, where he examines the Areopagas speech in the
context of "hellenische und jüdisch-christliche missions-
predigt;" and the more recent study by D. Sänger, "Jüdische-
hellenistische Missionsliteratur und die Weisheit," Kairos 23
(1981):231-243. While both these studies cover specific
texts, they accurately present an overall picture of the
phenomenon and its emphases.

54

elements.[99]   Thus, a key assumption which has influenced much

[99]   The importance of the view that there was a Jewish mis-
sionary activity among the gentiles of the Hellenistic world
should not be underestimated.   It has had a profound impact
on the understanding of much early Christian material (par-
ticularly the Pauline letters, James, and the Haustafelen in
the New Testament).   G. Klein's study, Der älteste Christ-
liche Katechismus und die jüdische Propaganda-Literatur (Ber-
lin, 1909), was particularly central in establishing this
view.   The understanding was that much of early Christian
paraenesis resulted from catechesis given to new Christians,
and that this was modeled and dependent upon the Jewish pro-
paganda literature.   Since much of the so-called Jewish "pro-
paganda literature" was understood as emphasizing the "moral
law," Christianity, it was argued, obviously took over its
keen moral concerns from this environment.   This understan-
ding of early Christian paraenesis became popular in the
English-speaking sphere through several important works, of
which two are particularly noteworthy: P. Carrington, The
Primitive Christian Catechism; and James E. Crouch, The Ori-
gin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel (Göttingen:
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), esp. pp.84-101, where he out-
lines the Jewish emphasis on "Noachian law" and its relation
to Jewish propaganda among Gentiles.   It is generally held
that the most important materials for understanding the pro-
paganda literature were the works of Philo, Josephus, and a
pseudepigraphic work entitled Pseudo-Phocylides.   On the
latter interesting work see the text and commentary in P. W.
van der Horst, The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides (Leiden: E.
J. Brill, 1978); and on its relation to James see van der
Horst, "Pseudo-Phocylides and the New Testament," ZNW 69
(1978):202.   The recent studies by Peter Borgen demonstrate
that the notion that Christianity was deeply influenced by
Jewish Hellenistic synagogue propaganda is still well entren-
ched in modern scholarship: see "The Early Church and the
Hellenistic Synagogue," in Philo, John and Paul: New Perspec-
tives on Judaism and Early Christianity, BJS 131 (Atlanta:
Scholar's Press, 1987), pp.207-232; and "Catalogues of Vices,
the Apostolic Decree, and the Jerusalem Meeting," in The So-
cial World of Formative Christianity and Judaism, pp.126-141.
   The connection between Jewish propaganda and early
Christianity in the Hellenistic world has extended itself
into the whole discussion of the role of the "God-fearer" in
early Christianity and Judaism.   See J. J. Collins, "A Symbol
of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Cen-
tury," in "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians,
Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity, eds. J. Neusner & E. S.
Frerichs (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), pp.163-186.   The
"god-fearer" becomes an important example of one who commits
him/herself to Judaism on the basis of a less rigorous view
of the law.

Jamesian scholarship is that law of Judaism was stripped of its ritual character laying bear its moral demands,[100] and that the epistle of James must be understood in this framework.[101]

---

[100]   Or, as Bousset has stated, Kyrios Christos, pp.371-372: Christianity appears in the comprehensive and classical formulation as 'the new law' which yet is actually the old one. This old law, in its proper exposition and stripped of its external and ceremonial nature, which however is actually only an apparent understanding and a misunderstanding and which rests upon a false interpretation of the wording; yet again the new law, the royal commandment of love, the perfect law of liberty.
In this scheme Christianity "perfects the tendency of the Jewish Diaspora with its demand for a genuine morality that is free from all particularism and all ritual."

[101]   There are of course many studies which one could cite which assume that James' use of the phrases νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας or νόμος βασιλικός refers to the moral law. For e.g. see O. J. F. Seitz, "James and the Law," SE 2/TU 87 (1964): 472-486; and Wolfgang Schrage, The Ethics of the New-Testament, trans. D. E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp.280-293. It is interesting that in J. T. Sanders' book on ethics in the New Testament (Ethics, pp.123-128), he rejects the ethics of Jesus and Paul as valid for contemporary Christians, but argues that the ethics of James with its "humanistic" thrust, clearly provides a biblical theological model for today. Underlying this is obviously an understanding of the letter which is greatly influenced by assumptions regarding James and the moral law. A further study on James and the law, which is equally important, is Luke T. Johnson's "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the letter of James," JBL 101 (1982):391-401. In this article he adequately demonstrates that in the letter of James there are at least seven verses of Lev 19 which appear to form the basis for certain key sections of the epistle. What makes this important is that Johnson has argued that Pseudo-Phocylides also uses Lev 19 in a similar manner. Now Johnson does not make any explicit connections between James, Pseudo-Phocylides, and Jewish propaganda literature, but it should be noted that in Lev 17-18 the Hebrew word גר is translated by the LXX as προσήλυτος, and since clearly, in the larger context, the προσήλυτος belongs τῇ συναγωγῇ τῶν υἱῶν Ισραηλ (19:2), Lev 19 could be viewed as an extension of the rules for "proselytes" in Lev 17-18. It is this point which has

Thus, there has been a distinct trajectory in contemporary research which has interpreted James in light of Hellenistic Judaism. In this view, the moral law was primary for Hellenistic Jews, while the Palestinian Jews were primarily "legalists," or at least oriented toward law-observance in some form.[102] As well, on the basis of geography the older religionsgeschichtliche approach was able to interpret

---

reinforced views which suggest that the Jews of the Hellenistic world were interested in providing moral aspects of the law which "proselytes" could adopt. This particular connection has been left out of Johnson's study, but obviously could add to the view that James fits within the larger corpus of Hellenistic Jewish propaganda literature, especially since it might appear to some that James has adopted the levitical moral code applicable to proselytes and abandoned the ritual aspects of the law. For more discussion on James and the law see Hubert Frankemölle, "Gesetz im Jakobusbrief: Zur Tradition, kontextuellen Verwendung und Rezeption eines belasteten Begriffes," in Das Gesetz im Neuen Testament, ed. Karl Kertelge (Freiburg: Herder, 1986), pp.175-221.

[102] In a recent essay in his book Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity, WUNT 60 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992), Daniel R. Schwartz argues that "Hellenism...by socializing, spiritualizing, relativizing and establishing an otherworldly ideal of perfection, encouraged the abandonment of the observance of Jewish law" (p.19). This indicates that in recent scholarship this understanding of Hellenistic Judaism is still prevalent. Schwartz also argues, however, that the Qumran group also undermined observance to the law with a similar outcome to that in Diasporic Judaism (see pp. 19-24). This appears to be untenable however for while Schwartz is correct in noticing certain tensions in the Qumran approach to the law, he undoubtedly errs in attempting to understand Qumran legal interpretation and practice without reference to their own symbolic worldview. He fails to work within the framework of their own hermeneutical foci, and fails to take account of the differences in hermeneutic interpretation from one Qumran genre to another (on these two issues see Daniel Patte, Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine, SBLDS 22 [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975], pp.271-308).

the themes of James in light of Hellenistic ones (particular-
ly Stoic and Hellenistic Jewish). From this point it was a

short step to affirm that James lacks the particularly

apocalyptic flavor of much Palestinian literature and,

hence, the sapiential character of James is clearly a mark of

its Hellenistic roots, as opposed to an apocalyptic character

which would be a mark of a Palestinian provenance.[103]   It is

---

[103]   This geographical distinction between sapiential and
apocalyptic has been influential until recently. Outside of
a few exceptions (e.g., Ben Sira which is a wisdom writing
born on Palestinian soil), works in which sapiential themes
predominate have been relegated to the Diaspora, and works in
which "apocalyptic" themes are in the forefront have been
given Palestinian provenance. Sänger's study illustrates
this point, since he explicitly connects "altjüdischer Weis-
heitstheologie" with Hellenistic Jewish propaganda literature
(Joseph and Aseneth). While it is true that Bousset recog-
nized that Hellenistic Christian literature did contain
apocalyptic-like themes (Bousset, Kyrios, pp.372-373), it was
never viewed as primary, nor anything which deserved much
attention. As well, for Bousset Paul was the model of Hel-
lenistic Christianity, and it is expressly in Paul that one
finds the least amount of the "fantastic Jewish apocalyptic,"
or so Bousset argued (p.372). Thus, the geographical dis-
tinction between wisdom and apocalyptic, does, for the most
part, hold up. The recent study by Stevan Davies, "The
Christology and Protology," demonstrates that these ideas are
far from dead as his statements on the Gospel of Thomas sug-
gest:
    ...Thomas derives from Hellenistic Judaism, which,
    or course, derived principal ideas from the broad
    wisdom tradition...Then the Gospel of Thomas would
    be a text of christianized Hellenistic Judaism,
    sharing with such authors as Philo and Aristobulus
    various principal themes and approaches...The Gospel
    of Thomas is to Christian Hellenistic Judaism what Q
    is to Christian apocalyptic Judaism (p.682).
Davies comments make it tacitly clear that he makes some form
of distinction between wisdom and apocalyptic on geographical
grounds, and he by no means is to be singled out as an excep-
tion in this regard.

clear, then, that this particular understanding of James has

led to a certain approach toward the entire framework of the

letter: James is understood in light of a proposed pattern of

Hellenistic Jewish concerns.

However, there are several serious flaws with this ap-

proach. First of all, the studies by Hengel have clearly

gone far in eliminating the older religionsgeschichtliche

distinction between a Palestinian and a Hellenistic Judaism.[104]

Recently, with the new theories on the primacy of the
sapiential stratum of Q, it is apparent that the older dis-
tinction is slowly breaking down, since in this view the
document Q has a Palestinian origin and is dominated by a
layer which is heavily inundated with sapiential themes in
its formative layer.

[104] In essence, it has been argued time and time again that
concerns, which had in the past been relegated to one type of
Judaism or the other, do in fact intersect to a great degree.
There are many examples to which one could point to illus-
trate this assertion. For instance, even something as
seemingly remote from the traditions of Palestine as the
synagogue of Dura-Europas, clearly has many affinities with
Jewish rabbinic and Jewish pseudepigraphic works of Pales-
tine. See the discussion by Rachel Wischinitzer, The Mes-
sianic Theme in the Paintings of the Dura Synagogue (Univer-
sity of Chicago Press, 1948), contra Hay, "Psychology of
Faith," pp.913-920, who is likely wrong in his assertion that
the paintings of Dura-Europas are a psychological/symbolic
representation of the philosophy of Philo and other Hellenis-
tic Jews. Also, M. Hengel, in a recent essay, has shown that
messianic expectations were not limited to Palestinian soil,
but could flourish in Hellenistic lands and lead to similar
results as in Palestine; see his "Messianische Hoffnung und
politischer 'Radikalismus' in der 'jüdisch-hellenistischen
Diaspora': Zur Frage der Voraussetzungen des jüdischen Auf-
standes unter Trajan 115-117 n. Chr.," in Apocalypticism in
the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. David Hell-
holm (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983), pp.655-686. Likewise,
distinctive Hellenistic themes could be found on Palestinian
soil (cf. Hengel, "Qumran und der Hellenismus").

Secondly, in regards to modern scholarly understanding of law in the Jewish Diaspora, it is markedly colored by false (and often theologically motivated) views of first-century Jewish relation to the law.[105] There is a great deal of evidence to suggest that Diaspora Jews were every bit as concerned to uphold the full extent of the law as were Palestinian Jews.[106]

---

[105] The view, in essence, is that Jewish religion in Palestine was based on a legalistic works-righteousness. In the older religionsgeschichtliche school's framework there was a need to provide a grounding for early Christianity which was not legalistic in its piety. This foundation came from viewing Christianity as having originated from Hellenistic Judaism which adopted, in the mind of modern scholarship, a less legalistic stance towards the law. For an excellent summary of older views on Jewish "work-righteousness" and the law see E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, pp.33-59. Any view which suggests that one can make a distinction between the moral law and the ritual law in the first century among Jews, clearly distorts the place and function of the law in early Judaism. Emphasizing what one could call "moral" aspects of the law in no way implies a lack of emphasis on "ritual" observance. For the most part, this dichotomy is one of modern making.

[106] For discussion of this see E. P. Sanders' study of purity, food and offerings in the Greek speaking diaspora, Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah, (London/Philadelphia: SCM/TPI, 1990), pp.255-308. His comment on p.270 is apropos: "the Diaspora Jews, like the Pharisees, wished to do what the law required, as best as they could, and more." Also see his various comments regarding practice and belief in the Diaspora in Judaism: Practice & Belief 63 BCE-66 CE, (London/Philadelphia: SCM/TPI, 1992), pp.47-303. This is not to suggest that there were not some obvious differences between the two due to the fact that Diaspora Jews did not have access to the temple as frequently as Palestinian Jews. There were certainly different patterns of religion among the two groups, which is supported by the studies of Jack N. Lightstone, The Commerce of the Sacred: Mediation of the Divine among Jews in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora, BJS 59 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984); as well as A. T. Kraabel, "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora Synagogues," in The Synagogue in Late Antiquity, ed. L. I. Levine (Philadelphia: American

As well, there is no evidence to suggest that they ever dis-
tinguished between a moral and a ritual law, as Christian
writers appear to have done later.[107] Thirdly, while the exis-
tence of God-fearers in the Jewish synagogues is not usually
held in question,[108] there is a great deal of doubt about an

---

Schools of Oriental Research, 1987), pp.49-60. These scholars
have demonstrated that Diasporic Jewry did have slightly
different patterns of religion given their context outside
Palestine. However, this does not imply that they rejected
Judaic legal precepts. The framework may have been dif-
ferent, but not necessarily the substance. It should thus be
stressed that different patterns of social organization and
mediation of the divine do not necessarily lead to sharp
differences between Hellenistic and Palestinian Jewry.
    On the religious life of Diasporic Judaism also see the
remarks by Fergus Millar, in The History of the Jewish People
in the Age of Jesus Christ, III.1, rev. ed., eds. G. Vermes,
F. Millar & M. Goodman (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1986), pp.138-
149.

[107] Sanders, Jewish Law, p.271, rightly points out that so-
called moral injunctions were every bit a part of of the
"ritual" law as were purity and food obligations. The in-
junctions of Lev 19 (which are also important for James!)
were all outward manifestations of the command to "love one's
neighbor as oneself (Lev 19:18b)." Later Gentile Christian
writers could separate moral law from ritual, as is evident
by the time the Epistle of Barnabas is written, but this is
not an internal Jewish development. Even in Philo, who of
the remaining literary evidence, seems to have come closest
to what appears in Barnabas, there is never any doubt that
one should maintain and practice the literal meaning of the
law (even though he is given to allegorizing and symbolizing
the same law). On this dual nature of Philo's interpretation
see Yehoshua Amir, "Authority and Interpretation of Scripture
in the Writings of Philo," in Mikra, CIRNT II.1 (Assen/
Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1988), pp.444-452.

[108] On the question of "God-fearers" in the New Testament
period see the discussion by Fergus Millar, The History, pp.
150-176. The term σεβομενοι θεον or φοβουμενοι τον θεον
occurs in both Josephus and Acts. It also occurs in several
inscriptions, the most undisputed of which is the Aphrodisias
inscription (see the discussion of this inscription in ibid.,

61

active Jewish propaganda movement among the Gentiles of the
Hellenistic world.[109] Consequently, some of the current em-
phasis on a Judaism of the Diaspora which focused on the
moral law in their propaganda appears to be riddled with
unfounded assumptions which really owes more to the older
religionsgeschichtliche approach, than to careful analysis of
historical context.[110]

---

pp.25-26; and the publication of it in J. Reynolds & R. F.
Tannenbaum, Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias, CPSSV [Cam-
bridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987]). For a dis-
senting view see A. T. Kraabel, "The Disappearance of the
God-fearers," Numen 28 (1981):113-126; and "The God-fearers
Meet the Beloved Disciple," in The Future of Early Chris-
tianity, pp.276-284.

[109] For a thorough treatment of the issue see the study by
Scot McKnight, A Light Among the Gentiles (Minneapolis: For-
tress Press, 1991).

[110] Another factor which comes into play in this regard is the
literature to which scholars refer in their interpretation of
Hellenistic Judaism. Hellenistic religion is usually, as in
the case with Goodenough, interpreted through the literary
remains of writers like Philo. What needs to be asked, how-
ever, is the relevance of the literature of Philo for recon-
structing religious practice at large among Jews in the Dias-
pora. Schwartz follows this same approach since he recon-
structs the impact of Hellenism on Jewish law observance
through Philo and Aristobulus, Pseudo-Aristeas, etc... The
question begs to be asked whether the literary texts of Hel-
lenistic Judaism reflect the practice and belief of the ma-
jority of Jews. For, as Ramsay MacMullen (Paganism in the
Roman Empire [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981],
pp.67-72) has pointed out, there was often real disparity
between what the minority elite of Greco-Roman society be-
lieved and presented, and the popular culture at large, es-
pecially in the period in which most of the Hellenistic
Jewish literature originates. There were real divergencies
separating the upper and lower classes, and Philo et al.
certainly reflect the upper class literary elite (who, in-
deed, may have tended to blend in more within the Hellenistic
framework than those lower on the scale. I Maccabees certain-

From the foregoing discussion several points should be clear: 1) The fact that James 2:8 speaks of a νόμος βασιλικός which is epitomized in the dictum ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν, and that James makes no reference to the so-called ritual aspects of the law, in no way implies that the writer of the work and/or his readers did not follow the Jewish law (including the so-called ritualistic aspects).[111] In fact, lack of explicit references to law observance means little either way. Consequently, one cannot

---

ly leaves one with such an impression). However, since the literary evidence from among the lower classes is almost non-existent and inscriptional evidence often difficult to identify, one is often forced to read the literary works of the time with an eye to what they reflect about the popular culture of the period in question (Aron Gurevich, Medieval Popular Culture, trans. J. M. Bak & P. A. Hollingsworth [Cambridge University Press, 1988], pp.1-38, has outlined this approach in regards to late Latin literature). Unfortunately, however, men like Philo were singularly uninterested in the common Judaism of the period, and no doubt embarrassed by much of it. Thus, one might have more luck with an analysis of a text such as Joseph and Aseneth then with the Philonic corpus itself.

[111] In this connection one could mention the ambiguity of the use of the Jewish law in Paul. In places he appears to reject the law, in other places he appears to have little problem with its observance. Generally, it appears he opposed the use of the law among converted Gentiles, but did not quarrel with its use among Jewish Christians. For a well textured discussion of Paul and the Law see Peter J. Tomson, Paul and the JewishLaw. It is clear that the role of the law in Paul's thought is quite complex and variegated, and this should provide a model for understanding the role of the law as a whole among Jewish people in Second Temple Judaism: there existed a variety of different responses, interpretations, and practices regarding the law among Judaism of the period, none of which were primarily geographically determined.

place James in the realm of the Hellenistic Diaspora on this basis. As well, one must be wary of reading the framework of the epistle in this light. 2) The attempt to situate the letter cannot be done merely on the basis of themes which appear to be Hellenistic or themes which appear to be Palestinian.[112] As well, simplistic distinctions between a Hellenistic piety and a Palestinian one need to be dropped. The phenomenon of Judaism was, in fact, much more complex in the first century. 3) In general, the hypothesis that James originated in the Hellenistic Jewish diaspora out of a synagogue setting must be abandoned until it can be substantiated on firmer grounds. To a certain degree this view is circular in nature,[113] and it places the letter of James in a framework which distorts the overall structure of the letter. For instance, the eschatology of the letter, while acknowledged,[114]

---

[112] P. H. Davids, for instance, has intimated that the setting for James is Palestine based on his study of the Judaic character of the book, especially Judaic traditions which were prevalent in Palestinian literature (e.g., the Qumran documents and rabbinic material). See his "Themes in the Epistle of James that are Judaistic in Character" (Ph. D. diss., University of Manchester, 1978).

[113] The logic seems to follow thus: a) James has Hellenistic themes (e.g., emphasis on moral law) therefore it must belong to the Diaspora. b) Since James belongs to a Hellenistic Jewish setting, the themes in the letter must be Hellenistic in nature. Clearly one does not know what are Hellenistic themes unless one has previously separated a Hellenistic corpus, but one of the common ways of doing this is through the analysis of common themes.

[i] Cf. Dibelius, _James_, p.49.

is seldom viewed as the controlling factor in the letter. Rather, one often gets the impression that the eschatology is an intrusion into the general framework of the epistle. Thus, the framework which was established under the older views on the distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity/Judaism needs to be abandoned. This means that current study on James will have to analyze the letter with a keen eye to the larger complexities surrounding first century Judaism and Christianity.

2. Wisdom and Eschatology in Early Christianity and James

Beginning with James M. Robinson's study, published in English in 1971,[115] and followed by Richard Edwards' study on Q in the mid-1970's,[116] the problem of relating prophetic, sapiential, and eschatological themes in the literature of earliest Christianity has become a central focus. With the publication of Kloppenborg's The Formation of Q, it has become more and more commonplace to suggest that the formative strata of Q was sapiential, while the apocalyptic or eschatological layer(s) came later.[117] Thus, a plethora of studies

---

[115] "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q," in Trajectories, pp. 70-113.

[116] A Theology of Q (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976).

[117] See Robinson, "The Q Trajectory," for a summary of research. Besides Robinson's "LOGOI SOPHON," just as foundational for contemporary study of Q is the work of Dieter Lührmann, Die Redaktion der Logienquelle, WMANT 33 (Neukir-

have been published in recent times which stress the impor-
tance of the sapiential nature of earliest Christianity as
reflected in Q.[118] Besides stressing the formative role of the
sapiential layer, modern scholars have also stressed that the
eschatological emphasis of Q is highly symbolic[119] and subor-

---

chen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969). Lührmann was among the
first to attempt a systematic separation of the redactional
layers in Q. His argument was that the apocalyptic judgment
on Israel is the Q redactional focus. As well, Lührmann was
one of the first to recognize that the sapiential themes may
have formed a layer in Q development which stood nearest and
prior to the redactional level of Q (though Lührmann's treat-
ment is by no means as systematic or as well developed as
Kloppenborg's). For further discussion on the redaction of Q
in current scholarship see F. Neirynck, "Recent Developments
in the Study of Q," in Logia, ed. Joël Delobel (Leuven:
Leuven University Press, 1982), pp.54-74; and Kloppenborg,
Formation of Q, pp.89-262.

[118] Besides the studies already mentioned consult R. A. Piper,
Wisdom in the Q-tradition: The Aphoristic Teachings of Jesus,
SNTSMS 61 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989);
Jacobson, The First Gospel, pp.77-183 ; and M. Jack Suggs,
Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel (Cambridge:
Harvard University Press, 1970), esp. pp.5-29.

[119] See Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology," where he asserts
that while Q lacks an apocalyptic eschatology, it does con-
tain symbolic eschatology, wherein eschatology primarily
functions as a "servant of an ethic of anti-structure and a
tool for boundary definition" (p.306). Essentially, then,
eschatology functions within the wisdom framework of Q and
helps mutate the wisdom framework in a particular direction.
In this view, it appears, the eschatological additions at the
redactional·level of Q were intended to be symbolic, or at
least, within the larger wisdom framework of Q, they neces-
sitate a symbolic interpretation. It is difficult to deter-
mine for certain, but it seems that Charles E. Carlston,
"Wisdom and Eschatology in Q," in Logia, pp.101-119, rep-
resents a similar, but perhaps more reserved version, of this
thesis. He argues that wisdom materials are shaped in an
eschatological direction, and rejects a radical disjunction
between wisdom and apocalyptic (cf. p.113). However, in the
final analysis it appears that he too would fit into a

dinated to the wisdom elements.[120] All of this has obvious
implications for understanding the origin and development of
early Christianity. As well, it also sets up certain para-
digms for interpreting early Christian texts.[121]

The study of wisdom and eschatology in Q and early
Christianity has obvious consequences for this study of
James. The themes which intertwine themselves in Q also
appear in a similar manner in James and it has become common-
place to suggest that James ought to be viewed as a wisdom
document, one which fits wholly within a sapiential frame-
work. Comments like this one are not uncommon: "Der
Jakobusbrief bleibt mit seiner Theologie ganz im Rahmen des
ihm vorgegebenen weisheitlichen Horizontes."[122] These comments

---

similar camp as Kloppenborg on this issue: the eschatology
still appears to exist within a wisdom framework. On this
also see the essay by R. Jeske, "Wisdom and the Future in the
Teaching of Jesus," Dialog 11 (1972):108-117.

[120] There are exceptions to this particular scheme. Some
noted ones are the two essays cited earlier by Horsley,
"Questions about Redactional Strata," and "Logoi Propheton?;"
Migaku Sato, Q und Prophetie; M. Eugene Boring, Sayings
of the Risen Jesus, SNTSMS 46 (Cambridge University Press,
1982), pp.137-182; Boring, The Continuing Voice of Jesus,
(Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), pp.191-234; David
R. Catchpole, "The Beginning of Q: A Proposal," NTS 38
(1992):205-221; and Catchpole's forthcoming study, The Quest
for Q (Edinburgh: T & T Clark). These studies, each in their
own way, emphasize a prophetic framework for Q as opposed to
a sapiential one.

[121] For further comments on the modern study of Q and early
Christianity see "excursus two."

[122] Ulrich Luck, "Der Jakobusbrief und die Theologie des
Paulus," TGI 61 (1971):179. It should be noted that the
primacy of the sapiential layer in Q is unrelated to this

clearly speak for a majority of scholars who take quotations

from Old Testament wisdom literature and so-called stock

wisdom vocabulary and motifs as indication of the framework

of James.[123] It is apparent, however, that the same problem

exists in James as in Q: how does one relate the sapiential

themes to the eschatological/prophetic ones.[124] Clearly, with

regards to both Q and James, a reexamination of wisdom and

eschatology in the sphere of early Christianity is needed.[125]

---

view on James. That is, the perspective and approach to
James as "wisdom" did not develop out of studies on Q. How-
ever, they are related in that the intersection of es-
chatology and wisdom in James parallels that of Q. Con-
sequently, in the larger investigation of early Christian
literature, both Q and James provide important insight into
the structure of early Christian teaching.

[123] On James as a wisdom writing see Rudolf Hoppe, Der
theologische Hintergrund des Jakobusbriefes, FzB 28
(Würzburg: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977); C. H. Felder, "Wis-
dom, Law and Social Concern in the Epistle of James" (Ph. D.
diss., Columbia University, 1982); B. R. Halson, "The Epistle
of James: 'Christian Wisdom?'," SE 4/TU 102 (1968):308-314;
Ernst Baasland, "Der Jakobusbrief als Neutestamentliche Weis-
heitsschrift," ST 36 (1982):119-139; and M. I. Webber,
"'Iakobos Ho Dikaios'," pp.1-40. A somewhat different ap-
proach is taken by G. Boccaccini, Middle Judaism: Jewish
Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press,
1991), pp.213-228 (esp.221-222), who views James as being a
product of a wisdom trajectory in early Christianity/Judaism,
in contrast to Paul who lies on an apocalyptic trajectory
(the main basis for this distinction is their perspective
views of the origin of human evil and freedom; James presents
a wisdom understanding of evil and freedom and Paul an apoca-
lyptic one).

[124] The recent monograph by Patrick J. Hartin, James and the
Q Sayings Jesus, deals with this particular problem in its
research into the relationship between Q and James. His
suggestions will not be taken up in the main body of this
paper, but see "excursus three" for further discussion.

[125] It should be mentioned that there are several studies

In anticipation of the following chapters of this thesis, a few comments will be made in regard to this issue which looms large in New Testament study.

1)First of all, one of the main issues to address is the difference this discussion makes. That is, what are the consequences for the understanding of James (or Q) if it is said that a sapiential or an eschatological framework control the content of the document. The answer is simple: it makes all the difference for interpretation. Both James and Q are unique in that their controlling frameworks are not readily perceivable. Thus, in the case of James, it is difficult to know how to interpret certain texts. In a recent book, Alan

---

which have explicitly or implicitly challenged the main current of Jamesian studies. These have made connections between James and apocalyptic/eschatological themes. Robert W. Wall has written an important article which in many ways prefigures much of our own research on James, though it is hoped that chapter two of this thesis will be able to fill out the eschatological context of James in a little more detail (see "James as Apocalyptic Paraenesis," RestQ 32 [1990]:11-22). Others have recognized the eschatological import of James, but have failed to develop it systematically (such as L. G. Perdue, "Paraenesis and the Epistle of James," ZNW 72 [1981]: 252; and Mußner, Jakobusbrief, pp.209-211). There are also several studies which, on the basis of themes and motifs, connect James to apocalyptic traditions (or traditions which are at least present in apocalyptic writings among other texts). On this see Davids, "Themes in the Epistle of James," and D. L. Beck, "The Composition of the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1973). The latter work connects James very closely with 1QS from Qumran; in fact, it suggests that James had access to the Vorlage of 1QS. For a discussion of further parallels between James and the Dead Sea Scrolls see H. Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament, Vol I (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966), pp.278-282.

P. Winton has provided an excellent basis for comparison
between the two types of frameworks.[126]   If one examines the
various uses of the reversal motif of exaltation and humilia-
tion in the biblical and extra-biblical literature, one is
astounded by the variety of contexts in which it occurs. For
instance, the reversal motif occurs in Isa 2:11, Sirach 7:11
(and Prov 12:2), I Enoch 48:8, Lk 1:51-53, and in James 1:9-
11 (to name a few). Winton does not mention this fact, but
there are also rabbinic parallels to the reversal motif in
the form of the "wheel of fortune."[127]   The problem is thus:
how does one understand the reversal motif in each particular
context.   In the prophetic literature it is clearly connected
with the coming eschatological "Day of the Lord." In the
wisdom and rabbinic literature it deals with an every day
context in which one's fortunes may change by the hand of the
Almighty if one does not conduct oneself properly. Given
this data, how is one to understand the reversal motif in
other documents, like Luke and James, which possess less
explicit frameworks? In these cases it is clear that one
must examine the larger contexts of the documents to deter-

---

[126]   The Proverbs of Jesus: Issues of History and Rhetoric,
JSNTSup 35 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), pp.87-98.
[127]   For relevant texts see F. X. Kelly, "Poor and Rich in the
Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., Temple University, 1973),
pp.145-151.

mine the horizon in which the reveral motif occurs.[128]   What is

apparent, in other words, is that the larger framework of a

document is crucial for relating the wisdom, prophetic, and

eschatological themes together.[129]   It is also important to

note that there are major distinctions between a wisdom

framework and an eschatological one.[130]

---

[128]   Winton suggests that the occurrence of reversal in James
takes place in the context of "theological wisdom" and not
eschatology (p.93).   As well, he advises against a hasty
attribution of the reversal motif in the Synoptics to es-
chatology.   He suggests the motif of reversal is theocentric,
and not primarily eschatological.   As far as Luke is con-
cerned, J. O. York's study suggests that the reversal motif
in Luke is essentially connected to Luke's eschatology since
for Luke present and future are inseparably linked: The Last
Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke, JSNTSup 46
(Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp.162-163, 182-184.   As will
be argued shortly in chapter two, the context in James ap-
pears to be eschatological as well (contra Winton; cf.
Mußner, Jakobusbrief, p.74).   For a most interesting treat-
ment of the development of the reversal motif in relation to
eschatology see the study by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Resurrec-
tion, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental
Judaism, HTS 26 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972).

[129]   Further examples of interpretive problems related to this
question of framework could be culled from James.   One par-
ticularly striking one is the so-called "testing tradition"
in James 1:2.   The same theme occurs again in I Peter 1:6-7
and also has a resemblance to motifs in I Cor 3:10-15.   It is
interesting to note that similar concepts appear in Wisd 3:6,
Sir 2:2-6, Mal 3:3, Zech 13:9, and 1QH 5:15-16 (for further
parallels, including Greek ones, see David Winston, The Wis-
dom of Solomon, AB [New York: Doubleday, 1979], p.128).   The
wisdom frameworks, such as Sirach, clearly point toward a
this-worldly understanding of testing and being proved, while
the context of I Cor 3 is clearly eschatological in thrust.
The Wisdom of Solomon passage appears to be similar to James:
this-worldly testing brought into a close connection with
God's eschatological judgment (cf. Mußner, Jakobusbrief,
pp.65-67).

[130]   A wisdom framework tends to be open to the world, able to

---

2) Secondly, there are several aspects of the relation between wisdom and apocalyptic/eschatological motifs in Second Temple literature which need to be mentioned in brief. a) There was, in the so-called apocalyptic texts of the period, a particular affinity for wisdom themes and motifs which were appropriated and intermingled with eschatological concerns.[131] In this context wisdom is the eschatological gift

rely on creation for knowledge, and able to derive maxims for life in the world. So, for instance, in the case of reading a wisdom framework in Q, one would end up with a picture similar to Guenther's, "The Sayings Gospel Q," where the Q parables emphasize "the reward of a secure this-worldly life" (p.67), and the Jesus of the chreiai is a moral sage more concerned with "immanence" than "imminence" (p.64).

   An eschatological framework tends to be more closed to the world, unable to rely on creation and so must rely on revelation from God, and is essentially other-worldly in focus (this present life is always lived in light of the coming judgment).

[131] There are several important studies which deal with the role of wisdom in apocalyptic/eschatological works: R. A. Coughenour, "Enoch and Wisdom: A Case Study of the Wisdom Elements in the Book of Enoch" (Ph. D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1972); E. E. Johnson, The Function of Apocalyptic and Wisdom Traditions in Romans 9-11, SBLDS 109 (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1989), esp. pp.55-109 (a chapter in which she compares the "confluence of apocalyptic and wisdom traditions in early Jewish literature"); E. J. Schnabel, Wisdom and Law from Ben Sira to Paul, WUNT 2.16 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985). Schnabel's chapter on I Enoch is particularly illuminating (cf. pp.100-112), especially the observation that the sections of I Enoch which date to the second century BCE contain only rare allusions to wisdom themes, whereas those sections clearly written in the first century BCE (I Enoch 91-105; 37-71) contain many more references to wisdom. As well, his chapter on Qumran and wisdom is very helpful (pp. 190-226). Also see J. J. Collins, "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age," HR 17 (1977):121-142, however his article is less helpful since he insists on separating wisdom and apocalyptic writings into distinct camps, which, in the

to the elect and forms the basis of their revealed knowledge

---

case of Wisdom of Solomon, is difficult to do. As well, J.
E. Worrell, "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls" (Ph.
D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968), is of particular
note, as are his following comments:
> Terms and forms which had their original Sitz im
> Leben among the teaching sages became the common
> property of an era. Many were categorically re-
> employed for specific ends by particularists of a
> multiformity of persuasions...[Qumran was one of
> the] movements which were based in the activities
> and motifs of the general wisdom tradition but which
> departed from its characteristic structural
> aphorism, taking on fixed institutional or literary
> forms. Elements of these outgrowths are to be found
> in the structures and substructure of such widely
> disparate expressions as apocalypticism, Torah
> Judaism, the synagogue school, the Pauline
> parenesis, the Gnostic sophia myth...the fundamental
> approach of what has been erroneously dubbed the
> "wisdom movement" stretches into indeterminable
> antiquity, and it is interwoven into the very fabric
> of semitic awareness (pp. 386-388).

For a dissenting opinion on the importance of wisdom at Qum-
ran see W. L. Lipscomb & J. A. Sanders, "Wisdom at Qumran,"
in Israelite Wisdom, eds. J. G. Gammie et al. (Scholars
Press, 1978), pp.277-285. What the authors appear to be
arguing is essentially that wisdom at Qumran is unlike that
found in the Jewish sapiential literature. However, it is
difficult to see how this contradicts the views expressed in
the above literature, since there is general agreement that
wisdom in eschatological works is expressed and functions
differently than it does in sapiential writings. The example
of 4Q185 is applicable here. While it does evince very close
parallels to traditional wisdom instruction and admonition,
it also has clear apocalyptic/eschatological influences (a
"confluence" to be more precise). On this text see Thomas H.
Tobin, "4Q185 and Jewish Wisdom Literature," in Of Scribes
and Scrolls, eds. H. W. Attridge, J. J. Collins, & T. H.
Tobin (Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), pp.145-52.
    The association and confluence of apocalyptic and
sapiential (mantic) themes in Daniel is also telling in this
regard. At the time of the final redaction of the work, it
was apparent to the editors/writers that the wise figure of
Daniel was by no means incompatible with apocalyptic themes
and images (on Daniel and apocalyptic see J. J. Collins, The
Apocalyptic Imagination [New York: Crossroad, 1984],
pp.68-92).

of God and his plan to which only those with "wisdom" are privy.[132] As well, further connections exist in that within the eschatological messianic expectations there were often associations between the "coming one" and wisdom.[133] Overall, then, one can suggest that wisdom themes and concepts have intermingled with eschatological ones to form a syncretism of ideas, and that wisdom elements are an important part of the larger framework of eschatological/apocalyptic texts. For the origins of this phenomenon one need look no

---

[132] Cf. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity," in "To See Ourselves as Others See Us", pp.73-91. Cf. also I Enoch 5:7-9:
> But to the elect shall be light, joy, and peace, and they shall inherit the earth....and then wisdom will be given to the elect. And they shall all live and not return again to sin, either by being wicked or through pride; but those who have wisdom shall be humble and not return again to sin (trans., OTP).

[133] See G. Schimanowski, Weisheit und Messias, WUNT 2.17 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985); and the excellent essay by Martin Hengel, "Jesus als Messianischer Lehrer der Weisheit und die Anfänge der Christologie," in Sagesse et Religion (Presses Universitaires de France, 1979), pp.147-188. On p.169 he makes the following comment: "Als notwenige Konsequenz ergibt sich daraus, daß gerade der messianische Herrscher und endzeitlicher Richter als Geistträger kat' exochän zugleich auch als ein Exponent göttlicher Weisheit erscheinen muß." Also see the brief comments by F. W. Burnett, The Testament of Jesus-Sophia (Washington: University Press of America, 1981), pp.371-375.

further than the hellenism of the Near East.[134] [135]

b) In the New Testament and early Judaism there is no evidence for a unified wisdom tradition upon which the individual writers could draw. Hermann von Lips, in his exhaustive study of wisdom traditions in the New Testament and their background (Weisheitliche Traditionen in Neuen Testament), argues several cogent points: i) In early Judaism, wisdom and various other traditions (halakic, apocalyptic,

---

[134] The origins of "apocalyptic" has been a hotly debated issue. In recent times it has been linked to either biblical prophecy (see the most recent treatment of this by James C. Vanderkam, "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought," in A Word in Season, pp.163-176), to biblical wisdom (see the classic expression by G. von Rad, Wisdom in Israel [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972], pp.263-283), or to a combination of both of these in the form of so-called "mantic wisdom" (J. J. Collins, "The Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," JBL 94 [1975]:218-234). It is doubtful, however, whether it is at all possible to trace the roots back into the biblical period. Rather, it is best to view apocalyptic/eschatological texts as a new manifestation in the Second Temple period, which, nonetheless, had antecedents in post-exilic biblical literature.

[135] To this discussion should be added the recent work of Margaret Barker, The Older Testament (London: SPCK, 1987). Her work is one of the most novel approaches to the understanding of wisdom and eschatology in Intertestamental literature in recent times. Her treatment of the wisdom themes in I Enoch is most helpful (pp.8-80), and she makes several important connections between the angel mythology of Enoch, the role of pride, and the understanding of revealed wisdom. Her discussion on wisdom (pp.81-103) in the larger horizon of Second Temple literature, the New Testament, and the Hebrew Bible, should also be noted. While the success of her endeavor to trace these themes back to the royal cult of ancient Israel is still open to debate, she certainly has brought to the forefront many interesting points, and one in particular with which I find agreement: the "most likely idea of wisdom to underlie the New Testament is that of the Enoch tradition" (p.99).

prophetic) interact with each other, and the whole complex of
their relation is a "wechselseitiges Phänomen." One can thus
not speak of a "einlinige Entwicklung" of the wisdom tra-
dition. ii) In the case of Q (and arguably other early
Christian texts), the coming together of various traditions
makes it difficult to identify the controlling tradition or
the one which has the "vorrangige Bedeutung" for the docu-
ment. Even if one considers just the wisdom elements, it is
still a complex situation. For instance, in the case of the
teaching of Jesus one has streams of sapiential traditions
from the Hebrew Bible, from early Judaism, and also from
"Volks- und Sippenweisheit." With James, the case is
similar. It can thus be difficult to identify which type of
wisdom is primary for the framework of the document, or if
any of them are primary at all. In the case of James, while
there are several streams of wisdom which have been appro-
priated by the letter, von Lips is reticent, correctly in my
view, to simply identify James with "wisdom."[136] iii) In

---

[136] For references see pp.188,226,257,431-432,458. It should
also be noted that while von Lips' overall study is excel-
lent, there are some problems with his conclusions. For
instance, while he does recognize that Q has an "apoka-
lyptisch geprägter weishetilicher Überlieferungen" (p.466),
he tacitly takes up Bousset/Dibelius' position on James and
asserts that the letter belongs to Hellenistic Diaspora
Judaism and maintains that: "da die gesetzeskritische Ein-
stellung von diesem Zweig des Christentums ausging, liegt
hier die Aufnahme weisheitlicher Tradition besonders nahe"
(p.466). Von Lips has essentially affirmed the older re-
ligionsgeschichtliche division between theology on Hellenis-

general, then, one must be wary of speaking of a wisdom tra-
dition in the New Testament. There was no single monolithic
wisdom tradition upon which to draw, but there existed a
multifarious smorgasbord of wisdom streams - everything from
the speculative wisdom of Philo, to folk and popular wisdom,
to the biblical wisdom traditions, to the wisdom traditions
stemming from the circles of Ben Sira, to those stemming from
the circles of I Enoch and Qumran. Any given document of the
period could mix and match these various traditions in a
variety of ways. Thus, to speak of wisdom and sapiential
themes in the New Testament and early Judaism is to invoke
several streams of tradition at once.

c) Some time ago R. E. Clements made several perceptive
comments on the nature of wisdom genres.[137] His basic point
was to suggest that certain forms of speech such as apho-
risms, proverbs, riddles, admonitions, etc... could not be
used to pinpoint a particular setting in life of the material
since these forms would be significantly widespread enough in
any culture to have several settings in which they could be
used. As well, he pointed out that certain so-called wisdom

---

tic soil (which, as in the case of James, is nearer to wis-
dom) and theology on Palestinian ground (which, as in the
case of Q, is formed within an apocalyptic horizon). Von
Lips also fails to treat fully and adequately the relation
between wisdom and eschatology which is clearly an issue for
both Q and James.

[137] See his excellent discussion in Prophecy and Tradition
(Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1975), pp.73-86.

features are simply standard rhetoric utilized by a variety
of traditions and are not in themselves content-specific, and
that vocabulary and themes in a given document are often
determined by the particular situation being addressed.[138] Now
it is true that certain forms may predominate in certain
types of literature, but that is often solely a reflection of
the fact that particular literature tends to draw from a
tradition of standard forms. For instance, in didactic works
one would naturally expect admonitions or "Mahnsprüche,"[139] and
these will naturally carry the "ring" of sapiential themes.
Von Lips has made a similar observation by asserting that
many of the wisdom motifs in the sayings/teachings of Jesus

---

[138] Thus, confusion results because scholars fail to recognize
that certain forms are not the sole or even main property of
one specific genre of literature. One particular example of
confusion is the use of the war oracle in Isaiah. J. W.
Whedbee, in his study Isaiah and Wisdom (Nashville: Abingdon
Press, 1971), evinces the problem. He suggested that Isaiah
had come under wisdom influence due to the predominance of
oracles, admonitions, proverbs, parables, and other didactic
forms. However, Whedbee, and many other scholars who have
pursued this avenue of inquiry, have missed the basic point
that the woe oracle is not the sole property of the wisdom
tradition. R. A. Coughenour commits somewhat of the same
fallacy in regards to I Enoch when he insists that the woe
oracles are a wisdom component of compilation (see "The Woe
Oracles in Ethiopic Enoch," JSJ 9 [1978]:192-197). What
these scholars fail to recognize is that certain forms are
not content-specific.

[139] It should thus be no surprise to find, for instance, ad-
monitions in the Synoptic didactic segments (on these see the
study by Dieter Zeller, Die weisheitliche Mahnsprüche bei
den Synoptikern, 2nd ed., FzB 17 [Würzburg: Katholische
Bibelwerk, 1983]). However, the mere presence of these forms
does not make Q a wisdom document.

come through the use of illustrations, references to ex-
perience, and analogical thought.[140] Yet, this is exactly what
one would expect in such a context of teaching(that is, re-
ferences to experience and comparison are natural and will
carry the "ring" of sapiential tradition). So, to pursue one
example of the implications of this, it thus is somewhat
tautologous to assert, for instance, that since admonitions
or references to experience are found in Q/James, Q/James
must be wisdom documents, for it rests on an a priori asso-
ciation of admonitions or references to experience with wis-
dom. This point clearly calls into question the designation
of Q and James as wisdom documents based on their respective
uses of so-called wisdom forms.[141] Simply because Q, for in-
stance, contains numerous aphorisms and admonitions,[142] does
not thereby imply that it belongs to a tradition of "sayings
of the wise."[143] Prophets such as "Isaiah" as well as apoca-

---

[140] Cf. Weisheitliche Traditionen, pp.225,254.

[141] Cf. Hartin, James and the Q Sayings, pp.44-80.

[142] On the use of basic wisdom forms in the teaching of Jesus
see Charles E. Carlston, "Proverbs, Maxims, and the His-
torical Jesus," JBL 99 (1980):87-105.

[143] In the case of Q it may well be a "sayings collection,"
but to add "of the wise" is to impose an interpretive frame-
work on the document which may not be substantiated from the
larger context. "Wisdom" is a content designation, not
necessarily a generic category.
     It appears that the understanding of paraenesis in James
suffers from similar generic confusion. A recent study on
the genre of paraenesis connects it with wisdom literature:
John G. Gammie, "Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology
of a Secondary Genre," Semeia 50 (1990):41-77. He has set up

lypticists such as "Enoch" also used admonitions, aphorisms, appeals to experience, etc... The point is that the presence or lack of certain so-called wisdom forms has no bearing on the larger interpretive framework of a document. This larger framework must be decided upon independently from the forms which make up that work, forms which themselves are not content or genre specific. Ultimately, when one speaks of genre in the case of Q and James, one must do so keeping in mind the interrelation of forms in the works. Thus, "community instruction" or "didactic document" are clearly more appropriate than "sapiential collection." The latter only describes forms and content (and this only loosely), while the former describe form, content and function.[144]

---

a paradigm of understanding paraenesis which makes it a sub-genre of wisdom literature (the primary genre). Apocalyptic literature, as a sub-genre of prophetic literature, contains exhortations, but is not viewed as containing any distinct forms of paraenesis such as precepts or maxims. However, it should be noted that the mere presence of maxims or precepts in any given work does not necessarily mean it is a wisdom document or that it belongs to a wisdom genre. What is primary for any document is the framework or context of the precept, maxim, exhortation or admonition.

[144] This appears to be the direction which Horsley is heading in his essay, "Logoi Propheton?." This whole discussion seriously questions the legitimacy of analyzing redactional layers in Q. While one can certainly make a formal distinction between an admonition, proverb, and parable, it is less certain that one can make redactional distinctions on the basis of formal analysis. As well, it is clearly the overall framework of a document which allows one to distinguish between an eschatological admonition and a sapiential one. The problem is that the content of many admonitions and proverbs are somewhat ambiguous unless one has an overarching framework in which to make sense of them. This aspect was discus-

In conclusion, then, the relations of apocalyptic/prophetic/eschatological and sapiential themes in early Christianity and Judaism is clearly a complex issue. Simple and simplistic designations of a text as a "wisdom" or "eschatological" or "prophetic" document must be abandoned, as should the simple designation of a text on the basis of particular forms. Rather, the whole framework of the document must come into the discussion in such analysis. As far as James is concerned, this has not been done adequately and thus the generic classification of the epistle has suffered. Rather than examining the framework first, particular units and segments of the text have been allowed to determine the overall framework of the epistle, rather than vice versa. This study is intended as a partial corrective to this problem, for the argument is that the framework is what defines and determines the sapiential and eschatological content.

In this chapter several caveats were summarized which have provided certain obstacles to the study of James in the past. In the first part particular factors affecting the dating and in part the setting of James have been examined (i.e., language of the letter and the so-called anti-

---

sed earlier in relation to the reversal motif. For another example compare Q 12:2-3 ("the hidden will be revealed"). This text could either have a sapiential interpretation or an eschatological one and so it is therefore necessary to interpret it within the overall framework in which it appears in Q.

Paulinism). These issues, at least implicitly, also affect the understanding and interpretation of the framework of the letter since they place a priori expectations on the content and thrust of the text. In the second section two other factors were examined which clearly affect how the framework of the letter is understood (i.e., James in the context of Hellenism, and the relation of wisdom and eschatological motifs). In the next chapter an examination of the eschatological framework of James will be undertaken. This will be followed by the third chapter which will examine the way in which the eschatological framework controls how the mid-section of James is read, and how this example of "community instruction" relates synchronically to other early Christian and Jewish texts.

Excursus One: Apocalyptic in Early Christianity and Judaism

For the purposes of this paper the term apocalyptic needs to be elucidated in its relation to eschatology. Where it is possible I have substituted "eschatology" for "apocalyptic," and have used the former term only when the discussion of contemporary literature necessitates it. It is my view that the term "apocalyptic" is riddled with problems as currently utilized, and it is questionable whether it is of much further use in scholarly discussion since it means many different things to different scholars. Traditional treatments of apocalyptic may be found in Klaus Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic (London: SCM, 1972), pp.18-35; D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964), pp.205-390; and Lars Hartman, Prophecy Interpreted, CBNS (Lund: GWK Gleerup, 1966), pp.23-101. The approach of these works was to list features of apocalyptic and to find works which would correspond in content to the lists. Besides the problem that this method is patently circular, and the fact that the older studies did not include all the aspects which are now included in current definitions of apocalyptic, the main problem with this method of defining apocalyptic is that, often, for a work to be considered apocalyptic, it needs to have all or most of the features listed. Thus, if a document contains eschatology but lacks the typical apocalyptic features of anomie before the end of time and a list of warnings which will precede the end, one would not label this document as apocalyptic (this is illustrated by John S. Kloppenborg, "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q," HTR 80 [1987]:287-306, where he refrains from labelling Q as apocalyptic for this reason). However, what was not often realized was that the paradigm of apocalyptic in its classic usage was an amalgamation and it never existed in a pure form in any one document. Rather, it marked a range of possible ideas which would manifest itself variously in different settings, time periods, and cultures throughout the Near East in the period of the Hellenistic era.

With the publication of P. D. Hanson's essay on "Apocalypticism" in IDBSup there was an attempt to define more precisely terms such as apocalyptic, apocalypse, and apocalypticism. This was followed soon after by the now famous SBL Apocalypse Seminar which published its research in Semeia 14 (1979). The introduction by J. J. Collins, "Towards the Morphology of a Genre," pp.1-20, set the tone for modern discussion on the subject. The definition of apocalypse which was adopted (p.9), however, was so imprecise as to fit much of the literature of the period, many documents of which were not, at least clearly, similar to the others. As well,

the use and definition of the term apocalyptic as both a noun and an adjective was left open to debate. Also, the entire approach placed an etic generic framework on the literature, and failed to grasp the fuller emic dynamics at work within the culture. Apocalyptic by nature was eclectic and syncretistic (a child of its time), and incorporated sapiential, prophetic, historical, legal and other similar motifs. This naturally complicates simple generic discussion.

Recent studies on "apocalyptic" have taken scholarly discussion further away from the original use of the term. Amid notable critiques of older and more recent definitions and approaches to apocalyptic (cf. P. R. Davies, "Qumran and Apocalyptic or Obscurum per Obscurius," and Robert L. Webb, "'Apocalyptic': Observations on a Slippery Term," in JNES 49 [1990]:115-134), have surfaced some new and innovative approaches to understanding apocalyptic. Noteworthy works are I. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), pp.3-72, who emphasizes the mystical side of apocalyptic; and Christopher Rowland, The Open Heaven (London: SPCK, 1982), pp.9-189, who stresses a fairly complex definition in which every apocalyptic aspect is related to the disclosure of heavenly mysteries. Neither of these recent studies would deny the importance of eschatology, but would view it as only one aspect of a much larger phenomenon of the revelation of heavenly secrets. On the other hand, E. P. Sanders has proffered an essentialist definition which stresses apocalyptic genre as "the combination of revelation with the promise of restoration and reversal;" a combination of the older emphasis with the newer one ("The Genre of Palestinian Apocalypses," in Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East, ed. David Hellholm [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983], p.458).

While the actual definition of the term apocalyptic is still open to question (see the relevant comments by Webb, "'Apocalyptic,'"), there are some aspects of its use which are fairly clear. The essence of apocalyptic literature and themes is clearly eschatological in some sense. It goes beyond mere end-time judgment, however, to include the whole spectrum of themes from anomie, historical review, to messianism, and anything else which deals with the future unraveling of God's kingdom, his present dominion over the earth, and the implications of this larger paradigm for human existence in the present. It even includes reflection on creation, for as Hermann Gunkel has shown, eschatology is intimately related to protology (see his Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921], esp. pp.171-398). Inseparably tied in with this is an emphasis on revelation, for without a doubt the key terms ἀποκάλυψις/ἀποκαλύπτω relate closely to the revelation and disclosure of either supernatural secrets

or eschatological events (see BADG, p. 92; as well as the more detailed discussion on the meaning of these terms in Morton Smith, "On the History of 'Apokalypto' and 'Apokalypsis'," in Apocalypticism, pp.9-20). Thus, what distinguishes apocalyptic from prophetic or wisdom is not so much the content and themes of its message, but rather its interpretive framework. The message is shaped by the belief that God has revealed to select communities and individuals a vision of what is to come. What is important is not so much the vision itself, but the fact that this vision infuses the present with meaning, and allows those people to interpret their present in light of the future through the combinations of historical detail, symbol and myth. The nature of apocalyptic is thus a combination of the revelatory and the historical aspects: "it is not only the revelation of the purpose of God in history...it is also the denouement of the nature and purpose of God in that consummation" (John Gray, The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979], p.227). In the final analysis, however, apocalyptic is simply a specific type of eschatological system; a framework which is a bastard child of the Hellenistic environment: apocalyptic is a combination of different traditions and themes from prophetic, wisdom, mantic, historical, legal and other types of material originating in both Jewish and other Near Eastern environs. What makes apocalyptic a genre of literature is that there was an identifiable continuity of method, interpretation, and themes tied to a specific historical period and context (N. T. Wright, The New Testament and the People of God [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992], pp.244-338, has an excellent discussion of the relation of so-called apocalyptic themes and motifs to the larger historical context of Second Temple Judaism). After 135 C.E. for Judaism, and after the second century for Christianity, true apocalyptic literature could no longer exist since the hermeneutical fusing of method, themes, and context had changed to the point where the literature ceased to exist in continuity with the past. This view departs from previous ones in several respects. Crucial is its attachment to historical context and to particular themes used within a revelatory context which itself is loosely defined. Thus, so-called "gnostic apocalypses" (on this see G. W. MacRae, "Apocalyptic Eschatology in Gnosticism," in Apocalypticism, pp.317-325) are apocalyptic only to the degree they stand in continuity with traditional Jewish/Christian apocalyptic. On the other hand, Greco-Roman "apocalypses" (on this see H. D. Betz, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre in Greek and Hellenistic Literature: The Case of the Oracle of Trophonius," Apocalypticism, pp.577-597) are certainly revelatory literature, but they do not belong to the genre of literature which biblical scholars label as apocalyptic. This is really not

so far off from the manner in which genre questions entered
biblical studies to begin with. The point was always to
learn more about a unit of literature through comparison with
other similar types. Form-critical study of the royal
psalms, for instance, was always most effective when carried
out against the backdrop of other biblical and Near Eastern
royal psalms reflecting similar interpretive frameworks.
Genre discussion of Mark's gospel is always most productive
when carried out against the foil of possible influences on
Mark. All these discussions in their own way have acknow-
ledged that particular themes, methods, and interpretive
frameworks are always tied to specific historical contexts
and frameworks of interpretation. There are of course ante-
cedents to any genre, but these are distinct from the actual
genre. For instance, the Babylonian and Akkadian kingship
prophecies may provide important influences on formative
apocalyptic literature (see the discussion by G. Hasel, "The
Four World Empires of Daniel 2 Against Its Near Eastern En-
vironment," JSOT 12 [1979]:17-30), but by no means could they
themselves be considered as belonging to the identifiable
literature we know as apocalyptic.

   In short then, the use of the term eschatological
cannot really replace apocalyptic. While the latter is
focused on eschatology and is a subset of it, eschatology
itself is a more general category. Unfortunately, contem-
porary scholarship has often used the terms interchangeably
and thus has confused the issues even further (cf. David
Aune, in a recent essay "Eschatology (Early Christian)," ABD,
Vol. 2, pp.594-609, suggests that "when applied to early
Christianity, the terms eschatology and apocalypticism are
essentially synonymous, since there is no aspect of cosmic
eschatology that cannot also be considered an aspect of
apocalypticism, apart from the imminent expectation of the
end" [p.595]). In this thesis the term eschatological
refers to the larger end-time scheme witnessed to in the New
Testament and early Judaism. It is used in this thesis to
represent the whole complex of themes and motifs which are
present in the literature of the Second Temple Period, and
which in a general way relate to eschatological hopes and
expectations and the wider implications of these as they
relate not only to the future, but also the past and present
as well: life as viewed under the shadow of a future, im-
minent divine judgment on the wicked and reward for the
righteous. Thus, the understanding of New Testament es-
chatology in this thesis places the phenomena very close to
the interpretive framework of apocalyptic writings and their
eschatology. But while it has much in common with the
apocalyptic writings, the New Testament incorporates and
fuses together a variety of different genres. For instance,
the eschatology of the New Testament, by and large, is cen-

tral to its faith expression. The central confession of early Christianity, the death and resurrection of Jesus, was interpreted within an eschatological framework as the eschatological event sine qua non (see Dale C. Allison, The End of the Ages Has Come [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985], p.141). However, while this eschatological expression borrows many themes and itself partakes partially in the interpretive framework of the apocalyptic literature, indeed living and breathing in the environ of apocalyptic, the eschatology diverges in significant ways. For one thing, it draws upon other sources such as classical biblical prophecy and eschatologizes many prophetic passages to a much greater degree than the apocalyptic literature does (in this way it is closer to the framework of the Qumran community than to the apocalyptic literature proper). As well, the unique emphasis on Jesus as the Christ and the centrality of this for the incipient faith clearly had a mutating affect of its eschatological framework.

These observations obviously indicate that the eschatology of the period was not monolithic. For instance, alongside the eschatology of the apocalyptic texts one has the eschatological framework of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (on this see the excellent discussion by Anders Hultgård, L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches, 2 Vols. AUUHR 6, 7 [Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int., 1977, 1981]). This framework has a particular emphasis on the sin-exile-return paradigm and the Levi-Judah scheme which is placed in an eschatological interpretive framework (cf. M. de Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints," ANRW 2.20/1, esp. pp.398-405). Also, the role of the covenant formulary in the eschatology of the Second Temple period has been outlined in detail by Klaus Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary. In short, the nature of eschatology in the period was diverse and any particular community or group may indicate influences in their eschatology from a variety of sources. Viewed in this light both the Qumran community and the various New Testament communities represent a combination of several different eschatological frameworks, neither of which are purely apocalyptic. Qumran, for example, is not an apocalyptic community; it is a community which evinces an eschatology in the apocalyptic tradition, but also mutated by other traditions (on the eschatology of Qumran see Lawrence H. Schiffman, The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls, SBLMS 38 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989]). As well, in the New Testament the eschatologies are also diverse. Revelation is a combination of prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology (on the nature of eschatology in Revelation see the discussions by A. Yarbro Collins, The Combat Myth in the Book of Revelation, HDR 9 [Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976];

and the various essays in Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, The
Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment [Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1985]). The Gospel of Luke represents an
admixture of various influences (see the excellent discussion
by A. J. Mattill, Luke and the Last Things [Dillsboro: Wes-
tern North Carolina Press, 1979], for a discussion of the
various dimensions of Lukan eschatology; and see David P.
Moessner, Lord of the Banquet [Minneapolis: Fortress Press,
1989], for a discussion of the prophetic, particularly
deuteronomic, framework of Lukan thought). Thus, the es-
chatology of any particular New Testament writing must be
examined in detail in order to more fully elucidate what is
intended by its particular eschatological understanding. These
observations consequently move us beyond simplistic and less
cautionary designations of New Testament eschatology, and
hopefully indicate the great complexity that exists in
delineating any eschatological framework within the period of
Second Temple Judaism.

In using eschatological instead of apocalyptic it is
hoped that the meaning will be less ambiguous, and more in
line with what is, in this thesis, viewed as the fundamental
nature of apocalyptic. It is doubtless that writings which
have traditionally been labelled apocalyptic do not share
common eschatological themes, and it is not implied in this
thesis that there is a singular paradigm for understanding
eschatology in the period. Just as there are many Judaisms
and many types and expressions of Messianic expectations,
there are also many different eschatologies among the Jewish
writings of the Second Temple Period. The suggestion is,
however, that there is a group of literature in which escha-
tological emphasis was primary. In light of the framework
developed above, it is suggested that groups like Qumran and
those behind I Enoch and Jubilees (and the New Testament for
that matter) can be viewed as differing expressions of a
larger eschatological phenomenon. It is true that almost all
literature of the period will have some eschatological as-
pect, but one can clearly distinguish between literature in
which this is primary (e.g., I Enoch) and literature in which
this is secondary (e.g., Ben Sira; on the relation of Ben
Sira to eschatological themes see James D. Martin, "Ben Sira
- A Child of His Time," in A Word in Season, pp.141-161).
Naturally there will be literature over which there will be
some debate as to the primacy of the eschatological themes.
Indeed, this thesis is written to answer the debate about the
place of eschatology in James, whether it is primary and
formative or simply one aspect of the larger received tra-
dition of the writer of the letter. It is suggested, how-
ever, that to some degree or another in all early Christian
literature an eschatological framework looms large in the
horizon. As the movement solidified in the second century

the eschatology became more a product of tradition and more symbolic and it became less central to the interpretive framework of Christianity as Christianity itself became less at home in one strand of eschatology: apocalyptic. As well, as the early Christian framework met other interpretive frameworks it mutated and transformed. Thus, the eschatology of the Gospel of Thomas is clearly something different than that of the writings of the New Testament (though some such as James Robinson have argued otherwise, the difference is clearly noted by Wright, The New Testament, p.443). Eschatology in the Gospel of Thomas, in its present framework, is vertical rather than horizontal; that is, life is lived under the revelation of secret knowledge rather than imminent judgment. It is this vertical eschatology which several recent New Testament scholars wish to read into documents such as Q. This further confuses the issues since what is meant by eschatology in this vertical understanding is patently different from the traditional understanding of eschatology.

Excursus Two: Theology and New Testament Criticism

There is a strong historical and theological undercurrent which has been formative in modern scholarship's emphasis on the wisdom teachings of Jesus and its movement away from emphasis on the eschatological context of Jesus' life and death. Historically, Walter Bauer's study Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity opened up the possibility that other early Christian documents, which were later viewed as heretical, may have actually been the orthodox ones at an earlier time. Bauer's historical view provided one important impetus for the theological emphasis which attempted to "save" Jesus from apocalyptic (on this see Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic, pp.57-97, who has discussed the history of continental scholarship's attempt to save Jesus from the apocalyptic mode in which Albert Schweitzer had definitively cast him). There is no doubt that the fountainhead of this movement was Rudolf Bultmann, who in his History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. J. Marsh (Harper & Row, 1963), pp.69-108, treated Jesus as the wisdom teacher par excellence. The tendency already existed in Bultmann to suggest that Jesus himself coined many of the wisdom logia (p.101) while the prophetic/apocalyptic sayings were more apt to be treated as Jewish tradition which the church had inserted into the context of Jesus' teaching (apocalyptic phrases were not viewed as Jesus' [p.125], but some of the prophetic elements did stem from Jesus [p.126]). In the end it was important for Bultmann that "Jesus was not an apocalyptist in the strict sense" (p.109). Given Bultmann's demytholo-

gization program, it is not surprising that Jesus should end up as more of a philosopher than a prophet. It should also be noted that Bultmann, in his study, already form-critically separated wisdom from prophetic/apocalyptic (pp.108-130), something which provided his demythologization project with a historical ground (for an excellent treatment of Bultmann's view of early Christianity in relation to his theology see John Painter, Theology as Hermeneutics: Rudolf Bultmann's Interpretation of the History of Jesus [Sheffield: Almond Press, 1987], pp.47-116). The Bultmannian scheme became crucial in the "New Quest" for the historical Jesus, and I would suggest, also for the resurgence of Q research (particularly the study of redactional layers in Q) which is really an aspect of the larger program (on the "New Quest" see James M. Robinson, A New Quest for the Historical Jesus and Other Essays [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983], pp.9-125). In the final analysis, the Jesus of the "New Quest" looks surprisingly much like the picture of Jesus in Bultmann's Jesus and the Word (Collins, 1958) (cf. N. T. Wright, The New Testament, pp.437-442).

Consequently, the influence of Walter Bauer on the Bultmannian school (his influence on Bultmann is noted by Painter, pp.90-91), coupled with Bultmann's own theological/historical program, made it possible for modern developments in the study of early Christianity (especially as they have been mediated via Koester and Robinson). In this view wisdom is foundational for Jesus' teachings, and eschatology is subordinated to this sapiential framework. H. Koester, in a recent treatment of Q (Ancient Christian Gospels, has argued that Q "must have included wisdom sayings as well as eschatological sayings. It cannot be argued that Q originally presented Jesus simply as a teacher of wisdom without an eschatological message" (p.150). However, the remainder of his discussion makes it clear that he distinguishes between apocalyptic eschatology and another sort of eschatology, the latter being the act of God's Kingdom breaking into the present (pp.156,160). This distinction between "apocalyptic eschatology" and "existential(?) eschatology" (see Wright, The New Testament, p.437, where he makes the similar observation on the different uses of eschatology), as well as the attempt to make Jesus more than a mere wisdom teacher, but less than an apocalyptic prophet, is clearly following the Bultmannian line of development. Even where prophetic aspects appear to break into the message of Jesus in the earliest stratum of Q, these are viewed as being taken in a wisdom direction, and thus resulting in a realized eschatology (pp.157-158). The anti-structural ethic of Q, which is normally cast in a wisdom framework, is thus viewed as originating from "radical eschatological demands." What is ultimately "breaking in" is God's radical (and existential)

demand, while there is admittedly little emphasis on the very real coming judgment of God, a corner stone of all eschatological frameworks. One cannot help but get the impression that what is at work here is a dialectical theology historicized in the teachings of Jesus (here wisdom and eschatology dialectically express their relationship in a radically realized eschatology). Realized eschatology did exist in the first century and before, but it was one possible form of eschatology within the larger sphere, and cannot be sharply distinguished from apocalyptic eschatology (for more on the phenomenon of realized eschatology see David E. Aune, The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology, NovTSup 28 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972]).

Furthermore, the emphasis on the Gospel of Thomas as an important source for early Christianity, and reference to the gnosticizing direction of early Christian texts, are also appear to be part of this larger historical and theological trajectory from Bauer to Bultmann to the present. It should be noted, however, that not every scholar who studies Q from the perspective of a sapiential formative layer in Q (e.g., Kloppenborg) has consciously alligned him/herself with this larger historical framework, but there is little doubt that the beginning of this approach with Robinson and Koester does stand within the larger Bultmannian trajectory.

Excursus Three: James and the Q Sayings of Jesus

In the context of this first chapter it is appropriate to bring up the recent monograph by Patrick J. Hartin, James and the Q Sayings of Jesus. Unlike the previous studies which connect James with wisdom, Hartin consciously utilizes the paradigm of recent Q research and suggests that James fits in the trajectory of the Matthean version of Q (p.215). Hartin clearly views James as a wisdom document (p.136) that is "steeped in wisdom traditions" (p.92) and in various places Hartin undoubtedly places the content of James within a "wisdom framework" (cf. pp.72,88,90,113,209). In other places, however, he speaks about an "eschatological framework" (pp.65,68,78) and a "deuteronomistic perspective" which operate alongside the wisdom traditions (p.77). It is obvious that Hartin is having a difficult time relating the themes of wisdom, eschatology, and prophecy in James. His basic problem is that he begins with the premise of Robinson et al. that the formative layer of Q is a sapiential stratum. He then proceeds to analyze James in a similar manner. However, since it is difficult to provide a detailed argument for redaction in James, one has to affirm, unlike Q, that the

wisdom and eschatological/prophetic elements were brought
together simultaneously (even if they did have a prior sepa-
rate existence formally). Hartin must thus relate eschato-
logical themes to wisdom ones in a way which one can avoid in
the study of Q by appealing to redactional layers.

In my opinion the greatest weakness of Hartin's book is
his attempt to relate the wisdom and eschatological elements
he so often speaks about. He attempts to hold the two to-
gether in some sort of tension, wherein the wisdom elements
function within an eschatological framework. The overall
thrust of Hartin's argument, regardless of what he explicitly
states, is that the framework which controls interpretation
in James is eschatological. His view that James contains an
"eschatological wisdom" (p.214) clearly indicates that James
belongs to an eschatological framework, not a wisdom one. In
a recent review of Hartin's book, Kloppenborg has aptly ar-
ticulated this same tension:

> What distinguishes James from Old Testament wisdom
> is the eschatological horizon James gives his
> materials, and it is precisely in this respect that
> James resembles Q, a wisdom collection thoroughly
> permeated by eschatology...Hartin argues that not
> only does James use wisdom sayings; it also has
> adopted a characteristically sapiential worldview,
> and like Q, employs the notion of Sophia per-
> sonified (CBQ 54 [1992]:567).

It is difficult to know what to make of this. Hartin appears
to claim that eschatology is central to James, and that the
letter is permeated by it. On the other hand, he also as-
serts that a sapiential worldview predominates alongside the
structural importance of wisdom. The "eschatological hori-
zon" of which Hartin writes appears to be vague and under-
developed. How are the two elements to be related? Within
the framework in which Hartin is working, either eschatology
controls the wisdom elements or vice versa. Our approach, on
the other hand, is to suggest a different analysis: the wis-
dom elements are the woof and warf of the eschatological
framework and do not represent an independent frame of re-
ference. James does not have a sapiential framework and
structure, but is thoroughly controlled by an eschatological
understanding wherein wisdom themes have an important role
and function. Hartin's own peculiar treatment, though, is
unclear and inconsistent. Much of the detail of the scheme
is left unstated and the implications are not developed. His
attempt to read Q redactional layers (wisdom - eschatological
- prophetic) into James, as well as his Q - James - Matthew
typology in which he argues for a perceivable development
towards a full blown wisdom christology, clouds the issues.
The first is an issue in that the redactional layers in Q are
the result of the developmental process of the tradition.

The layers are generally held to represent different stages in the development of a particular community(cf. J. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People" Semeia 55 [1991]:77-102). For James, however, there does not appear to be a similar development in the community and thus an attempt to read Q redactional issues into James will pose problems from the start. The final product of Q is a composite of various communities, but James is the result of a particular community (according to Hartin, and most scholars). As well, the typology of Q-James-Matthew suffers the same fate of most typologies of this nature: it is too imprecise in its understanding of the relations between the documents, and inevitably results in forced interpretations (such as the view that James identifies Jesus as "God's wisdom," p.97, and that Jesus as κύριος τῆς δόξης belongs in a wisdom context, p.96: against this latter view see L. Joseph Kreitzer, Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology JSNTSup 19 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987]). Consequently, while Hartin has indeed articulated issues of concern in James, and precisely hit upon the necessity to relate wisdom and eschatological/prophetic elements in James, he himself has not produced a fruitful explanation of these matters in his recent monograph.

Several other points should be mentioned in conjunction with Hartin's book. 1) He should be commended for his attempt to be consistent. That is, the current understanding of Q has implications for other early Christian documents besides the Gospel of Thomas. The attempt to understand James in light of a sapiential framework based on Q research is certainly a novel idea, and quite likely foreshadows future scholarship on the issue. 2) Hartin's overall argument that James knew both Q and Q^{Mt} (p.187) is needlessly complex. As well, it is not apparent that Hartin has demonstrated a thorough familiarity of James with Q which would necessitate the view that James knew the actual document. Also, there are times that James resembles Q^{Lk} more than Q^{Mt} (cf. Jm 4:9 and Lk 6:25). Hartin recognizes this problem and thus suggests that James knew both Q (Luke's version) and Q^{Mt}. In contrast to Hartin, however, the parallels in James are just as easily explained on the basis of oral Jesus tradition which circulated in the churches (there are numerous hypotheses as to the function of Jesus tradition in the early church; for one example see C. H. Dodd, "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of Jesus," in New Testament Essays, ed. A. J. B. Higgins [Manchester University Press, 1959], pp.106-118). Furthermore, outside of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain, it is not clear that Hartin has met the criteria suggested by R. Bauckham which would indicate use of Q as a whole (see Hartin, pp.141-142; and R. Bauckham, "The Study of Gospel Traditions outside the Canonical Gos-

pels: Problems and Prospects," in Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels, pp.369-419). Kloppenborg, in his review of the book, also feels that Hartin has not built a strong enough case for James' use of Q in its final form, though he appears to concede that Hartin has more adequately demonstrated James' familiarity with some of the "main compositional blocks of Q" (p.568). In my opinion, though, Hartin's connections are often tenuous, and consist primarily of word parallels (cf. p.185, where both Q 14:11/18:14 have verbal parallels to James 4:10: humble and exaltation language: [ταπειν- and υψω- related vocabulary. Yet, this is stock biblical language, and is not a rare occurrence in Christian literature [cf. I Peter 5:6]). Thus, while Hartin may have established a few important parallels, overall much of his detailed argument rests on the occurrence of similar language and themes, a phenomenon which itself suggests that James is steeped in Jesus and church tradition, and not necessarily implying he knew the document Q (cf. the comments by Deppe, "The Sayings of Jesus:" "no conclusive evidence pointing to a knowledge of the Q or M traditions can be derived from the Epistle of James). Context of course controls language to a large degree, so the fact that similar vocabulary occurs at times in similar contexts is no further proof of dependence and influence; it only shows that certain stock language was previously associated with particular contexts and frameworks (e.g., see the discussion of wisdom vocabulary and context by Clements discussed earlier). 3) Hartin's attempt to reconstruct a development in early Christian beliefs running from Q to James to Matthew is inevitably fraught with serious problems. Given the diverse nature and expression of early Christianity, it would be nearly impossible to trace a specific line of development from one text to another, even if Hartin could establish beyond a doubt that James was actually part of the lineage of Q and Matthew. 4) It may be that Hartin's attempt to understand James in light of Q may cause some serious reevaluation of the nature of Q itself. If Q and James are cast from the same mold, and if the current stratification theory in Q (an original wisdom layer and an apocalyptic addition) does not fit James, it is entirely possible that the present view of Q is in need of revision. Our study of James does in fact have some implications for Q, and these will be followed up briefly in chapter three of this thesis.

Chapter Two: The Eschatological Framework of James

I. Introduction

In the first chapter of this thesis several aspects
pertaining to the dating and conception of the Epistle of
James were examined. It was suggested that past scholarship
had at times read the content of James in light of precon-
ceived notions as to authorship, date, and place of com-
position. The use of prior schemes and models obviously can
be helpful for interpreting data, but at the same time, when
not used with discretion and care, they often prefigure con-
clusions and distort the data. Thus, in the past, terms
such as "Hellenistic," "Palestinian," "Diaspora," and the like
have been loaded terminology, bringing as they do prior in-
terpretive frameworks to bear upon the data under examina-
tion. As well, in Jamesian study themes and terms such as
"wisdom," "sapiential," and "anti-Paulinism" have been used
in a manner which pejoratively shapes the inquiry. In the
first chapter I attempted to deal with the key issues which I
perceived to hamper the study of the epistle - those concepts
which placed an a priori scheme upon the study of the epistle
and which distorted, in my view, the understanding of the
framework of the epistle. It is hoped that this has cleared
the way for a fresh interpretation of the data.

In this second chapter I plan to outline in a fresh

manner a framework for understanding the epistle of James which is not based on explicit external interpretive schemes, but which attempts to analyze the implicit internal structures of the letter itself. Through an analysis of the opening and closing of the letter of James with an eye to revealing the interpretive structure of the epistle, it is my aim to demonstrate that the eschatological horizon of the letter looms large, and indeed controls the reading of the epistle as a whole. In essence, the argument is that the beginning and ending of the main body of the document deliberately frame the community instruction of the text within an eschatological context. The analysis will begin with some brief introductory comments about the nature of James as a literary document, and then proceed with a delineation and examination of the opening and closing sections of the main body of the letter. This chapter will then conclude with some observations on the way in which the sections under scrutiny relate to the main body of the epistle.

II. The Nature of James

Regarding the nature of the epistle of James, two issues which are pertinent to the present discussion come to the forefront. The first is the nature of the epistolary framework in James, and the second relates to James' generic categorization as paraenesis. Since the argument in this chapter

depends upon various structural aspects of James, it seems
expedient to briefly examine the issues surrounding James as
letter and paraenesis.

It has become common in past scholarship to question the
epistle of James' designation as a letter. Due to various
influences such as A. Meyer's view that James is a testament-
like document,[1] Thyen's characterization of James as a syna-
gogue homily,[2] and Dibelius' labelling of James as parae-
nesis[3] to name a few, the letter format of James has been
viewed as insufficient proof of its authenticity as an actual
letter.[4] These various views all implicitly challenged the

---

[1] See his Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes, BZNW 10 (Gießen:
Alfred Töpelmann, 1930). Meyer argued that James was a
superficially christianized Jewish document which was a fic-
titious last testament from the patriarch Jacob to his twelve
sons. Meyer maintained that one could detect the various
sections of James which were devoted to each son (pp.242-
269). For further discussion of this thesis see Klaus
Kürsdörfer, "Der Charakter des Jakobusbriefes" (Ph. D. diss.,
Eberhard-Karls-Universität, 1966), pp.28-86.

[2] H. Thyen, Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie
(Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955).

[3] M. Dibelius, James, rev. H. Greeven, trans. M. A. Williams
(Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), p.3. For Dibelius
paraenesis was a generic classification, a genre which was
characterized by eclectic content lacking any one particular
context. For further discussion of Dibelius' work on James
see Kürzdörfer, "Der Character," pp.87-125.

[4] W. G. Kümmel's comments are typical:
the obscurity of the destination, the impersonal
standpoint of the content, the lack of any con-
clusion to the letter make it doubtful that James is
a letter at all...the whole writing arouses the
impression of being an essay in the form of a
letter...Regarded from the form-critical standpoint
James gives rather the impression in its entirety

understanding of James as an actual letter by suggesting that the principles at work in the writing appeared to be of either a literary (Thyen, Meyer) or a random (Dibelius) nature. More recent scholarship has nuanced this discussion somewhat by suggesting that James is a letter in which the epistolary framework is used as a framing device.[5] The distinction between a document which is an actual letter and one which merely using the epistolary framework as a literary device is significant (or at least has been treated as such by modern scholarship) and therefore has some bearing on the nature of the discussion of this chapter. Hence, a few com-

---

that it is a paraenetic instructional writing... (Introduction to the New Testament, rev. ed., trans. H. C. Kee [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973], p.408).

[5] This is the understanding reflected in James L. Bailey and L. D. Vander Broek, Literary Forms in the New Testament (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), pp.199-201: "...it...reflects the Hellenistic custom of framing literary essays and moral and philosophical treatises with components of the letter...these are not personal or 'real' letters, letters responding to issues in specific Christian communities" (p.200). Also see the pertinent comments by Luke T. Johnson, The Writings of the New Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986): "...James is not responding to the problems of a specific community but addressing issues pertinent to a general Christian readership. James is not a real piece of correspondence but a composition fitted to the epistolary genre" (p.455).

On the nature and format of ancient letters in general see the excellent discussions by John L. White, "New Testament Epistolary Literature in the Framework of Ancient Epistolography," ANRW 2.25/2, pp.1730-1756; Stanley K. Stowers, Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986); and David E. Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987), pp.158-182. For a general discussion of early Christian letters see Aune, pp.183-225; and William G. Doty, Letters in Primitive Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1973).

ments will be made in this regard at the outset.

First of all, as far as the tone and content of James are concerned, James clearly belongs to the category of letters of exhortation and advice.[6] As well, while James lacks some of the features of the Hellenistic personal letter such as the explicit immediacy of context, and the strict opening-body-closing format of the Hellenistic personal letter, it does have some significant features of epistolary literature. Some of these features have been demonstrated by F. O. Francis in an important article.[7] Francis argues that James evinces the features of "secondary" or literary letters, beingletters which lack situational immediacy. The presence of a greeting, the thematic doubling of the opening formula, the development of the opening themes in the body of the letter, the catchword connection between the greeting and the opening, the presence of a blessing/thanksgiving section, the use of an eschatological injunction in the closing, as well as reference to prayer and the use of πρὸ πάντων setting off the concluding health wish and oath formula (or in the case of James, the prohibition of an oath) all point to James as being a type of Christian secondary letter. Francis also

---

[6] On this category see Stowers, Letter Writing, pp.91-152.

[7] See his "The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and I John," ZNW 61 (1970):110-126. White appears to accept Francis' conclusions regarding the letter of James ("New Testament Epistolary Literature," p.1756).

demonstrates that the lack of an explicit closing formula was
an acceptable variation among actual Hellenistic letters.[8]
In the final analysis, Francis has argued forcefully that the
epistolary framework of James, regardless of whether one
views it as an actual framework or as a literary device, is
by no means incidental to the epistle, but indeed deli-
berately frames the letter, and to a certain extent controls
the development of the body of James. It is this conclusion
which will be taken up later in this chapter.

----

[8] One of the problems with Francis study, however, is that
he does not carefully differentiate between a secondary and a
primary/actual letter. His definition of a "secondary let-
ter" is one which "for one reason or another lack[s] situa-
tional immediacy" (p.111). An example of such a letter would
be one which was imbedded in an historical work (such as the
letters found in Josephus or I Maccabees). Peter Davids has
concluded from Francis' discussion that "it is clear that
[James]...is a literary epistle, i.e. a tract intended for
publication, not an actual letter..." (Commentary on James,
NIGNT [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982], p.24). However,
from Francis' own comments it is not entirely certain that he
would conclude that James is in fact a literary letter.
Davids' own observations are tied to his theory about the
two-stage or layered development of the epistle. Francis, on
the other hand, uses common and private letters in his dis-
cussion, and establishes parallels with the so-called secon-
dary letters of James and I John. Ultimately, then, what
distinguishes the primary and secondary letters is the lack
of immediate context. It is not clear, however, that this is
sufficient grounds for making such a distinction (the letters
in Josephus and Maccabees, for instance, do have immediate
contexts; they are regarded as literary letters because they
are imbedded literary creations, not because they lack im-
mediate context). As well, as was pointed out in the first
chapter in regards to James 2, it is not all together certain
that James does lack an immediate context since there appear
to be obvious community problems which are being addressed
(cf. D. F. Watson, "James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes
of Argumentation," NTS [1993]:120).

As far as the body of the letter is concerned, ever
since Dibelius it has become common place to identify James
as paraenesis. Dibelius defined paraenesis as "a text
which strings together admonitions of general ethical con-
tent."[9] For Dibelius James lacked continuity of thought, it
was characterized by eclecticism, its content was often lin-
ked by catchword association, its themes were often repeated
throughout the writing, and it lacked a specific setting in
life. Thus, according to Dibelius James was the example par
excellence of a paraenetic document.

Contemporary discussion has gone in several directions,
but for the most part modern scholars recognize some of the
problems with Dibelius' contentions. Klaus Berger has been
one of the few who has rejected the understanding of James as
paraenesis altogether, and opted for designating James as
protreptic symbouleutic literature. In this view James is a
deliberative letter urging a particular course of action.[10]

---

[9] See his discussion of the nature of paraenesis in James,
pp.1-11.

[10] Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments (Heidelberg: Quelle &
Meyer, 1984), p.147: "Von Dibelius' These bleibt daher nicht
viel übrig: Jak ist eine symbuleutische Komposition, aber
keine Paränese." Thus, for Berger James belongs to one of
the three main branches of ancient rhetoric. On these bran-
ches see Aune, New Testament, pp.198-199.
    This understanding of James is more elaborately de-
veloped by Ernst Baasland, "Literarische Form, Thematik, und
geschichtliche Einordnung des Jakobusbriefes," ANRW 2/25.5,
pp.3649-3661. He argues that James "ist eine für Vorlesungs-
zwecke in Briefform geschriebene, protreptische, weisheit-
liche Rede...als Rede an eine Gemeinde, die eine hellenis-

As well, other recent studies of the genre of paraenesis have attempted to move beyond Dibelius more simple understanding and better define what is meant by the term. Leo Perdue has suggested that the real nature of paraenesis is that it contains traditional and unoriginal material, it is general in applicability, it is often addressed to readers who have heard them before, and it uses human examples (paradeigma) for purposes of instruction. Also, according to Perdue, paraenesis involves a close relation between the "teacher" and the "student" which for Perdue is the epitome of the social setting of paraenesis: the instructional situation of the novice and new initiate under the more seasoned instructor.[11]

John Gammie has recently attempted to define more adequately the genre of paraenesis and its relation to other

tische Bildung besitzt, ist das Werk auch nach rhetorischem Muster geformt..." (p.3654). Baasland further draws out the rhetorical implications of designating James as protreptic deliberative rhetoric.

[11] "Paraenesis and the Epistle of James," ZNW 72 (1981):241-256. Perdue has developed his initial observations on parae-nesis further in "The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature," Semeia 50 (1990):5-39. For more on the role of the teacher in James see Alfred F. Zimmermann, Die urchristlichen Lehrer, WUNT 2.12, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988), pp.194-208; and J. Wanke, "Die urchrist-lichen Lehrer nach dem Zeugnis des Jakobusbreifes," in Die Kirche des Anfangs, eds. R. Schnackenburg, J. Ernst, & J. Wanke (Freiburg: Herder, 1978), pp.489-511. Wanke's link between the "teacher" and "paraenesis" would support Perdue's observations regarding the latter's social function: "Der Schwerpunkt der Tätigkeit der urchristlichen Lehrer liegt nach Auskunft des Jakobusbriefes in der Gemeindeparänese" (p.509).

like genres.[12] For Gammie paraenetic literature is one of two
branches of wisdom literature, and which can further be
broken down into two composite sub-genres: instructions and
paraeneses. These composite sub-genres are further made up
of various sub-genres such as admonitions, exhortations,
precepts, wisdom sayings, chreiai, etc... Gammie classifies
James as belonging to the paraeneses division of paraenetic
literature since in James one finds a collection of precepts
and a high frequency of exhortation. Contrary to Berger,
Gammie does not view James as protreptic in nature since it
does not have a sustained deliberative argument, but is
characterized more by the presence of precepts and maxims.[13]

These recent studies show that the inquiry into the
relation of James and paraenesis is still a pertinent con-
cern. As well, these studies also exhibit some of the prob-
lems with understanding James as paraenesis. For one thing,
both Perdue and Gammie still treat paraenesis as catechesis-

---

[12] See "Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a
Secondary Genre," Semeia 50 (1990):41-77.

[13] The marked difference between paraenesis and deliberative
rhetoric in antiquity is not always readily apparent. Mar-
garet M. Mitchell discusses some of the definitional problems
in Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation (Louisville: West-
minster/John Knox Press, 1991), pp.50-53. The distinction
she makes is as follows: "deliberative rhetoric contains
advice about specific matters and incidents, whereas parae-
nesis is more general moral exhortation which is of universal
application" (pp.52-53). Gammie, on the other hand, would
make further distinctions on the basis of the sub-genres
which predominate in one and not in the other.

like material which lacks continuity and overall coherence.[14]
The observation that James is made up of precepts, maxims,
and exhortations has thus continued to influence modern un-
derstanding of James, an influence which particularly shows
itself in the view that the epistle's structure lacks co-
herence. As well, Gammie's observations as to the sub-genre
make up of the composite genres, while helpful, also place
James (and other paraenetic literature) in an a priori wisdom
framework: by definition paraenesis is a wisdom genre. In my
view this definitional framework places certain preconceived
categories on the interpretation of the text which may and
indeed do hinder a full understanding of that text. Compo-
site genres, by their very nature, are eclectic and thus
cannot be placed properly within a wisdom, prophetic, or
apocalyptic framework. Thus, the two main problems, James
being seen to lack cohesion and the perception of it as a
wisdom document, are both caused by its identification with
the genre of paraenesis, or more particularly, a specific
understanding of what paraenesis is.[15]

---

[14] Gammie, for instance, draws a distinction between parae-
neses and instructions on the basis of the latter being
"less assorted" and "more cohesive" (p.49). For Perdue, it
appears that what gives paraenesis cohesion is not its con-
tent at all, but its social context and function. In some
ways, then, Perdue's work has attempted to circumvent the
problem of making sense of the whole by seeking underlying
functional cohesion.

[15] It should be noted that the approach of this thesis does
not rule out James being, in some form, paraenesis or parae-

In the previous chapter some of the problems which re-
sult from placing James in an a priori wisdom framework were
taken up. As well, that chapter dealt with some of the prob-
lems associated with defining James as a wisdom genre based
on its content. Thus, the issue of paraenesis as a wisdom
genre can be left to the side at the moment. However, the
issue of the structure of James in light of paraenesis must
be addressed.

Even at a quick glance it is easy to see that not all
sections of James are internally unstructured and incoherent.
For instance, Duane F. Watson has demonstrated that James 2
and 3:1-12 have clear and sustained developmental arguments.[16]
These sections are clearly more than disparate elements ga-
thered around a common topos. As well, in a section such as
3:13-4:10 Luke Johnson has shown that a topos such as "envy"
has been used to structure the paraenetic unit,[17] and F. O.
Francis has demonstrated that the opening section of James is

---

netic in nature. However, the use of the term paraenesis in
this thesis in no way is intended to imply what other
scholars have meant by that term. Rather, paraenesis is
used to denote the general category (not genre) of instruc-
tional literature in general, of which James is a prime exam-
ple.

[16] See his "James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Ar-
gumentation," and "Can a Fig Tree Yield Olives or a Grapevine
Figs? Rhetoric of James 3:1-12," forthcoming in NovT.

[17] "James 3:13-4:10 and the Topos ΠΕΡΙ ΦΘΟΝΟΥ," NovT 25
(1983):327-347. Johnson outlines the logical structure as
consisting of an indictment (3:13-4:6) and a call to conver-
sion (4:7-10).

a well structured piece in which the themes of the epistle
are expressed and then recapitulated (James 1:2-11 and 1:12-
17). Thus, it is apparent that the perception that James is
essentially unstructured and fragmented is clearly erroneous.
As Johnson asserts, "paraenetic texts often have definite
structure,"[18] and indeed James appears to be proof of the
case. However, while it is fairly clear that the individual
sections of James have cohesion, it is still not obvious what
unifies these seemingly disparate sections into a whole.
That is, while the individual units appear to have cohesion
and structure, it still remains to be seen how the various
units themselves fit into the larger macrostructure of the
epistle.

Various scholars have taken different approaches to
examining the interrelations of the individual sections of
James. Perdue, as mentioned earlier, appears to argue that
what unites the units of James is a common social function:
the teacher-pupil relationship in the process of ritual
initiation or transference from one state to another. For

---

[18] "James 3:13-4:10," p.329,n.9. In this regard also see the
excellent discussion by David C. Verner, The Household of
God, SBLDS 71 (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), pp.112-125. His
conclusion is that "...the investigator of paraenesis is
warned against concluding that paraenetic discourse has no
logic or coherence, when it does not happen to exhibit the
kind of logical coherence found in certain other types of
discourse..." (pp.118-119). Verner maintains that a parae-
netic text may or may not be coherent, but only an examina-
tion of a particular instance will determine the matter.

Davids, on the other hand, what unites the various sections

of James is theology.[19] Davids believes that the underlying

framework of the letter is a Leidenstheologie; the readers of

the letter are in a situation of oppression and conflict and

the writer intends the letter to comfort and support the

readers.[20] R. Hoppe has also argued for a theological scheme

as the unifying element of the epistle, his emphasis being

the role of wisdom and faith in James.[21] F. Mußner follows a

---

[19] Cf. Davids' comments, "As soon as one admits that there is
a unity to the Epistle of James, one must also begin to look
for a theology, for no matter how fragmentary and disunified
the sources may have been, the end product is a redacted
whole" (Commentary on James, p.34). This comment stems from
Davids' belief that original speeches and writings of James,
the brother of the Lord, have been gathered together in the
letter of James. This explains both the unified and fragmen-
tary nature of the epistle.

[20] While there are various themes in James which Davids re-
cognizes (pp.34-57), for him the theme of suffering/testing
"underlies the whole book" (p.38). Regarding the context of
the epistle in the oppression and conflict of the readers, in
recent scholarship this view has been maintained by Ralph P.
Martin, James, WBC 48 (Waco: Word Books, 1988); Pedrito U.
Maynard-Reid, Poverty and Wealth in James (Maryknoll: Orbis
Books, 1987); and Martin I. Webber, "ΙΑΚΟΒΥΣ ʽΟ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ:
Origins, Literary Expression and Development of Traditions
about the Brother of the Lord in Early Christianity" (Ph. D.
diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, 1985).

[21] Der theologische Hintergrund des Jakobusbriefes, FzB 28
(Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977):
    Denn gerade hier wird die These von M. Dibelius und
    vieler anderer, die dem Jak entweder eine leitende
    theologische Konezption [sic] absprechen oder wenig-
    stens nicht entdecken können, fraglich...Zwei Leit-
    gedanken kristallisierten sich aufgrund unserer
    einleitenden Analyse aus dem Brief heraus: die Vor-
    stellung von der Weisheit und der Glaube im Jak
    (p.146).

similar line, however in his case he argues that what unifies
James is its eschatology, particularly the "Interimsethik"
which underlies the whole epistle.[22] In a similar vein,
Robert Wall has attempted to take Mußner's initial insights
and make them more systematic and thoroughgoing. He argues
that what unites the various portions of James is its per-
meating apocalyptic outlook and the various concepts which
spring from this mold.[23] As well, Roy B. Ward also fits in
here as his emphasis on "community concern" in the epistle of
James is similarly intended to provide structure and cohesion

---

[22] Der Jakobusbrief, HTKNT, 5th ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1987):
Zusammenfassend kann gerade im Hinblick auf die
Eschatologie unseres Briefes gesagt werden: die
These Dibelius', der Jak-Brief habe "keine
Theologie", bedarf der Revision. Wenn man unter
"Theologie" nur "Christologie" versteht, dann hat
allerdings unser Brief kaum Theologie. Ist aber
Theologie wesentlich auch "Eschatologie," so gehört
der Jak-Brief unter ihre ausgezeichneten Vertreter
im NT (p.210).

[23] "James as Apocalyptic Paraenesis," RestQ 32 (1990):11-22.
Wall finds fault with Mußner's approach in that the latter
does not "extend his observation in a more systematic, com-
prehensive direction" (p.12), and he does not view the escha-
tological framework as an ethos (p.11). Wall's basic premise
is that apocalyptic is best understood "as a theological
tradition and not as a literary genre" (p.21), and hence
apocalyptic themes can be viewed as the theological link
among the various units. While he may have a point with
regarding apocalyptic as a theological tradition, his ar-
gument that it is not a genre is misdirected, since the genre
in question is apocalypse, not apocalyptic, and the two
are usually kept fairly distinct in current discussion.

to the letter.[24]

Other scholars have tried out different methods in their attempt at unifying the various segments of the epistle. E. Baasland, for instance, has attempted to analyze the structure of the epistle in terms of Greco-Roman rhetorical categories consisting of a prooimion/exordium: 1:2-18, diegesis/narratio: 1:19-27 (the propositio), pistis/argumentatio: 2:1-3:12 (the confirmatio) and 3:13-5:6 (the confutatio), and the epilogos/conclusio/peroratio): 5:7-20.[25] W. Wuellner follows a similar line, though he also adds insights from structural exegesis.[26] Moving away from classical rhetoric, E. Fry applies a simple structural analysis of the epistle, and concludes that the themes of testing and patient endurance structurally balance James.[27]

---

[24] See "The Communal Concern of the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1966); as well as his two articles based on his thesis: "The Works of Abraham: James 2:14-26," HTR 61 (1968):283-290; and "Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4," HTR 62 (1969):87-97.

[25] "Literarische Form," pp.3655-3659. For more on these category classifications see Burton L. Mack, Rhetoric and the New Testament (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp.41-43; and idem., "Elaboration of the Chreia in the Hellenistic School," in Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels, Burton L. Mack & Vernon K. Robbins (Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1989), pp.53-57.

[26] "Der Jakobusbrief im Licht der Rhetorik und Textpragmatik," LingBib 43 (1978):5-66.

[27] "The Testing of Faith: A Study of the Structure of the Book of James," BibTrans 29 (1978):427-435. F. O Francis' article on James also takes a similar type of structural approach to unifying James. In essence, the opening section of James structures the remaining epistle since the sections

There have thus been numerous and varying attempts to understand the relation of the parts to the whole in James. Not all attempts have not been equally successful, however. The understanding of the social function by Perdue is somewhat questionable in so far as he proposes one particular social function and context. Paraenesis, like any other form of literature, can have a variety of functions and purposes, of which helping the novice through the liminal stage of community is only one, and probably a minor one at that.[28] On the other hand, the attempt to understand the unity of James in light of themes, motifs, and theology is a little more adequate. While it is true that the themes are often so general as to fit almost any part of James, and if one is to press the matter it is apparent that not every section can be made to fit apocalyptic, pastoral, or a testing/suffering theology, there are aspects of this approach which are help-

---

which follow elaborate upon the themes of the opening. Hermann von Lips, Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament, WMANT 64 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), pp. 414-418, also follows a similar line. His argument is that James 1:1-12 provides motifs which reoccur throughout the remainder of the epistle providing an explicit structuring of the letter.

[28] Perdue appears to be developing upon the older understanding, outlined in the previous chapter, that paraenesis had a special function in instructing Gentile converts to Judaism (God-fearers). In this connection, besides the literature cited earlier, also see the more recent work by Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, Gesetz und Paränese, WUNT 2.28 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987), where the connection between paraenesis and its catechetical function is still explicitly made.

ful. For instance, there are some significant themes and motifs which do provide a partial structuring of the epistle, and clearly the underlying concern of community is a principle unifying element.[29] It is true that the theme of "community concern" is a fairly general one, but at the same time it is also an obvious major focus in many early Christian and Jewish texts.[30] Alongside the value of attempting to understand the relations of the various parts of James through theology is the importance of the structural method. This approach has proven to be quite fruitful in understanding the structure of James, particularly because the epistolary framework of James already goes a long way in structuring the letter and provides a good place to begin analysis.

The following section will be an attempt to outline an understanding of the structure of James for the remainder of this chapter. In it both thematic and structural insights will be utilized, particularly as they were briefly outlined

---

[29] This underlying theme in James has been elucidated by R. B. Ward, "The Communal Concern."

[30] For a general treatment see R. W. Wall, "Community," ABD, Vol 1, pp.1103-1110. For more specific treatments see Robert Banks, Paul's Idea of Community (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1980); Gerhard Lohfink, Jesus and Community (Philadelphia/New York: Fortress/Paulist Presses, 1984); and pertinent discussions of the New Testament households in Hans-Josef Klauck, Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum, SBS 103 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981); David C. Verner, The Household of God; and John H. Elliott, A Home for the Homeless (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), pp. 165-266.

above. The main contention is that the opening and closing sections of the main body provide an overall context which frames and controls the reading of the main body portion of the text. It is the structural importance and centrality of the opening and closing which provide the key to unifying the epistle of James as a whole, and which, ultimately, aids in classifying the type of literature which James represents.

III. The Structure of James

The main argument of this chapter is that the opening and closing sections of the body of James frame and control the reading of the middle section of the body of the letter. As well, it is also maintained that the close cohesion of the opening and closing of the body is deliberate, and indeed the closing of the body helps shed light on the opening part, a section which has its share of ambiguity in meaning. This portion of the chapter will delimit the structure of the opening and closing sections, as well as provide a justification for reading the letter in light of the opening and closing of the main body of the epistle.

A. Methodological Justification

While the importance of the beginning of a document for reading the rest of the text has been demonstrated for nar-

rative,[31] it is sometimes held in question for non-narrative documents. Thus, the first matter that must be dealt with is why the opening of a letter is particularly important for understanding the content which follows, and how James, as a paraenetic letter, fits into this scheme. Two arguments will briefly be addressed here: 1) the nature and importance of the opening section of the body in the Greco-Roman and Christian letter tradition, and 2) the nature of the beginning portion of the body in a paraenetic document.

1) Letters in early Christianity are somewhat sui generis in the context of the Greco-Roman non-literary letter tradition. Part of the reason for this is their length. Outside of literary letters, the letters in antiquity were on the whole shorter and more concise than the letters which are left to us in the corpus of early Christian literature.[32] As

---

[31] See the discussions by D. E. Smith, "Narrative Beginnings in Ancient Literature and Theory," Semeia 52 (1990):1-9; and M. C. Parsons, "Reading a Beginning/Beginning a Reading: Tracing Literary Theory on Narrative Openings," Semeia 52 (1990):11-31. Recently, Joel Marcus has produced a study which demonstrates the interpretive importance of the opening of Mark's gospel in establishing the framework of the remaining narrative. See his The Way of the Lord (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), pp.12-47.

[32] John White, Light from Ancient Letters (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), p.211, makes reference to the brevity of ancient letters in the context of suggesting that often times it is "artificial" to discuss the middle section of the body since they are regularly too short to have more than an opening and a closing to the body. No doubt cost and efficiency of production were one aspect which contributed to this. Another may well have been the fact that much private correspondence was between individuals, whereas early Chris-

well, as far as classification is concerned, the letters of

the Christian tradition are generally harder to classify

according to one type. The Pauline letters, for instance,

are usually classified as "familial" epistles.[33] However, at

the same time the letters of Paul clearly stretch the bounds

of family letters in the strict sense. They are, for in-

stance, longer than most familial letters, and combine di-

verse rhetorical features and styles due to the complex

situations which he addressed.[34] Thus, a letter such as

Romans has certain features of the letter of recommendation.[35]

---

tian letters were written to whole communities, and were
usually intended to be read in the Christian house church
when the community gathered for religious observance. On
this last point see, White, "New Testament Epistolary Litera-
ture," p.1739; and Aune, The New Testament, pp.192-194.

[33] See White, "New Testament Epistolary Literature," p.1739.
The other two main types of epistles are letters of petition
(on this see John White, The Form and Structure of the Of-
ficial Petition, SBLDS 5 [Missoula: Scholars Pres, 1972]),
and letters of recommendation and introduction (Chan-Hie Kim,
The Familiar Letter of Recommendation, SBLDS 4 [Missoula:
Scholars Press, 1972]). White, Light from Ancient Letters,
pp.193-197, outlines the basic four type of non-literary
letters. These categories are essentially repeated among the
literary letters (p.197). The content, tone, and style of
the letter of course vary from one epistle to the next, and
modern scholars at times classify a letter according to its
style. Thus, as the ancient rhetoric handbooks indicate, a
letter can be commendatory, consolatory, ironic, etc...(for a
complete list of styles see White, Light, pp.202-203).
White's own classifications of the non-literary letters are
more general, however.

[34] See the pertinent comments by D. Aune, New Testament,
p.203.

[35] For instance, in Romans 16:1-2 Paul "recommends" (συνίσ-
τημι) Phoebe to the Roman congregation. On the the nature of
this recommendation see Robert Jewett, "Paul, Phoebe, and the

As well, hortatory and petitionary elements are present in
several of Paul's letters (e.g., Galatians, II Corinthians).[36]
Also, an epistle like Romans has a fairly distinct epideictic
style which places it closer to the literary letter tra-
dition.[37] Nevertheless, the Greco-Roman non-literary letter
tradition is invaluable for understanding New Testament epis-
tles including the epistle of James in spite of the real
differences between the two.

The fact that evidence from the Greco-Roman letter tra-
dition has importance for understanding James has not always
been recognized.[38] Traditionally the significance of Greco-

---

Spanish Mission," in The Social World of Formative Chris-
tianity and Judaism, eds. J, Neusner et al. (Philadelphia:
Fortress Press, 1988), pp.142-161. On the textual integrity
of Romans 16 see Harry Gamble, The Textual History of the
Letter to the Romans, SD 42 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans,
1977), pp.84-95. The letter of Philemon, of course, is a
perfect example of the letter of recommendation, and thus is
the only Pauline epistle which does not belong to the
familial type.

[36] II Cor. 8 may be viewed as having elements of petition and
recommendation, for instance. Here Paul requests money for
the Jerusalem collection and recommends Timothy and his com-
panion to the Corinthians. On this see Dieter Georgi, Remem-
bering the Poor (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992), pp.80-92.
It is of course the recognition that II Cor. 8 forms a fairly
identifiable letter of recommendation in and of itself apart
from the rest of II Cor. that has lead to partition theories
in this epistle (see H. D. Betz, 2 Corinthian 8 and 9, ed.
G. W. MacRae [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985]; and N. H.
Taylor, "The Composition and Chronology of Second Corin-
thians," JSNT 44 [1991]:67-87).

[37] On this see D. Aune, The New Testament, pp.219-221.

[38] This, in fact, is the motivation behind the study of F. O
Francis mentioned earlier. He attempts to elucidate the
value of the Hellenistic letter tradition for an understan-

115

Roman letters for the New Testament has been recognized only
for non-literary letters such as one finds in the Pauline
corpus. This is changing in more recent scholarship with the
burgeoning of the field of ancient rhetoric and its applica-
tion to New Testament criticism. But to a large degree the
so-called "literary letters" of the New Testament have been
neglected. Since James is often characterized as a literary
letter, this discussion is obviously pertinent to the argu-
ment at present. In essence, the distinction between
literary and non-literary letters is somewhat artificial, and
due partially to an older framework in which the Pauline
churches were believed to stem from the lower classes of
society and consequently were unconnected to the context from
which literary types of letters arose.[39] There are three

ding of James against those that view it as insignificant.
[39] On this see John T. Fitzgerald, "Paul, the Ancient Epis-
tolary Theorists, and 2 Corinthians 10-13," in Greeks,
Romans, and Christians eds. David L. Balch et al. (Min-
neapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp.190-192.
    It is important to note that the modern distinction made
between non-literary and literary letter tradition is exactly
that, modern. In antiquity, at least according to the hand-
books, letters were all to be actual correspondence, and were
not to be affected conversation. Despite the ideal, however,
there arose many essays and treatises in the form of letters
in which the letter format was clearly secondary and affected
(White, Light, p.193). This secondary letter phenomenon is
often included in the category of "literary letters," but
should probably be kept distinct. The basic requirement of a
letter - the substitution for personal contact and conver-
sation (White, Light, p.191) - should be used as the measure
by which a text is judged to be a letter or not. According
to this most basic definition it appears that James should be
regarded as a letter, even if it has the character of a

basic arguments which support the view that non-literary and literary letters are perhaps not as distinct as sometimes thought, and that an early Christian letter like James may indeed be understood in light of both the larger Greco-Roman non-literary and literary letter tradition. First, it is clear that literary rhetoric played a formative role in non-literary letters, as the Pauline texts indicate.[40] Thus, the distinction between non-literary and literary on the basis of the presence of rhetoric (itself a supposed sign of literary sophistication) is over-simplified.

Secondly, Stanley K. Stowers has recently argued that the non-literary letters do in fact reflect very similar types and styles as the rhetorical handbooks set out for literary epistles. Stowers has argued that what unites the two classes of letters is the social transaction and the means whereby this is achieved, elements which are present in both types of letters. Stowers has successfully shown that non-literarily transmitted letters, by virtue of attempting the same type of social transaction, are not as dissimilar

---

literary epistle. The study by Francis shows that James is not to be regarded alongside the essay/treatise type of letter in antiquity, where the letter format was a secondary element. The epistolary framework of James, as was suggested earlier, is an integral part of the letter.

[40] Numerous studies have been done in recent times showing the importance of Greco-Roman rhetoric for an understanding of the Pauline epistles. For one of the latest studies see Mitchell, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation.

from the literarily transmitted letters as is sometimes sug-
gested.[41] This is significant in that it demonstrates that
insights from non-literary letters such as the Pauline epis-
tles or letters on papyrus may be pertinent for the study of
a text such as James.

Thirdly, regardless of the significance of the non-
literary letter tradition on papyrus, it is arguable that the
importance of the Pauline letter tradition in early Chris-
tianity also had an impact on the Christian literary letter
tradition.[42] Thus, epistolary conventions may well have been
mediated not only from the Greco-Roman context, but also
through the role the Pauline letter tradition played in the
formative years of early Christianity. All this is to argue
that insights from papyrus letters and from the Pauline let-
ter tradition, even though these are classified as non-
literary letters, provide insight into a letter such as
James, even if the latter is viewed as a so-called "literary

---

[41] "Social Typification and the Classification of Ancient
Letters," in The Social World of Formative Christianity,
pp.78-90.

[42] For a brief assessment of the Pauline influence on later
letters see William G. Doty, Letters in Primitive Chris-
tianity, pp.65-69. Also see the discussion by White, "New
Testament Epistolary Literature," pp.1751-1755. It is in-
teresting to note that while White does acknowledge the on-
going influence of Paul's letter style in the New Testament,
he makes mention of the fact that "when NT letters incor-
porate conventional epistolary features, they are often clo-
ser to the common conventions than to Paul's adaption of the
practice" (p.1752).

118

letter."[43]

In light of the above discussion it would seem that James may indeed be compared with non-literary Christian and Greco-Roman letters. When this is done is appears that the opening section of the body of James does in fact have a significant place in understanding the main body of the letter. This is demonstrated when the opening in James is elucidated by comparison with the opening of the main body of a letter in the non-literary and Pauline epistolary tradition.

In the non-literary letter tradition the motivation for writing, which appeared in the conclusion of the main body in the Ptolemaic period, was shifted to the beginning of the main body of letters during the Roman period.[44] As well, the original importance of the opening of the body of the letter was to set the tone and place the middle of the body in con-

---

[43] One gets the distinct impression that the use of "literary letter" to describe James is often times used in a manner which implies that the epistolary framework of James is affected, secondary, or inconsequential. According to the comments above, it should imply none of these. What the term "literary letter" can and should imply is that James represents a fair amount of sophistication in arrangement and style and this sets it apart from the non-literary tradition. The generality of the content and the perceived lack of situational immediacy are aspects of a letter which may or may not be present, but which should not be viewed as legitimate reasons for subsuming a text under the term "literary letter" and for suggesting the superficiality of the opening and closing elements. Recent scholarship is beginning to exhibit more clarity in this area as is evidenced by the recent essay by Fitzgerald, "Paul, the Ancient Epistolary Theorists."

[44] White, Light, p.207.

119

text, and in fact introduce the information to follow.[45]
These two factors, the move of the motivation of writing from
the conclusion to the opening, and the importance of the
opening for introducing the main body of the letter, indicate
that the opening to the main body in ancient letters was an
important element in understanding the main body of the let-
ter.

In the Pauline letter tradition the opening of the main
body often reveals significant details about the main body of
the epistle. In the Pauline corpus the following opening
sections of epistles are instructive for the content which
follows: Rom. 1:13, Gal. 1:6-14, Philemon 7-14, Phil. 1:12-
18, and I Cor. 1:10-16. These sections of the Pauline let-
ters are all openings to the main body and in all cases
clarify the content which follows by placing it in a specific
context.[46] While it is true that the opening in James is
somewhat different from the Pauline cases, the argument put

---

[45] For an important discussion of the body of the Greek let-
ter, including the significance of the opening and closing
portions, see John L. White, The Body of the Greek Letter,
SBLDS 2 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972).

[46] It should be noted that a distinction between the opening
of the letter and the opening or introduction to the main
body has been made. In the Pauline letter tradition the
opening of the letter generally consists of a statement of
sender and recipient, a salutation of some sort, and usually
a thanksgiving section. This is not what is meant by
"opening" here. Rather, by "opening" the introduction to the
main body of the letter is meant. For more on the format of
the Pauline letter see Bailey & Vander Broek, Literary Forms,
pp.23-31.

forth here is that it functions in a similar way. Like the Pauline epistles, the opening to the main body in James introduces the main body, and like the Pauline epistles it deviates from the standard length of openings in the non-literary letter tradition, the latter being considerably shorter in length. The main portion of this thesis will attempt to bear this out in a more detailed and systematic fashion.

2) The second point to be made about the significance of the opening of the letter of James is that paraenetic documents often outline, in the opening of the body of the work, the material which is to follow in the main section of the document. This point has been discussed at length by Hermann von Lips.[47] Upon studying several biblical and Greco-Roman paraenetic texts he concludes that:

> der Anfang paränetischer Sammlungen offensichtlich bewust gestaltet ist. Grundlegende Mahnungen stehen am Beginn, aber ohne daß notwendig ein inhaltlicher Zusammenhang zu den weiteren Mahnungen besteht. Aber es ist auch zu beobachten, daß thematisch Grundlegendes zu Beginn gesagt wird, auf das im weiteren explizit oder implizit Bezug genommen wird.[48]

What von Lips has isolated is a phenomenon which occurs quite readily in James. That is, the opening of the main body of the paraenetic section is a consciously structured unit which often, though not always, is connected to the following

---

[47] <u>Weisheitliche Traditionen</u>, pp.412-427.
[48] <u>Weisheitliche Traditionen</u>, p.413.

paraenetic section through reoccurring leitmotifs and/or
"flashbacks."[49] Both these phenomena can be used to unite
otherwise disparate elements of a work. Von Lips continues
by suggesting that the opening to the main body of paraenesis
in James has the function of a "summarische Exposition" to
the remaining text. By this von Lips wishes to express two
functions which the opening of the body has by virtue of
being the introduction to the main body:

> "Exposition" ist der Abschnitt, sofern die wesent-
> lichen Anliegen des Autors hier bereits vorweg an-
> gesprochen werden. "Summarisch" muß der Abschnitt

---

[49] This latter term is used by Baasland, "Form, Thematik,"
p.3658, in conjunction with the technique evident in James
whereby key words or phrases are alluded to in order to draw
the connected words into a symbiotic relation whereby the
word alluded to sheds light on, or provides a subtle nuance
to, the new context. James M. Reese, Hellenistic Influence
on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences, AB 41 (Rome:
Biblical Institute Press, 1971), pp.123-140 discusses the
general use of this technique, and its specific use by the
writer of Wisdom. Reese's understanding is that "flashbacks"
complete an author's idea later in the text, and are a dis-
tinguishing mark of a literary text. As well, they are de-
liberate attempts to unify an author's work. Of course,
Reese was referring to a particular usage of this technique
in the book of Wisdom. Its character, however, is not exclu-
sively hellenistic, and its use is not always by the author
of a single text. Hebrew Bible, New Testament, and various
Second Temple Jewish texts all utilize a similar flashback
technique. Key words, phrases, images are used to refer back
to another event, person, place, or theological concept which
is meant to shed light on the present text. This is a
similar phenomenon as one finds in Wisdom and other parae-
netic texts, though it involves referring to words and
phrases which are not the author's own, but which do carry
significant import for the writer of the text. Aggadic in-
ter-biblical exegesis is a good example of how this phenome-
non occurs in the Hebrew Bible (on this see Michael Fishbane,
Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel [Oxford: Clarendon
Press, 1985], pp.281-440).

genannt werden, sofern dies eher pauschal geschieht, nicht aber im Sinne einer Gliederung oder genauen Inhaltsangabe.[50]

Von Lips attempts to mediate between the view that James is "zusammenhanglose" and that it has a "systematisches Schema." His suggestion is that the introductory portion of the body of the text, while not providing an exact outline of what is to follow, does anticipate and introduce the material in an approximate manner.[51] As well, frequent reference to key words and themes in the introductory portion throughout the remainder of the text help unify the individual paraenetic units into a complex.[52]

---

[50] Weisheitliche Traditionen, p.424.

[51] Thus, a paraenetic document need not necessarily evince the features suggested by Dibelius et al. It is precisely for this reason that scholarship should adopt the more general notion of "paraenesis" as denoting "instruction" generally. The definition offered by Bailey & Vander Broek, Literary Forms, p.62, adequately captures the generality of the term: "Paraenesis is ethical exhortation, instruction concerning how or how not to live." The treatment of symbouleutic literature by Berger, Formgeschichte, pp.117-220, is a superior discussion of paraenetic elements because he is able to distinguish between different types and forms. Thus, "paraenesis" and "paraenetic" are viewed as general categories which need further elaboration and delineation.

[52] In his study of the two-fold opening form in hellenistic letters, F. O Francis has made a complementary point to the one made here. He suggests that hellenistic letters commonly paralleled "opening expressions with similar expressions elsewhere in a letter..." and that "both the developed form and the freer parallelism appear to have the same function, namely to emphasize the important subject matter of a letter and to do so in a mutually complementary way" (p.117). Francis' insights relate to the epistolary form of a document, while the ones made above relate to a general paraenetic document. However, this shows that varieties of documents used a similar patterning phenomenon for structuring the

The significance of this observation regarding the function of introductory portions of paraenetic texts is important for understanding the relation of the opening of the main body of James to the remainder of the text. It would appear that an attempt to utilize the opening of the main body to help interpret the purpose and thrust of the letter of James is not a futile exercise, but indeed is necessitated by the structure of paraenetic documents. The insights from the Greek letter tradition also bolster this initial impression, as it has been shown that the introductions to the main body of a letter often crystalize the underlying concerns and motivations for writing. Thus, the opening of the main body of James is clearly significant for the remaining text, and, as I hope to show, helps provide a framework in which to place the epistle.[53]

B. The Opening/Closing Structure of James

---

work. What appears to be at work is not a random technique, but a commonly recognized one in which introductions to documents were viewed, often times, as setting the pattern for the work to follow.

[53] There is no direct evidence from the epistolary or paraenetic traditions for viewing the conclusion of the main body with similar importance. However, in the case of James at least (as will be shown), the explicit connections between the opening and closing clearly mark the closing section as forming an inclusio with the opening. Thus, the closing section, in essence, becomes viewed in continuity with the opening section, and its importance is determined by that of its opening counterpart.

In this section the opening and closing structure of
James will be set forth. The purpose will be to determine,
using thematic and verbal connections, the nature and extent
of the framework of James. The conclusion will be that James
1:2-12 and 4:6-5:12 form the framework inclusio of the epis-
tle.[54]

The epistle of James is characterized by several epis-
tolary features, and for the purposes of outlining the basic
structure of the letter these will prove useful. To begin
with, James opens with a standard epistolary greeting:
Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος ταῖς δώδεκα
φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ χαίρειν. This is the standard
form of greeting in the non-literary letter tradition.[55] The
epistolary greeting is followed by the opening of the main
body of the letter. This is standard for the non-literary
letter tradition, though the Pauline epistles generally have
mutated the tradition by including a "thanksgiving" section
after the epistolary greeting and before the opening of the

---

[54] It should be noted that the main argument of this thesis
does not stand or fall with the structuring of James presen-
ted here. For the purposes of delineating units for analysis
I have delimited specific opening and closing units. These
specific delineations, however, may vary somewhat (particu-
larly by a few verses). These variations are in themselves
fairly insignificant, and do not really affect the thrust of
the argument.

[55] White, Light, p.195.

main body of the letter.[56] The opening to the main body is structured on the catchword χαρὰν which forms a catchword association with χαίρειν in the first verse.[57] Thus, as will be argued shortly, the opening of the main body of James begins at 1:2 and continues through to vs.12. The main body of the text begins at 1:13 and ends at 4:5. The conclusion to the main body begins at 4:6 and follows through to 5:12. The epistolary conclusion is 5:13-20. It is true that the epistle lacks the customary farewell, but as Francis has pointed out, many Hellenistic letters lack concluding formulas; they simply conclude once the writer has set forth his information in the main body.[58] This, then, is the basic structure of James as as letter which is being followed. This approach, however, needs some clarification and explanation, especially since it departs in some significant ways from previous outlines of the structure of the letter.

1) The Introduction of the Main Body (James 1:2-12)

There is little disagreement that James 1:1 represents the customary epistolary greeting. The main problem that

---

[56] On this phenomenon in the Pauline letters see P. T. O'Brien, _Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul_, NovTSup 49 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977).

[57] For an excellent discussion of catchword association see Dibelius, _James_, pp.6-11.

[58] Francis, "The Form and Function," p.125.

exists at this juncture of the letter is determining the opening of the main body and its extent. The majority of modern scholars follow the chapter break at the end of 1:27 and view this initial section as the thematic opening to the epistle. Davids, Amphoux, and Francis are representative of this view.[59] Francis' article is in many respects the best articulated argument for this opening division, and indeed Davids essentially follows Francis' lead. Francis' basic premise is that 1:2-11 and 12-25 forms a double opening statement, wherein the first opening statement is repeated and elaborated upon in the one following. 1:26-27, in this scheme, then becomes both a recapitulation of the opening sections, and a bridge to the first section of the main body (2:1ff.). Francis' argument is that this form of opening is a recognizable characteristic of the secondary letter tradition (letters which lack situational immediacy). The basic problem with Francis' analysis, however, is that it is too neat and tidy, and James 1 does not fit into this scheme as well as Francis appears to imply. Francis attempts to elucidate an abc/abc pattern in James 1:2-25, but while the a element (vs. 2-4 and vs. 12-18) has some essential correspondence based on the themes of "patient endurance" and "trial",

---

[59] Davids, _James_, p.27; C.-B. Amphoux, "Systèmes anciens de division de l'épître de Jacques et composition littéraire," _Bib_ 62 (1981):390-400; and Francis, "The Form and Function," p.121.

the remaining parallel sections have but the faintest rela-
tion.[60] Contra Francis, I would argue that the opening sec-
tion of James consists of 1:2-12. There are two factors
which appear to support this division. The internal and
apparently deliberate chiastic structure of this unit, and
the frequency by which key words and leitmotifs in this unit
occur in the closing section of James.[61]

The chiastic structure of 1:2-12 is easily discernible
and more cohesive than Francis' structural alignment:[62]

James 1:2-4 ================ testing of the believer (A)

James 1:5-8 ======= wisdom for the believer (B)

James 1:9-11 ======= future of the believer (B)

James 1:12   ================ testing of the believer (A)

---

[60] Another division that is made among modern scholars is a
break at 1:19a. Martin, James, p.ciii-civ, and Fraçois
Vouga, L'Épitre de Saint Jacques, CNT XIIIa (Genève: Labor et
Fides, 1984), p.20, both make their division here. The prob-
lem with this is that they both view James as divided into
three distinct sections dealing with separate topics, and
they fail to recognize the structural importance of the
opening verses of the text. As well, outside of the opening
greeting, they ignore the structural importance of the epis-
tolary framework of James.

[61] The analysis at this point is based upon the key insights
by von Lips, Weisheitliche Traditionen, pp.412-427.

[62] On the nature of chiasm and its use in the New Testament
see the classic study by Nils W. Lund, Chiasmus in the New
Testament (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992 rpr.); and
the brief discussion in Bailey & Vander Broek, Literary
Forms, pp.178-183. For a treatment of chiasm in the New
Testament, Hebrew Bible, and the larger ancient Semitic and
Greco-Roman context see the various essays in ed. John W.
Welch, Chiasmus in Antiquity (Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Ver-
lag, 1981).

The thematic chiasm comes clearly into focus. The two fra-
ming sections, 1:2-4 and 1:12, emphasize the testing and
steadfastness of the believer. The middle sections, perhaps
not quite as clearly, are related to the conditions of the
testing. 1:5-8 deals with wisdom, faith, and double-
mindedness, and the need for the believer to remain stead-
fast. 1:9-11 refers to the eschatological reversal which the
steadfast believer will achieve. This interpretation needs
further discussion and justification and this will be under-
taken in the proceeding section. At this point, however, it
is important to note that this unit of 1:2-12 forms part of
an inclusio with the conclusion to the main body through the
"flashback" technique. Through demonstrating this it is
hoped that the central place of 1:2-12 as a structuring ele-
ment can be established.

There are several key words in James 1:2-12 which recur
in the conclusion of the main body. Here is a brief outline
of some of the important cases:

- One of the key words in the introductory unit is
ὑπομονή, appearing in 1:3 and 1:4. The only other time it
occurs in the epistle is 5:11. Its virtual synonym, μακ-
ροθυμία, occurs in 5:10.

- Related to the above word is its cognate verb ὑπομένω
which occurs in 1:12. It occurs one other time in the epis-
tle, in participial form (ὑπομείναντας) at 5:11. Its virtual

synonym μακροθυμέω occurs three times, twice in 5:7 and once in 5:8.

- The word δίψυχος, a hapax legomenon in the New Testament, occurs only in James at 1:8 and 4:8.

- The noun ταπεινός and its cognate noun ταπείνωσις occur in 1:9 and 1:10 respectively. The first noun occurs again in 4:6. Its cognate verb, ταπεινόω, occurs at 4:10.

- The important word πλούσιος appears in 1:10 and 1:11, and occurs again in 5:1.

- The noun ὕψος (1:9) has its cognate verb, ὑψόω, appear in 4:10.

- The word μακάριος, which occurs in 1:12, has its cognate verb, μακαρίζω, appear in 5:11.

- The verb καυχάομαι occurs in 1:9 and again in 4:16. As well, a cognate word (καύχησις) appears in 4:16.

- The word χαρά occurs in 1:2 and 4:9.

There are, of course, other parallels between the two sections such as κύριος, θεός, and the ἐργ- cognates. However, these parallels are less significant since they are words which are more common in the New Testament as a whole, and in James in particular. What is significant about the parallels pointed out above is that they are generally words which are rare in the New Testament, and hence their occurrence twice in the same document, placed carefully in particular contexts, is noticeable. Alongside these verbal

130

links, one could also mention the thematic connections be-
tween the two units. The most important of these are the
theme of steadfastness in the midst of trials (1:2-4,12 and
5:7-11) and the motif of the humble believer and the rich
person (1:9-11 and 4:6-5:6). These verbal and thematic links
clearly set off 1:2-12 as a unit which is structurally re-
lated to the conclusion of the main body.

So far the parallels which have been listed occur in the
conclusion to the main body of the letter. It is the argu-
ment of this thesis that this is a deliberate structuring
technique in order that the two units would form an inclusio
for the main body of the epistle. In regards to the impor-
tance of 1:2-12, however, a few more parallels can be eluci-
dated for the letter as a whole in order to demonstrate that
this unit functions as the introductory section to the main
body. The most striking are the key parallels of the πειρα-
cognate words (1:2, 12 and 1:13, 14), πίστ- cognate words
(1:3, 6 and 2:1, 5, 14-26 [occurs 14 times]), τέλει- cognate
word group (1:4 and 1:17, 25, 2:8, 22, 3:2), σοφία (1:5 and
3:13, 15, 17), δίδωμι (1:5 and 2:16, 4:6, 5:18; as well as
the cognate δώρημα in 1:17), αἰτει- cognates (1:5,6 and 4:2-
3), ἀγαπῶσιν (1:12 and 2:5), ἀκατάστατος (1:8 and 3:8, 16),
and the list could continue. What becomes apparent even from
a cursory glance at this list is that James 1:2-12 is not
only the introduction to the main body, but indeed it pro-

131

vides a structuring principle for the main body. The text

which follows draws upon the introduction through verbal and

thematic allusion and links. No other section of James 1 has

as many verbal links with the rest of the letter as does

1:2-12. It is the argument of this thesis that this is a

deliberate rhetorical device on the part of the writer, and

that the introductory unit should be broken off after 1:12.[63]

In conclusion then, James 1:2-12, under close scrutiny,

separates itself off from its larger context through its

---

[63] Some may suggest that 1:13-15 should also be included as
part of the opening to the main body. The suggestion would
be based on the observation that πειρα- cognates occur
several times in this brief section, and form part of the
flow established in 1:12. However, I would suggest that the
connection between 1:12 and 1:13 is not as much based on the
flow of argument as it is on catchword association. The
discussion on God as a source of temptation does not neces-
sarily flow out of the discussion of 1:12. In fact, 1:13-15
appears to interrupt the eschatological themes which appear
in 1:9-12. Peter H. Davids has attempted to relate 1:13-15
to the testing tradition which one finds evinced in 1:12
("The Meaning of ΑΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΟΣ in James I.13," NTS 24 [1978]:
386-392), and therefore unify the thought between the verses.
However, 1:13-15 is clearly at home in the יצר הטוב and הרע
יצר tradition elucidated in 1QS 3 and 4 (on this see O. J. F.
Seitz, "Two Spirits in Man: An Essay in Biblical Exegesis,"
NTS 6 [1959]:82-95; and J. Marcus, "The Evil Inclination in
the Epistle of James," CBQ 44 [1982]:606-621), and while it
does have eschatological significance, the basic undercurrent
of thought is different from that expressed in 1:12. Con-
sequently, what unites vs. 12 to vss. 13-15 is the common use
of the πειρα- cognate words, and the very general motif of
trial or temptation. Consequently, it would appear that the
delimitation of the introductory section from 1:2-12 is ap-
propriate. 1:13 thus marks the beginning of the main body of
the epistle, and it begins by catchword connection to the
previous verse (much like 1:2 begins by catchword association
with 1:1).

chiastic arrangement and through the numerous references made to it throughout the main body of the epistle. It appears that this section is to be regarded, as von Lips has suggested, as a "summary exposition" of the remainder of the text. It provides the stock themes and words upon which the remaining body draws. As well, its particularly close cohesion with 4:6-5:12 both in theme and verbal connections suggests that the two have been deliberately structured to form an inclusio to the main body of the epistle.[64]

2) The Conclusion of the Main Body (James 4:6-5:12)

The beginning, closing, and extent of of the conclusion of the main body of the letter are a little more difficult to determine. Both the beginning of the section and its end are somewhat ambiguous, as one would expect from a paraenetic letter. In James various units are placed together based on topical arrangement and often times connected on the basis of catchword association. Thus, transitions between various sections can be difficult to determine at times. However,

---

[64] This point need not imply that every unit of the opening and closing sections was actually composed by the writer of the epistle. Some of the units show signs of being traditional material (4:6-12 particularly). However, the argument here is that the writer has deliberately structured the opening and closing sections either by composing his own material or using traditional materials available to him. For more on the character and nature of James' arrangement see the third chapter of this thesis.

133

the argument here is that the conclusion of the main body can
be delineated and that it can be separated from the epis-
tolary conclusion to the letter. There are several important
structural elements which will be examined in order to demon-
strate the following: the conclusion to the main body con-
sists of 4:6-5:12 and the conclusion to the letter of 5:13-
20.

The conclusion to the letter is somewhat different than
standard epistles. For instance, there is no final farewell,
greeting, or other significant concluding formula as is evi-
dent in most of the Pauline corpus. Francis has argued that
the πρὸ πάντων formula, which appears in 5:12, when combined
with a health wish is an important element in the final
closing of a Hellenistic letter. As well, oath formulas are
also an important part of the closing of some letters.[65]
Thus, Francis has suggested that the closing to the letter
includes 5:12 in which one finds the πρὸ πάντων formula with
an oath formula (or anti-oath formula in this case). As
well, in 5:13-18 one finds a concern for health expressed, as
well as mention of prayer (itself a major element in the
closing of New Testament letters). This, according to Fran-
cis, is clear evidence that James 5:12-20 forms part of the

---

[65] "The Form and Function," p.125. Francis is here relying
on the study by F. X. J. Exler, The Form of the Ancient
Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography (Washington:
Catholic University of America, 1923).

134

closing section to the letter. For Francis, however, the conclusion to the letter begins much earlier at 5:7 with οὖν marking the beginning of a new unit: the eschatological close which is characteristic of New Testament letters.[66] His argument has some real merit especially in regards to 5:12-20, but the structure presented here demurs in several respects.

The argument presented here is that 5:13 not 5:7 marks the beginning of the conclusion to the letter. There are three main reasons for suggesting this. First, the eschatological instruction is clearly connected to what precedes it. The οὖν connects 5:7-11/12 with the eschatological denunciation of the rich. To separate the unit at 5:6 is to break up the logical flow of thought. 5:7ff. is not the eschatological conclusion to the whole letter, it is the conclusion to the argument of 4:6-5:6. The break in thought between the injunctions against the rich clearly takes place at 5:13 and

---

[66] Francis, p.124, argues that eschatological instruction and thematic reprise are important elements in New Testament letter closings. As far as the view that the close of the letter begins at 5:7, there is relatively general agreement on this point among those scholars who attempt to structure James in light of its epistolary framework (Cf. Davids, James, p.26). Baasland, who does not structure James in light of its epistolary framework but according to its rhetorical scheme, also views the peroratio/epilogos as beginning at 5:7 ("Form, Thematik," p.3656). As for the remaining scholars who do not view the epistolary framework as essential for structuring the letter, they do not make any break at 5:7 or at 5:12/13 (cf. Vouga, p.20; Martin, p.civ).

not at 5:7, since it is at 5:13 that the subject switches completely to the writer's concern for the well-being of the readers.

Secondly, against Francis, the eschatological instruction appears not to end at 5:11 but at 5:12. 5:12 would seem to fit best within the preceding section (5:7-11). 5:12 deals with the threat of falling under judgment. As such, it quite clearly and most naturally fits into the discussion of 5:7-11. Also, the series of imperatives (5:7, 8, 9) set up a structural link with the imperative in 5:12. The series of imperatives are quite likely meant to be regarded as part of the eschatological injunction.

Thirdly, the reoccurrence of the phrase τις ἐν ὑμῖν three times (5:13, 14, 19) appears to provide a structural link for the unit of 5:13-20. In James the use of phrases and key words is an important structuring technique, as has already been demonstrated for 1:2-12. Even simple phrases can be used to link together paraenetic units, such as the occurrence of ἄγε νῦν in 4:13 and 5:1. These simple constructions, when they occur in quick succession and in similar units of material, can link individual units together. The τις ἐν ὑμῖν formula, simple as it is, helps unite the paraenetic units which appear at the end of James. In light of these observations it is suggested that the conclusion of the letter begins at 5:13. The section of 5:7-12

forms part of the conclusion to the main body of the epistle, and should not be regarded as beginning the epistolary conclusion to the letter. Further observations on the structural unity of 5:7-12 with the injunctions against the rich which precede will follow in the next section.

While the beginning of the epistolary conclusion can be set at 5:13, thus indicating that the conclusion to the main body occurs at 5:12, the beginning and extent of the closing to the main body is a little more difficult to determine. For one thing, while the parallel between 5:1-6 and 4:13-17 is usually noticed, both these passages are usually kept distinct from 4:1-12 which precedes. Also, sometimes 4:1-10 is viewed as a separate unit from 4:11-12. Added to this is the further general agreement that 5:7-11/12 is separate from the section of 5:1-6 (a point which was addressed in the previous paragraph). Despite the view that the ending of the main body generally lacks a definite structure, in the proceeding discussion an attempt will be made to delineate the beginning and extent of the conclusion to the main body and show the definite structure which appears to emerge.

As was already mentioned, the connection between 4:13-17 and 5:1-6 is usually maintained in modern scholarship. The parallel theme of denunciation against a certain class of people, as well as the important reoccurrence of the words ἄγε νῦν in 4:13 and 5:1, clearly links these two units to-

gether. The occurring word pattern occurs no where else in James or in the New Testament, so the ensuing parallelism can hardly be missed.[67] Alongside the unit of 4:13-5:6 must be placed 5:7-12. In the previous discussion the reasons for regarding 5:7 as part of the larger unit preceding were laid out.[68] Thus, so far, the unit 4:13-5:12 forms a tightly knit paraenetic unit, and properly provides an eschatological close to the main body of James.

However, the argument of this section is that the closing to the main body begins at 4:6 and not at 4:13. There are several observations which will be made at this juncture to support this interpretation. First of all, there

---

[67] The article by Bent Noack, "Jakobus wider die Reichen," ST 18 (1964):10-25, is still the best discussion on the relation between these two units. Mußner (p.193), Davids (p.171), Marynard-Reid (p.68), and F.X. Kelly, "Poor and Rich in the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., Temple University, 1973), pp.219-220, are a brief sample of some of the scholars who follow Noack's lead. However, while some view the two units as thematically and syntactically connected, not all maintain that a similar group is in view. For instance, Maynard-Reid suggests that in 4:13-17 the writer is addressing the merchant class, while in 5:1-6 he is addressing the rich agriculturalists (pp.68-98; Martin also has a similar suggestion, p.172). Despite the view that two distinct groups are addressed, most scholars still suggest that the units are to be held together as a unit.

[68] Noack also regards 5:7 as forming part of the preceding section of James. His main argument surrounds the significance of οὖν in 5:7: "Die meisten neueren Ausleger scheinen keine nähere Verbindung zwischen der eben abgeschlossenen Rüge und dieser Aufforderung herstellen zu wollen; meiner Erachtens mit Unrecht. Der Verfasser selber hat wieder einmal mit seinem οὖν die Verbindung hergestellt" (p.20).

seems to be a structural shift at 4:6. The connection be-
tween 4:5 and 4:6 and the interpretation of these two verses
is difficult to determine. It appears, however, that 4:5
provides a summation of the argument of 4:1ff. While 4:5 is
difficult to translate, it seems to be rendered best by two
rhetorical questions: "Or do you think that the scripture
speaks in vain? Does the spirit which he made to dwell in us
long towards envy?"[69] These rhetorical questions, meant to be
answered in the negative, nicely summarize the section which
precedes in which the writer criticizes the adverse effects
of envy.

Thus, with 4:5 concluding the previous discussion, 4:6,
though it has some links to 4:5, appears to make a shift in
the flow of thought, and is best viewed as beginning a new
section.[70] The phrase "but he gives more grace" is notorious-

---

[69] This follows the suggestion by Sophie Laws, "Does the
Scripture Speak in Vain? A Reconsideration of James iv, 5,"
NTS 20 (1973-1974):210-215. Also see the discussion in her
commentary on James, The Epistle of James, rpr. (Peabody:
Hendrickson Publishers, 1980), pp. 174-179. Johnson, "James
3:13-4:10," pp.330-331, also follows Laws' lead. This trans-
lation by Laws does the least damage to the text, and pro-
vides a fairly straight forward reading of 4:5. As well, it
helps overcome some of the interpretive problems in the verse
(on these see Martin, pp.149-151).

[70] Laws simply asserts that the connection of the quotation
of Prov. 3:34 to the phrase "but he gives more grace" and to
4:5 is "unclear" (Epistle, p.180). Lewis J. Prockter, "James
4:5-6: Midrash on Noah," NTS 35 (1989):625-627, has attempted
to view these two verses as a unity based on his reading of
midrashic elements in them. His interpretation seems rather
tenuous, however, and it does not account for the relation of
4:5 to 4:1-4.

ly difficult to fit into this new unit,[71] but with the Prov.
3:34 citation it appears to form a transition to what follows
in 4:7ff.[72] Nonetheless, the connection between 4:6a and the
citation is clear: it is based on the catchword connection
between δίδωσιν χάριν. The writer obviously is attempting to
provide some sort of introduction for the quotation which
follows 4:6a.

Despite some attempts to connect 4:5 and 4:6,[73] one may
argue that 4:6 is meant to be a transition to the closing of
the letter on the basis of the I Peter 5:5-11 parallel. This
latter example is pertinent since it has several close lin-
guistic parallels with James 4:6ff,[74] and indeed may represent

---

[71] Cf. Mußner, p.184.

[72] If one follows the Nestle-Aland punctuation of the Greek
text, 4:6a would form another question (rhetorical or not):
"but does he give greater grace?"

[73] Johnson, "James 3:13-4:10," has argued that the two verses
are logically connected. His overall argument is that 3:13-
4:6 is an indictment of the community, with 4:7-10 the call
to conversion. In this view 4:6 is the summation of the
foregoing indictment and provides the transition to the call
to conversion. Prov. 3:34 would then have a logical connec-
tion to the previous verse(s) in that ὑπερηφανία is often
associatedwith φθόνος (p.346). However, this is rather a
tenuous connection at best, and surely not enough evidence to
warrant an obvious logical connection between 4:6 and the
preceding verses.

[74] Interestingly enough, I Peter 5 cites Prov. 3:34 in the
same way James, and I Clement 30:2 do; replacing the LXX's
κύριος for ὁ θεός. It is tempting to see this as an indica-
tion of a shared paraenetic tradition, especially because of
the similar contexts in which it appears in each of these
various texts, however the complex nature of the Greek text
transmission does not allow any hasty conclusions in this
regard.

some form of common eschatological conclusion to paraenetic discourse in the early church.[75] In I Peter, 5:5 is the transition verse between the main body and its conclusion. The citation of Prov. 3:34 ties together the preceding comment, and then it provides a catchword connection to 5:6 which provides the eschatological injunction to close off the main body. 5:12 then begins the epistolary closing to the letter. The writer of James seems to have used a similar technique with the quotation of Prov. 3:34. It appears to be intended to summarize the preceding discussion, and via the catchword (ἀντιτάσσεται in 4:6 and ἀντίστητε in 4:7) and synonym (ταπεινοῖς in 4:6 and ὑποτάσσω in 4:7) association with the proceeding verse, provides a transition to the eschatological conclusion of the main body of the letter. As with I Peter 5, the injunctions which follow at James 4:7ff. are no longer related to the immediate discussion of envy, but rather provide the conclusion to the letter as a whole. James 4:7 is clearly coordinated with 4:6 as the οὖν clause indicates, and just as in I Peter 5:6, the οὖν joins the eschatological conclusion with the preceding citation of

---

[75] While I am not persuaded by the whole argument, there is indeed some merit to the suggestions put forth by P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism (London: Cambridge University Press, 1940); and E.G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter, 2nd. ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981 rpr.), pp.365-466, that certain paraenetic sections of the New Testament appear to have a common origin and circulation in the early church.

Prov. 3:34 and indeed builds upon the citation.[76] Hence, the
argument presented here is that 4:6, regardless how one in-
terprets the verse, is intended as a transition from the main
body to its conclusion. 4:6 is loosely related to what pre-
cedes, and explicitly connected to what proceeds. As well,
the injunctions of 4:7-10 are not meant to conclude the sec-
tion on envy, as Johnson suggests, but are meant to form the
beginning of the conclusion to the main body of the letter.

The second reason for suggesting that 4:6 forms the
beginning of the conclusion to the main body of the epistle
has already been touched upon in the section outlining the
introduction to the main body (James 1:2-12). In that dis-
cussion it was mentioned that beginning in 4:6 and continuing
through in the following verses there is a high degree of
verbal parallels with 1:2-12; in fact, the greatest amount of

---

[76] It may be argued that the appearance of the particle διο
in 4:6 indicates that the citation is subordinated to the
preceding discussion. However, διὸ, especially in the New
Testament, does not always have a subordinating function, but
sometimes a co-ordinateing one as well (Nigel Turner, Gram-
mar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III (Edinburgh: T&T Clark,
1963), p.333. The question still is, of course, "co-
ordinated" to what? The adversative δε at the beginning of
the verse also does not clearly show to what it is co-
ordinated. As an aside, an interesting observation as far as
διο is concerned is its use as a transition device in let-
ters: it is often used to make "the transition from the back-
ground to a statement of request" (White, Light, p.211).
However, this normally would apply to the beginning of a
letter, not its conclusion, and there is little evidence to
suggest that the writer is making special use of the particle
διο in 4:6.

verbal and thematic parallels with 1:2-12 is found in the section of 4:6-5:13. Particularly noteworthy is the parallel of 1:9-11 with 4:6 and the mention of ταπεινός in both units. As well, the explicit parallel between the ταπεινός and the πλούσιος in 1:9-10 and the ὑπερηφάνοις and the ταπεινοῖς in 4:6 is notable. Also, pursuing this parallel even further, it is interesting to note that in 1:9-10 the humble person is exalted and the rich person humbled, just as, in a similar vein, the proud person in 4:6 is opposed by God and the humble person is given grace. The two units form a tight and probably quite deliberate parallel. For this reason it is suggested that the writer has consciously set off 4:6ff. by use of linguistic and thematic parallels, and that 4:6ff. is meant to form an inclusio with the summary exposition unit of 1:2-12.

The third reason for suggesting that 4:6 marks the beginning of the conclusion to the main body of the epistle is the interesting connection between 4:6 and 5:6. L. A. Schökel first suggested this connection, and his argument has a great deal of merit.[77] The argument rests on the fact that the verb ἀντιτάσσω is a rare word which occurs only six times in the LXX and five times in the New Testament (two of which are citations of the Greek version of Prov. 3:34 [James 4:6 and I

---

[77] "James 5,2 [sic] and 4,6," Biblica 54 (1973):73-76.

Peter 5:5]). Since this is a relatively uncommon word in the New Testament one takes notice when some sixteen verses after its first occurrence in 4:6 it appears again, in identical form, in 5:6. Schökel argues that 4:6 cites Prov. 3:34 as a text to be commented upon. 4:7-10 comments upon the second part of the verse, while 4:13-5:6 comments upon the first part of the verse. This accounts, Schökel maintains, for the sudden appearance of the same verb and for the lack of an explicit subject in this second instance.[78] In this interpretation 4:6 and 5:6 are deliberately parallel and mark the beginning and ending of the warning and judgment speech. The strength of this position is that it provides a structure for 4:6-5:6 and links the various elements together within a unified paraenetic unit. As well, it indicates that a new unit begins at 4:6, and that a transition is made between 4:5 to 4:6, the latter, in the view expressed here, forming the

---

[78] This last point is an important one since Schökel maintains that the reason why 5:6 does not have an explicit subject with ἀντιτάσσω is because the subject for the verb was previously expressed in 4:6: ὁ θεὸς. Schökel goes on to argue that both grammatically (the οὐκ makes good sense if read as the opening to a rhetorical question) and stylistically (a rhetorical question makes a fine ending to the indictment of the rich section) the best translation of 5:6 is "you condemned and killed the righteous man, will God not oppose you." While other scholars have not embraced Schökel's interpretation at this point, some have agreed that a rhetorical question is the best way to construe 5:6b (cf. Davids, James, p.164). Schökel's suggestion, however, makes clear sense of the unit of 4:6-5:6, especially in that the ὑπερηφάνοις of 4:6 become identified with οἱ λέγοντες of 4:13 and οἱ πλούσιοι of 5:1.

opening to the conclusion of the main body of the epistle.

So far the three arguments presented here have argued
for viewing 4:6 as a transition verse to the closing of the
main body, and viewing 4:6-5:13 as a tightly knit unit of
eschatological paraenesis which is logically structured on
the basis of the parallel fates of the ταπεινός and the
πλούσιος/ὑπερηφάνος. The only obstacle to viewing this unit
as an intentioned structural piece is the seeming intrusion
of 4:11-12. Schökel argued that 4:11-12 explains God's func-
tion as judge, which is implied in the Prov. 3:34 citation,
and thus forms part of the larger unit. This, however, is
not a convincing argument by which to unite 4:11-12 with what
precedes and proceeds, especially since the theme of "God as
judge" is mentioned only at the end of vs.12. However, de-
spite his failure to perceive the nature of the link between
the sections, as well as the failure of others to recognize
the link in the first place,[79] it is suggested that 4:11-12
does indeed fit perfectly within the larger unit of 4:6-5:12.
There are two reasons for making this suggestion.

First, as was noted previously regarding the relation of
5:12 to the preceding section of 5:2-11, the series of im-

---

[79] Johnson, "James 3:13-4:10," makes a separation between
4:10 and 4:11-12, and Davids, James, p.168, asserts that "the
relationship of these next two verses (which obviously form a
unit themselves) to the rest of the chapter is difficult to
discern...they are simply a free-floating admonition."

peratives forms a structural link between 4:7-10 and 4:11-12.
In 4:7-10 one encounters a series of aorist imperatives.
While it is true that 4:11 does not have an aorist impera-
tive, the imperative form does appear and it does provide
another series in the chain from 4:7ff. It may well be,
especially based on the I Peter 5:5ff. parallel, that the
author has supplemented traditional paraenesis with a further
admonition. The relation of this further admonition is also
logically connected to what precedes. In 4:7-10 the writer
issues a call to conversion and purity in light of the coming
judgment reflected in the Prov. 3:34 citation. 4:11-12 not
only picks up on the series of admonitions, but it also ties
it into the coming judgment.[80] The argument of 4:11-12 is
that by being judge of one's fellow Christian one has sup-
planted the place of God as judge, and by extension, will be

---

[80] In early Christian circles, more often than not, the es-
chatological expectation was as much a warning for Christians
as a time of vindication. O. Lamar Cope's observations on
Matthew apply just as readily to James: "...the dominant
role which the apocalyptic expectation plays...is the role of
avoiding punishment for misdeeds and receiving reward for
good deeds...the future judgment, or Lord's return...is poin-
ted to not as a time of reward or vindication but as one of
potential punishment if one fails to do what Jesus commands"
("To the Close of the Age: The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in
the Gospel of Matthew," in Apocalyptic and the New Testament,
eds. Joel Marcus & Marion L. Soards, JSNTSup 24 [Sheffield:
JSOT Press, 1989], p.118). The expectation of the Lord's
return in James has both this warning affect as well as the
aspect of vindication (or more precisely, vindication on the
basis of being found pure and holy).

judged in return.[81] 4:11-12 thus forms part of the eschato-
logical community instruction and provides a bridge from the
discussion of the ταπεινός in 4:7-10 to the discussion of
the ὑπερηφάνος in 4:13-5:6 all the while focusing on the
theme of judgment.

The second reason for tying 4:11-12 into what precedes
and proceeds is based upon an elaboration of the parallel
noted in the previous paragraph between 4:11-12 and 5:12. It
is interesting to note the following: 4:11 and 5:12 both
begin with present imperatives after a series of aorist im-
peratives in the verses immediately preceding. As well, both
are negative imperatives occurring with μή. Alongside these
similarities, it is also interesting to note that both make
some sort of connection to judgment (κριτής [twice] and κρίνω
[four times] in 4:11-12; κρίσις in 5:12). Also, both units
have the appearance of being loosely connected to the pre-
ceding verses, and both come after sections in the text which
provide injunctions to the community in light of the eschato-
logical events to come. On the basis of these observations
it seems reasonable to suggest that both independent units
are intended to form part of their respective verse sections

---

[81] One is reminded here of Q 6:36-38, especially the well-
known logia: καὶ μὴ κρίνετε καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε (Q 6:37). This
is an important point since it makes a connection which ap-
pears in other community documents. Judgment in the present
proleptically sets oneself over God since he is the one who
is to judge in the future.

147

(4:11-12 belonging with 4:7-10 and 5:12 belonging with 5:7-11), and that the writer has indeed intended them to form a parallel in the unit of 4:6-5:12. Viewed in this light one notices a fairly evenly balanced pattern which results in the conclusion to the main body of the letter:

James 4:6-12:............Injunctions to the community (A)

James 4:13-5:6:   Indictment of the rich/proud (B)

James 5:7-12:............Injunctions to the community (A)

Both units of community injunctions end with the switch from aorist to present imperative, and are distinctly marked off by reference to judgment in the community. The middle section of indictment is nicely sandwiched between the two and emphasized as a result. It would seem, then, that 4:11-12 is meant to parallel 5:12 as the end of the injunctions to the community, and intended to provide structural links between the various sections of the conclusion of the main body in order to evenly balance the unit.

The main part of this section has dealt with attempting to construct and delineate the opening/introduction and the closing/conclusion to the main body of the epistle. As has already been suggested, the opening of James is an important element in understanding the epistle as a whole. The introduction to the main body has been isolated as 1:2-12. At the same time, however, the many linguistic and thematic parallels between the opening and the closing (which has been

isolated as 4:6-5:12) suggests that the two were meant to form an inclusio for the main body of the letter. As such, and in light of the various parallels, it is contended that the opening and closing must be examined in order to provide the framework in which the writer himself meant the entire epistle to be cast.

As well, since the two units form an inclusio for the main body of the epistle, it is also suggested that the implicit meaning of various themes and motifs in 1:2-12 can be elucidated by the explicit meaning of these same themes and motifs in 4:6-5:12. Given the ambiguity of the opening section (1:2-12), especially regarding the meaning of several key words in the context, it is argued that the conclusion can help shed light on the opening section. Unless one affirms an approach like that taken by Dibelius in which little of James has any coherence, the two parts of the inclusio are clearly meant to be parallel and indeed to frame the midsection of text within an eschatological horizon. The remainder of this chapter will attempt to bear out these insights through a discussion of the content of James 1:2-12 and 4:6-5:12, and will conclude with some suggestions as to the implications which the eschatological inclusio has for reading the document as a whole.

IV. The Opening and Closing of the Epistle of James

Having outlined and delineated what is regarded for the purposes of this thesis as the opening and closing of the main body of the epistle, this framework of the main body will now be examined. In the previous section it was suggested that James 1:2-12 and 4:6-5:12 form an inclusio for the main content of the letter. It was also suggested that these two units of the inclusio place the main content in a particular context, and indeed shape the reading of the material. In this present section an attempt will be made to elucidate this framework. The approach taken will not be so much a commentary on the text as an attempt to isolate some themes and motifs which predominate in the opening and closing sections and which help unify the thought structure of these two units. The argument of this section is that the themes and motifs which predominate in James 1:2-12 and 4:6-5:12 are largely drawn from the prophetic literature of the Hebrew Bible[82] with parallels in the eschatological texts of

---

[82] On the role of prophetic literature in the post-exilic period see the excellent study by John Barton, Oracles of God (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986). Barton identifies four basic modes of interpreting the prophets in this period. Of particular importance for James are the first and second modes of reading prophetic literature: as ethical instruction (pp.154-178) and eschatological prediction (pp.179-213). Early Christian texts as a whole utilize both these modes. Barton separates the second eschatological mode from a similar third mode, both which view prophetic texts as predictive. His distinction between the two approaches is valid, however, as the second one views the predictions as referring to imminent events, while the third approach views the predictions as occurring at a time further in the future

early Judaism, and that these themes and motifs are placed in

an explicitly Christian eschatological context. The approach

of this section will be to follow the logical flow of the

---

than the interpreter's own time. In the third mode the pro-
phecies confirm that God is in control and that everything is
working out according to a divine plan, but the sense of
immediacy evident in the second mode is lacking. This dis-
tinction helps account for some of the differences in viewing
"eschatology" which existed between "apocalyptic" literature
and wisdom texts (as well as between "apocalyptic" texts and
some Hebrew Bible prophetic texts). Alongside Barton's book,
R.J. Tournay's recent treatment of the prophetic dimension of
the Psalms of the Second Temple Period demonstrates the on-
going importance of prophetic interpretation and themes in
the Intertestamental Period (Seeing and Hearing God with the
Psalms, JSOTSup 118, trans. J. Edward Crowley [Sheffield:
JSOT Press, 1991]).
       The other issue involved in this discussion is that of
how the influence of preceding biblical texts are evident in
those which follow. This is obviously a large area of dis-
cussion, and involves such issues as explicit citations,
allusions, reminiscences, the type of text and/or translation
used, etc... On the explicit citations and allusions in
James see A. T. Hanson, The Living Utterances of God (London,
1983), pp.146-155; Richard Bauckham, "James, 1 and 2 Peter,
Jude," in It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, eds. D.
A. Carson & H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge Univer-
sity Press), pp.306-309; and P. H. Davids, "Tradition and
Citation in the Epistle of James," in Scripture, Tradition,
and Interpretation, eds. W. W. Gasque & W. S. LaSor (Grand
Rapids, 1978), pp.113-126; and for an extensive listing of
the allusions and citations see Craig A. Evans, Noncanonical
Writings and New Testament Interpretation (Peabody: Hendrick-
son Publishers, 1992), pp.213-214. Part of the problem in
the discussion is separating conscious allusion and citation
from use of stock biblical imagery and vocabulary, for there
are obvious different levels of use of biblical material. On
this see further the brief but excellent discussion by Bonnie
Kittel, The Hymns of Qumran, SBLDS 50 (Scholars Press, 1981),
pp.48-52. Also see the well-nuanced discussion of "echoes"
and "recollections" by Richard B. Hays, Echoes of Scripture
in the Letters of Paul (New Haven: Yale University Press,
1989), pp.1-33; and the various essays dealing with Hays'
approach in Paul and Scriptures of Israel, JSNTSup 83/SSEJC 1
(Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp.42-96.

structure outlined in the previous section and to intersperse
the discussion of James with some background material which
is viewed as pertinent to understanding the framework of the
epistle.

A) The Conclusion of the Main Body of James

The arguments for beginning the conclusion of the main
body of James at 4:6 and ending it at 5:12 have already been
given in the previous section. At this point several key
themes which appear in the concluding units will be related
to one another.

4:7-12 marks the so-called "call to conversion" which
appears at the end of the main body, and which is triggered
by the threat of judgment implied in the citation of Prov.
3:34 in 4:6. In light of the fact that God opposes the proud
but gives grace to the humble, the believers are urged to be
just that, humble themselves before God. On comparison with
I Peter 5:6-9, this appears to be a common closing tradition,
itself drawn from stock Hebrew Bible vocabulary.[83] The basic

---

[83] P. Carrington, The Primitive Christian, has argued that
this same pattern extends to Colossians, Ephesians, and Heb-
rews. In these latter cases, however, the argument is not
nearly as cogent as the the parallels are less obvious and
the occurrence of the parallels is over several chapters. In
James and I Peter the closing parallels take place over
several verses in succession and the linguistic and thematic
parallels make it clear that a common pattern is being drawn
upon.

intent of the unit is a call to purity in the community, drawing upon cultic/ritual terminology.

In and of itself this call to purity and submission (or, submission through purity) need not reflect an eschatological concern. The connection between purity and resisting the devil and drawing near to God is made in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and in each case no explicit eschatological context is in view. TDan 6, the conclusion to the testament, is a good example. The patriarch enjoins his "children" to "fear the Lord", take notice (προσέχω) of Satan, draw near (ἐγγίζω) to God, and to keep away from evil works (also cf. TSim 3:5, TIss 7:7, TDan 5:1, TNaph 8:4, and TBen 5:2). This is essentially the same pattern one finds in James 4:7ff,[84] but in this text it is apparent that an eschatological framework is in view. At the heart of the eschatological framework is the notion of the reversal of earthly orders at the time of God's judgment. It is this theme which undergirds the various units of the closing section.

In 4:9 the writer exhorts the readers "to be wretched" (ταλαιπωρήσατε) and "to weep" (κλαύσατε). The reason for these injunctions "to be wretched" and "to weep" is that in

---

[84] The injunctions are, of course, all in the imperative, but unlike James, there is a mixture of both present and aorist. The call to resist Satan and to draw near to God are in the present, and the elements of the call to stay away from evil works are in the aorist.

light of 4:6 it is obvious that God opposes the proud, and
thus the community activity must reflect the state of being
humble, characterized at this point by metaphorically being
wretched and weeping. In 5:1 it is important to note that
the rich are told to "weep" (κλαύσατε) in light of the
"miseries" (ταλαιπωρίαις) which are "coming upon" them. The
same word and cognate is used in 5:1 and in 4:9. What con-
nects these two verses and units is the notion of the end-
time reversal. That is, those who cry and weep now will be
saved, and those that laugh and have joy now will be brought
down to mourning and weeping when the Judge returns. In
essence, the call to purity is a call to salvation in light
of the imminent judgment of God. In this judgment God will
reverse the present order on earth, and thus the believer
must ensure that they fall in the right place come judgment
time: one must be found humble if one will be exalted at that
time. This is the theme which ties 4:6-5:12 together, and
which transforms standard Jewish calls to purity into escha-
tological injunctions.[85]

---

[85]   A. P. Winton, as was discussed in chapter one of this
thesis, argues that the reversal motif in James develops in
the context of "theological wisdom," and that most occur-
rences of the reversal theme elsewhere in the New Testament,
particularly in the Synoptics, should not be assigned hastily
to an eschatological context (The Proverbs of Jesus, JSNTSup
35 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990], pp.278-282). J. O. York,
on the other hand, has connected the reversal theme, at least
as it occurs in Luke, to the Lucan eschatological scheme (The
Last Shall Be First, JSNTSup 46 [Sheffield: JSOT Press,

The theme of reversal is not uncommon in the New Testament and in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period.[86] Perhaps the best known example is that expressed in the Sermon on the Mount/Plain, particularly the Lucan version.[87] It is in James 4:6ff., however, that the eschatological thrust of this motif comes most clearly into view. In particular

1991], pp.162-163,182-184). There is thus a fair amount of disagreement on the context and nature of the reversal motif in the New Testament. The argument being put forth here for James is that the reversal motif in James is placed in an explicit eschatological framework.

[86] For the reversal motif in the latter see the discussions by G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, HTS 26 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972); and John D. Crossan, The Cross That Spoke (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988), pp. 297-334.

[87] Luke 6:20-26 is particularly striking in that the reversal is made quite explicit by a series of reversal parallels. Four reversal blessings for the hearers (6:20-23) are paralleled by four woes placed upon those who will be rejected by God (6:24-26). The state one is in at present will be reversed in the future. As well, the interesting parallels between James and Luke at this juncture should not go unnoticed, especially the occurrence of several key words: James 4:9: πενθήσατε/πένθος, κλαύσατε, and γέλως; Lk. 6:25b: γελῶντες, πενθήσετε, κλαύσετε. The common occurrence of these combination of words and cognates in the same reversal context indicates that James' use of the tradition was not in isolation in early Christian circles. On Luke 6:20-26 see the discussion by I. Howard Marshall, Commentary on Luke, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978), pp.245-257. As far as the eschatological nature of the Sermon is concerned, Robert A. Guelich has argued an eschatological understanding for the Sermon on the Mount in Matthew, "The Matthean Beatitudes: "Entrance Requirements" or Eschatological Blessings?," JBL 95 (1976):415-434. The nature and context of these verses in Luke in Q is somewhat more difficult to determine. John S. Kloppenborg, The Formation of Q (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), pp.171-190, argues that the original Sermon was clearly sapiential in content and organization.

there are several clusters of motifs and concepts which gather around the reversal theme in James, of which especial- ly the words ταπεινός, ταπεινόω, ὑψόω, ὑπερήφανος, καυχάομαι, καύχησις, ἀλαζονεία, and πλούσιος are important. All of these words are common in the reversal scheme which occurs often in the Hebrew prophetic texts. From this cluster of words the following pattern appears to emerge: the "humble," who are now "humiliated," will someday be "exalted" over the "proud" and "boasting" ones, who are "exalted" in the pre- sent. From this basic motif spring a variety of associations and themes which are essential for understanding the frame- work of James. It would be helpful to outline some of these at this point.

In the Hebrew prophetic books, particularly Isaiah, this theme was connected to the coming judgment of God in terms of his action taken against Israel and the nations when they disobeyed God. The proud ones were about to be humbled by the avenging Judge.[88] For instance, in Isa. 5:15 the LXX translation reads: "he will humble (ταπεινωθήσεται) man...and the eyes of the haughty will be humbled (ταπεινωθήσονται)." In Isa. 2:9-17 the connection is quite explicit: "...men are humbled (ἐταπεινώθη)...and will be

---

[88] On the motif of pride and humiliation in Isaiah see the brief comments by Margaret Barker, The Older Testament (Lon- don: SPCK, 1987), pp.128-132.

humbled (ταπεινωθήσεται)

the pride (ὕψος) of men

 and the Lord alone will be exalted

(ὑψωθήσεται) in that day...for there is a day of the Lord

σαβαωθ against all the insolent (ὑβριστὴν) and proud

(ὑπερήφανον) and haughty (μετέωρον), and they will be brought

low (ταπεινωθήσονται)..."[89] Similar clusters of words appear

in Isa. 1:25 (LXX), 10:33, 25:11, 26:4-6, 40:4, Ps. 55:19,

94:1-7, and Zeph. 3:11. Perhaps one of the most telling

examples is in Ps. 75 (LXX 74). Here God, in the context of

coming to judge the wicked and the proud, "is judge, some

humbling (ταπεινοῖ) and some exalting (ὑψοῖ);" and in the end

it is the horn of the righteous which "will be exalted"

(ὑψωθησεται). What arises out of these texts is the fol-

lowing: 1) "The proud" is often used synonymously for "the

wicked" (cf. Ps. 94:4), and haughtiness, loftiness, and pride

are seen to be characteristics of the wicked. 2) The use of

the reversal language comes in the context of expected judg-

ment of the wicked; a sudden act by God in history (the "Day

---

[89] This is the reading of the LXX translation of the Hebrew.
It differs from the Hebrew in some aspects of wording, but
not in substance. Isa. 2:11a was left out of the translation
even though the same play on words as evident in the trans-
lated part is present. However, unlike the Hebrew which
reads "the eyes of the haughty will be humbled, the boasting
of men brought down," the LXX reads "for the eyes of the Lord
are high/exalted, but man is humble/low," which connects 2:11
with 2:10.

of the Lord"[90]).[91] 3) The "humble" are essentially placed in their position by the wicked, a situation which God intends to reverse. At the same time God has allowed the humiliation to take place in order to judge and purify his people. The Hebrew Bible is always clear, however, that this state of humiliation is only temporary.

There are several other interesting points to make in this connection. First, while God threatens to "bring low" and "humble" the exalted ones, and while God's people have been placed in humiliation because of the wicked, the characteristic of humility is also required of God's people. This is an important fact since it involves different levels of meaning. For instance, in Isa. 14:32 it is declared that through Zion the humble of the people will be saved." In this context ταπεινός is used to translate the Hebrew עֲנִי,

---

[90] On this see concept see Richard H. Hiers, "The Day of the Lord" ABD, Vol. 2, pp.82-83. The "day" is essentially a day of judgment by God, and can refer to a number of different occasions. On the development of the "day" theme in later Intertestamental literature see Paul Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie (J. C. B. Mohr: Tübingen, 1903), pp.188-190. Cf. also the comments by Tournay, Seeing and Hearing, pp.156-157; and the discussion by Ben Witherington III, Jesus, Paul and the End of the World [Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992], pp.147-177).

[91] It should be noted, however, that this observation applies primarily to prophetic books. In the Wisdom literature the use of these clusters of words focuses on the earthly sphere. That is, the reversal motif in wisdom texts views the reversal as part of the natural course of the universe: the proud will be humbled and the humble exalted in due course. This is similar to the rabbinic "wheel of fortune" concept (or to put it bluntly: "what goes around comes around").

"afflicted". Similarly in Isa. 11:4 ταπεινός translates both עני and דל, both words used to express the state of the poor and down-trodden.[92] The "humble ones" are thus because of oppressors. On the other hand, in the Hebrew Bible humility comes to be a characteristic of God's chosen ones. Hence, in Isa. 66:2 God "looks to the humble (ταπεινός)" (cf. Zeph. 3:12, II Chron. 7:14). The meaning in these contexts approximates the use of ταπεινός in the Wisdom literature. For instance, in Prov. 3:34 the reference to the humble one is in contrast to the self-exaltation of the proud. Sirach 7:17 has a similar thought, though here, as in James, one is enjoined to be humble: ταπείνωσον σφόδρα τὴν ψυχήν σου. Or there is Sirach 2:17: "those who fear the Lord...will humble (ταπεινώσουσιν) themselves before him." Consequently, one finds subtle shifts in the use of ταπεινός in the Hebrew Bible. In one instance the state of humility is viewed as an evil consequence brought on by an oppressor, and from which the afflicted needs vindication. In another, the state of humility - in this sense the opposite of self-exaltation - is viewed as the expected state of the righteous.[93] What happens in time is that both meanings come into play. So for in-

---

[92] For more on the Hebrew conception of poverty and the poor see the essay by J. David Pleins, "Poor, Poverty," ABD, Vol. 5, pp.402-414.

[93] For more on the ταπειν- cognates see the article by W. Grundmann, "ταπεινός κτλ," TDNT, Vol. 8, pp.1-26.

stance in James the writer both exhorts the believer to humble himself and at the same time, given the state of humiliation placed upon him by the rich person, the believer can also expect - and indeed hope - for a reversal wherein the self-exalted one is brought low. Since ταπεινός and its cognates translate a variety of Hebrew words, various concepts cannot help but come into contact with each other, as the epistle of James illustrates.

The second point that needs to be made is the further connotations of pride/proud. It was already suggested that the term had connections to wickedness.[94] It is also clear that the motif of pride has connections to wealth and to the motif of those who possess wealth (i.e., the rich). For

---

[94] In fact, the connection of pride with wickedness may be a primary one. Pride is sometimes seen as the root/cause of wickedness or sin. The so-called angel mythology which has left traces in Isa. 14 and Ezek. 28 connects the fall of the "wise one" with pride. The mythic theme of the fallen angels, which appears in I Enoch, displays the fall as being caused by the pride of the angels and their "ascent" (self-exaltation) to the place of God. It is this attempt to usurp the place of God through self-exaltation which is viewed as the primary act of rebellion against God. Hence, the theme of prideful opposition to God is a predominant theme in the Hebrew Bible (for more on the angel mythology see Margaret Barker, The Older Testament). It is interesting to note that in I Enoch 5:8, when wisdom is given to the elect, it is precisely unwitting sin and sin caused by pride which shall cease. As well, those who possess this wisdom will be humble and not sin again. It is important to note the contrast between the presence of pride and sin and the presence of humility and the absence of sin. Humility has come to represent the state of righteousness before God or the state of submission and absence of rebellion. The pairing of pride and humility thus appears to be a clear choice.

instance, in Ezek. 28:4-5 the connection is made between someone possessing an "exalted (ὑψώθη) heart" and the theme of gathering together wealth (δύναμις), piling up gold (χρυσίον) and silver (ἀργύριον) into the treasuries (θησαυροῖς), and increasing wealth through trade (ἐμπορία). The conclusion is that "the heart is exalted in...wealth." Another connection is made in Hab. 2:2ff., a passage which was quite influential in Second Temple Judaism.[95] In Hab. 2:4-5 there is a similar connection made as in Ezek. 28. The MT is somewhat different than the Greek and it is obviously corrupt, but the contrast is clear: "behold, the exalted one (lit. puffed up one), his spirit is not upright in him; but the righteous one shall live by his faithfulness." In 2:5 it appears that the Hebrew text should be emended to "wealth is treacherous, the arrogant man (in the Greek: "a man of boasting [ἀλαζών]) will not abide..."[96] In the Habakkuk Pesher from Qumran the reading of Hab. 2:4-5 follows a similar line to the one given above. In Hab. 2:4a the subject is viewed to be an oppressor/wicked person who, in the case of the Pesher, will have their soul "heaped upon" and not acquitted

---

[95] On the influence of this text see A. Strobel, Untersuchungen zum Eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem, NovTSup 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961). Also see the pertinent discussion of J. A. Sanders, "Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul, and the Old Testament," rpr. in Paul and the Scriptures of Israel, pp.98-117.

[96] The reading here emends היין to הון following the Qumran textual evidence.

at the time of judgment.[97] Here the wicked person is not said to be "arrogant" or "puffed up," but the certainty of eschatological judgment is clear. The Pesher goes on in Hab. 2:5 and translates the passage as "how wealth will make the proud one (or: "one in high office") faithless." The Pesher interprets this in the following manner: "its prophetic meaning concerns the Wicked Priest [whose]...heart became haughty [רם: exalted, lifted up] and he abandoned God and became a traitor to the statutes because of wealth [הון]..."[98] From these various texts the connection between pride, wealth, and wickedness comes into full view.

Thus, the theme of reversal was tied into the motif of the proud/haughty person, wickedness, and wealth. As well, the reversal was generally an act of God in history (in so far as the prophetic literature was concerned). It was a day of judgment when God would humble those who have exalted themselves and exalt those who have been humiliated by the proud.[99] Alongside this the notion of humility becomes a

---

[97] The subject is still not explicitly expressed, as in the MT. The Targum to Habakkuk, however, does make it clear that a wicked person in 2:4a is meant to contrast with the righteous in 2:4b: הא רשיעיא בלבהון אמרין לית כל אלין.

[98] This is the English translation given by William H. Brownlee, The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk SBLMS 24 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), p.131. Brownlee provides an excellent discussion of these verses and their interpretation in the Pesher.

[99] It is in this sense that Prov. 3:34 is interpreted in James 4:6. The original context of the citation has no es-

prized virtue - or even the virtue sine qua non - by which the people of God are characterized. The people whom God is to deliver are the humble ones who are humbled by others. These others are the proud and mighty self-exalted, the exact opposite of the ones they have humiliated. Thus, the characteristic of humility comes to symbolize the mark of those who are to be delivered; and they stand in stark contrast to those marked by pride and self-exaltation. To be anything other than humble is to exalt oneself above the Creator and to bring judgment upon oneself. Hence, one can see how various motifs and themes intertwine in the literature, particularly the prophetic books, and how they reappear again in James. Turning again to the closing of the main body of James the basic horizon of the text comes into clearer focus as these same motifs are taken up by the writer of the epistle.[100]

The closing section of James is concerned with the very same motifs which have been discussed in the previous pages.

---

chatological horizon, but the context in James does. It is clear that the writer understands that God "opposes" the "arrogant" and "gives grace" to the "humble" precisely at the time of his παρουσία (as is evident from the remainder of the unit 4:7-5:13). The citation of Prov. 3:34 in I Peter 5:5 occurs in an eschatological context as well (as Laws, James, p.181, recognizes, though she denies the same for James).

[100] For a fuller discussion of these various motifs as they are associated together in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the New Testament see the excellent study by Klaus Wengst, Humility: Solidarity of the Humiliated, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).

The themes of reversal, boasting, humility, pride, wealth,

and commerce come together within the framework of God's

expected judgment at the παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου (5:7).[101]   In

---

[101]   That the epistle of James witnesses to a end-time expec-
tation is evident. It is also fairly clear that it is an
imminent expectation. As to the exact nature of this expec-
tation, that is a little more difficult to determine. The
"Day of the Lord" in the Hebrew Bible could refer to all
sorts of periods when God was expected to act in history
against all that is proud and lofty. The New Testament ten-
ded to transfer the "Day of the Lord" to the time of the
"Return of Christ." At the level of early church redaction,
Jesus' return is viewed as the advent of the "son of man,"
who, in the style of Daniel 7, would judge the wicked. As in
James 5:7/9, this judgment was often perceived as imminent
(see further Richard H. Hiers, "Day of Christ," ABD Vol 2,
pp.76-79; idem., "Day of Judgment," ABD Vol 2, pp.79-82; John
A. T. Robinson, Jesus and His Coming [London: SCM, 1957]; and
T. Francis Glasson, The Second Advent, 3rd.ed. [London: The
Epworth Press, 1963]).
     In James there is the further problem of identifying the
exact nature of κύριος in relation to judgment; that is, does
it refer to God or Christ. The Christology in James is fair-
ly ambiguous, especially in regards to the referents of the
term κύριος. κύριος occurs ten times in the letter, often
not making a distinction between God and Christ. In 2:1
Jesus is κύριος, but the referent in 5:7 is not as clear.
Indeed, there is probably an overlapping of function seen
between God and Christ as far as end-time judgment is con-
cerned. In 2:1, if one does not read τῆς δόξης as a genitive
of quality (an influence of the Hebrew construct form), then
the Greek could translate: "...our Lord Jesus Christ, the one
of glory." Here it would be similar to the Pauline expres-
sion in I Cor. 2:8, and would refer to the manifestation of
Christ at the time of judgment and redemption. A functional
overlap between God and Christ occurs in texts relating to
judgment, and this same overlapping has been well documented
in the Intertestamental literature and shown to be key in
Paul's development of Christology and eschatology (see L. J.
Kreitzer, Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology, JSNTSup 19
[Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987]). Thus, the παρουσία κυρίου in
James may in fact be deliberately ambiguous, referring both
to the judgment of God (the "Day of the Lord") as well as to
the return of God's appointed Messiah as Judge and Redeemer
(the "Day of Christ").

light of the admonition to be patient and wait for the coming
of the Lord, it is clear that the writer of James anticipates
an eschatological judgment to take place. It is this anti-
cipation of the eschatological intervention which forms the
horizon to the closing section of the text.

It is in the above context that the injunctions of 4:7-
12 make sense. The writer is calling the readers to place
themselves in the state in which God, when he comes to judge,
desires to find his people. God will oppose the proud, and
thus the believer must be found humble. The state of wret-
chedness is obviously a metaphor for calling the community
back to God in light of the coming judgment. The language is
in the style of a call to repentance. The section on judg-
ment fits into this over all theme very well (4:11-12).
Regardless of the precise nuances of meaning, it is clear
that the one who judges sets himself in the place of the
Judge. This attempt to usurp the place of God is the sin
committed by the proud, and it is these who God will oppose.
Thus, 4:7-12 forms a coherent set of admonitions and warnings
to the community to prepare them for the imminent return of
the Judge.

The next two sections which follow pick up on the theme
of the coming reversal, at which time God will crush the
exalted ones. The cognates which appeared in the Hebrew
prophetic texts occur here again: καυχάομαι, ἀλαζονεία,

ἐμπορεύομαι, and πλούσιος. Once again the motif of pride is connected to "selling," "wealth," and "boasting". As well, the notion of judgment is always in the background. For instance, with the introduction to 4:13 and 5:1 the impression is given that the writer is calling the proud and rich to judgment. Though the Greek expression ἄγε νῦν is a common classical Greek one, the sense of the passage is that this forms an introduction to a prophetic Streitsprach;[102] that is, a prophetic disputation with the opponents in which the prophet, often using sarcasm, condemns the wicked for their having abandoned their covenant with God.[103] The prophetic judgment speech provides the undergirding to 4:13-5:6: the

---

[102] By way of interest, Isa. 1:18-20 introduces a prophetic dispute with the opponents with the Hebrew לכו־נא, an expression which translated literally would read ἄγε νῦν (that this unit forms part of a prophetic disputation is obvious from the context, and the simple imperfect in both the protasis and apodosis at least allows the interpretation of the conditions as hypothetical with sarcastic intention). The LXX, however, translates this expression by καὶ δεῦτε, and hence one would not want to press this point. As well, the expression ἄγε νῦν is a common one in classical Greek. This does not mitigate, however, the point that 4:13 and 5:1 in James appear to form a segment of prophetic disputation speech.

[103] For more on the forms of prophetic speech in general, and judgment oracles in particular, see Claus Westermann, Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech, trans. H. C. White (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991 rpr.); and idem., Prophetic Oracles of Salvation in the Old Testament, trans. Keith Crim (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991 rpr.). Also see the excellent study by D. L. Christensen, Transformation of the War Oracle in Old Testament Prophecy, HDR 3 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975).

rich[104] and proud stand under the judgment of God, and the
humble and contrite in spirit can rejoice for their salvation
is at hand.

The first part of the prophetic disputation with the
wealthy occurs in 4:13-17.[105] The tone of the text is on the
surface a little ambiguous since it does not contain any of
the censuring language of 5:1-6. However, the text appears
to deal with the notion that the proud traders do not recog-
nize the sovereignty of God. One of the Hebrew prophetic
passages which may aid the understanding of this text is Jer.
12:1-4. This prophetic text has key parallels with several
points throughout James, and an explicit reference appears in
the next unit at 5:5 in the phrase ἐν ἡμέρα σφαγῆς.[106] It thus
is quite plausible that the same text may be in the writer's
mind already at 4:13ff. At the very least, a similar thought
is expressed. In Jer. 12:1-4 the writer complains that the
righteous always seem to suffer and the wicked to prosper.

---

[104] See the "excursus" at the end of this chapter for further
discussion of the use of the terms "rich" and "wealth" in
James.

[107] That this unit forms part of the larger prophetic denun-
ciation which includes 5:1-6 has already been argued in the
previous section. The close repetition of ἄγε νῦν in 4:13
and 5:1 connects these two units; they both form a unified
condemnation of the arrogant.

[106] The other possible reference is to Jer. 25:34 (LXX 32:34).
In both cases the phrase occurs in the context of judgment,
but the phrase in James 5:3 is closest to that found in Jer.
12:3.

[107] W. L. Holladay, Jeremiah 1, ed. P. D. Hanson (Phila-
delphia: Fortress Press, 1989), p.379.

These "evil dwellers" in the land have caused the land to mourn and the grass to wither, and they have said to themselves "[God] will not see our end." This is an important phrase, and though it does not appear in the unit of James 4:13-17, a similar thought is evident. The Hebrew אחריתנו refers, as W. Holladay points out, to "one's final situation," while the Greek reading, "God will not see our ways," refers to the immediate life. Regardless of which reading one follows, however, it is clear that the evil people are "contemptuous of Yahweh's superintending of their lives..."[108] The wicked have no regard for the sovereignty of God, and they "boast in their arrogance" according to the writer of James. It is these people who will appear for a little while and then vanish. This notion, of course, has to do with the frailty and transience of human life, and how humans pale in comparison to their Creator. However, this same theme can also occur in the context of eschatological judgment:

> ...the end which the Most High prepared is near, and...the fulfillment of his judgment is not far off. For now we see the multitude of the happiness of the nations although they have acted wickedly; but they are like a vapor. And we behold the multitude of their power while they act impiously; but they will be made like a drop...they will be reckoned like spittle...as smoke they will pass away ...like grass which is withering, they will fade away. And we ponder about the strength of their cruelty while they themselves do not think about their end...And we notice the pride of their power

---

[108] W. L. Holladay, Jeremiah 1, ed. P. D. Hanson (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), p.379.

168

while they deny the goodness of God by whom it was
given to them; but as a passing cloud they will
vanish (II Baruch 82; trans., OTP).

The writer of this text looks forward to a time in which God
will reverse the present order and those of pride will be
leveled. In this context the writer makes repeated reference
to the "vanishing" of the wicked; they are but mere "drops"
and "vapor" which will dissipate at the time of judgment.
The writer has taken notions tied up with the impermanence of
human life and placed them in a context of judgment wherein
it is the wicked who shall "vanish". This is exactly the
context of the similar thought in James 4:14: "you are a mist
(ἀτμὶς) which appears for a little while, and then vanishes."
This phrase is not meant to express the brevity of life in
general. Rather, in the context of the prophetic denun-
ciation of the rich it points to the brevity of the life of
the arrogant individual.[109]

The second part of the judgment speech against the ar-

---

[109] In the citation from II Baruch and in the text of James
4:13-17, the notion of vanishing relates to imminent judg-
ment. This is clear from the citation of II Baruch and from
the larger context of James 4:13-17 in the larger framework
of 4:6-5:12. In somewhat similar language the wisdom poem in
Baruch 3ff. speaks of those who ἀργύριον θησαυρίζοντες καὶ τὸ
χρυσίον (cf. James 5:3) and those in power and position. The
poem then maintains that these have "vanished" (ἠφανίσθησαν)
and gone down to Hades (3:17-19). In stark contrast to the
vanishing language in James and II Baruch however, it is
clear that the vanishing, while being the judgment of God, is
not an eschatological judgment. It clearly takes place with-
in a wisdom framework wherein recompense and judgment occur
naturally within the course of history.

rogant and rich is 5:1-6. Here the interpretation is straight-forward: the rich have been greedy and oppressive and they stand under judgment. There are several interesting elements in this second unit of the prophetic-style denunciation. In 5:1, for instance, the words κλαίω (cf. Lam. 1:2; Isa. 15:2-3), ὀλολύζω (Isa. 15:3; 14:31; and particularly 13:6: ὀλολύζετε, ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου), and ταλαιπωρία (Jer. 6:7; Isa. 59:7) are strongly reminiscent of prophetic language. In contrast to 4:9ff. where the believers are told to be miserable (ταλαιπωρέω), to cry (πενθέω) and weep (κλαίω), here the rich and proud are told to do the same in light of the coming judgment. For the rich, however, they weep and mourn because of the devastation about to fall upon them, not because they are desiring the proper posture of those who God delivers. The language used is that of the prophetic funeral dirge and mourning cry. This is not the mourning of repentance, but the mourning at a funeral: a funeral of the arrogant and rich.

In 5:4 reference is made to the cries of the harvesters reaching εἰς τὰ ὦτα κυρίου σαβαὼθ (cf. Isa. 5:9: ἠκούσθη γὰρ εἰς τὰ ὦτα κυρίου σαβαωθ). The reference to κυρίος σαβαωθ is a striking one. Outside of the citation from Isaiah in Rom. 9:29, this is the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament. The word σαβαωθ, directly transcribed from צבאות, occurs by far the most frequently in Isaiah, and almost al-

ways occurs in the context of imminent judgment upon the wicked. It is the "Lord of Hosts" who pronounces woe on the rich and arrogant and who vindicates the poor and oppressed.

Reference has already been made to the phrase ἐν ἡμέρα σφαγῆς in 5:5. This reference to Jer. 12:3 clearly is meant to invoke the notion of judgment, particularly the killing of the "calves" who are now "fat" and ready for slaughter. The rich have gotten fat off the land and their destruction is at hand.[110] The notion of a "day of slaughter" in which God will come, destroy and then feast on his enemies is a common prophetic theme (cf. Isa. 34:5-8; Jer. 50:25-27; and perhaps most explicitly in Rev. 19:17-18: "come, gather together for the great supper of God (τὸ δεῖπνον τὸ μέγα τοῦ θεοῦ) that you might eat the flesh (φάγητε σάρκας) of rulers...").[111] The explicit connection with eschatological judgment is made in I

---

[110] There are some problems in interpreting this phrase as it occurs in James 5:5. A particular quandry is the use of ἐν in James 5:3 as opposed to the εἰς of Jer. 12:3. Nigel Turner has suggested (Grammatical Insights Into the New Testament [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965], pp.164-165]) that the preposition has been deliberately changed so that "for" (purpose clause) now means "in." Thus, Turner views this as a softening of the eschatological judgment elements in the passage (the phrase now refers to the period of the last days "in" which the writer finds himself). On the other hand, Davids, James, pp.178-179, argues that the "day of slaughter" is indeed a specific eschatological event for which the rich are presently preparing themselves. This appears to be the correct interpretation in light of the context of James 5:1-6.

[111] For further discussion see the essay by J. Priest, "A Note on the Messianic Banquet," in The Messiah, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp.232,234-237.

<u>Enoch</u> 94:8-9: "Woe to you, you rich...you have committed
blasphemy and unrighteousness, and have become ready for the
day of slaughter, and for the day of darkness and for the day
of judgment."[112] Thus, James 5:5 is referring to a time of
judgment for which the rich are preparing themselves.

Evidently, the unit of 5:1-6 is a denunciation of the
rich and a proclamation of their imminent destruction in
God's judgment of the rich and his vindication of the poor
and pious. The prophetic-like passage obviously envisions a
reversal about to take place; a reversal in which those who
are on top now will be brought low. In conjunction with
4:6-4:17, this larger unit provides clear insight into the
reversal paradigm: God opposes the proud, but gives grace to
the humble, and consequently will humble the proud and exalt
the humble. In light of this the writer of the epistle calls
the people to humility and a state of absolute submission to
God (4:7-12). The rich, on the other hand, are warned of
their impending doom: they will soon vanish and be slaugh-
tered.[113] In view of the sins of the rich and proud, 5:6

---

[112] The phrase "for the day of slaughter" in I <u>Enoch</u> 94 is
equivalent to the Aramaic שפיכת דם. In the MT of Jer. 12:3
the Hebrew phrase is ליום הרגה. Thus, while the wording is
obviously different, the notion which is expressed is
similar: a day of shedding of blood and of killing. The
similar expression from IQH 15:17 follows the Jer. 12:3 ver-
sion: "...the wicked you have created for the end of your
anger, and from the womb you have separated them for the day
of slaughter (הקדשתם ליום הרגה)."

[113] It is interesting to note the similarity between the in-

172

closes, as was mentioned previously, with a reiteration of God's action: "does he not resist you?" Thus, the citation of Prov. 3:34 has set the tone for the larger unit: a call to submission and salvation and an announcement of vindication and judgment.

To bring the closing of the main body to an end, and building upon the reversal pattern implicit in the section of 4:6-5:6, the writer concludes with encouragement to the believers and final exhortations (5:7-12). The writer maintains that in light of the coming reversal pattern the believer should be patient. Indeed, the various μακροθυμ-cognates occur four times (5:7,8,10), and ὑπομένω (5:11), ὑπομονή (5:11), and στηρίζω (5:8) once each in the short span of a couple verses. As well, three examples of patience are given: the farmer, the prophets, and Job. The writer of the epistle is obviously concerned about the importance of patience in light of the judgment which has been announced in the previous verses. The writer is clear that the coming of the Lord is "at hand" (three references to the παρουσία are made, once in 5:7 [παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου], 5:8 [ὅτι ἡ παρουσία

---

vective-like announcement of judgment to the rich in James 5:1-6 and the woes applied to the rich in I Enoch 94-97. Many similar sentiments of the James passage are expressed in I Enoch. On the latter see G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Message of I Enoch 92-105," CBQ 39 (1977):309-328; and idem., "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in I Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke," NTS 25 (1979):324-344.

τοῦ κυρίου ἤγγικεν], and 5:9 [ὁ κριτὴς πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν

ἕστηκεν]).[114] Alongside these references the theme of judgment

---

[114] The reference to τὸ τέλος κυρίου may also be an allusion
to the parousia of the Lord. The phrase "the end of the
Lord" as an act of God's deliverance has parallels in Rab-
binic literature in connection with the premature departure
of the Ephraimites from Egypt: they went out before the "end
of the Lord." The εἴδετε (aorist) need not be a problem in
the interpretation that reference is being made to the parou-
sia. First, the aorist does not necessarily imply a past
event. Second, the expression could be viewed as referring
both to the end of the trial of Job (which the believers have
seen), and also, with Job as the paradigm, to the end of
their present trials at the parousia. If the connections to
this exodus aggadah are actually intended by the writer, then
the connotations of deliverance from slavery and oppression
are being cast in the framework of exodus theology (a power-
ful image of deliverance to the early Christians). For more
on this interpretation of James 5:11 see Robert P. Gordon,
"ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΤΕΛΟΣ ΕΙΔΕΤΕ (JAS V.11)," JTS 26 (1975):91-95. Also
see the discussion by Strobel, Untersuchungen, p.259, for a
similar interpretation (Strobel himself argues for clear
connections between James 5:7-11 and the Passover liturgy of
the early church). The reference to some form of imminent
action by God in James 5:11 appears to fit the context of
James 5 as a whole. Even if one emends the reading of 5:11
from τέλος to ἔλεος, as Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The First Cen-
tury Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI," rpr. in A Wandering
Aramean (Chico: Scholars Press, 1979), pp.176-177, suggests
on the basis of the Qumran Job targumic tradition (42:11;
also cf. the mss. evidence of 1739), it would still appear
that the reference to "mercy" has the dual function of refer-
ring to the mercy which God showed toward Job in ending his
trials, and also to the hope and expectation that God's mercy
will soon end the trials of the believers themselves. The
place of Job as an example of patience in suffering obviously
would also have carried the sense of deliverance by God for
the present community in the midst of their suffering.
Whether God's parousia (τέλος) or his mercy (ἔλεος) is in
view, the point that just as Job suffered, persevered, and
then was delivered because of God's mercy, so also the com-
munity to which the letter is written can also anticipate the
same. Thus, while the main function of the Job example is to
provide a paradigm of patience amidst suffering, the notion
that this suffering will come to an end is clearly present in
5:11.

174

comes up in two verses (5:9: ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε ἰδοὺ ὁ κριτής...;
and 5:1 : ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν πέσητε).[115] In light of these
various themes - patience, return, judgment - it is apparent
that the writer wants to instruct the believers to remain
faithful and to be patient since the return and consequent
judgment will take place shortly. In the meantime he exhorts
the community to remain steadfast[116] and to maintain community
relations and regulations in order that the believers may be
found blameless at the time of judgment. Just as in 4:7-12,
the various injunctions in 5:7-13 are meant to enjoin the
believer to submit oneself before God and to prepare for the
imminent return.[117] It is clear that the writer anticipates

---

[115] One might also take note of the example of patience in
5:7. The farmer waiting for the crop is viewed as a model of
this patient endurance. Once the "crop" has received the
"early and the late rain" it is ready for harvest, and the
farmer is patient until that time. The time of harvest, of
course, has strong connections to judgment, as it is the time
when God comes to "harvest" (cf. Mk. 4:26-29, where the judg-
ment language is in the background; and Mt. 13:29-30, where
it is much more explicit). Thus, 5:7 may provide another
reference to judgment in this section. In this way the
example is meant to parallel the experience of the believers:
just as the farmer waits for the harvest, so the believer
should wait patiently for God's time of judgment.

[116] Further discussion of the "steadfast" and "patient" motif
in James will be taken up in the treatment of the opening of
the main body of the epistle.

[117] It is exactly this relationship between ethics and escha-
tology which is missed by modern scholars. Dibelius believed
that early Christians were not interested in "ethical re-
newal" of the world since they believed it to be on the verge
of destruction. In his view ethics became a increasing con-
cern and the Epistle of James belongs to this later period
(James, p.3). Dibelius fails to comprehend the relationship

the eschatological return of Christ and the judgment and

vindication which would follow.[118]

---

that exists between expectation and ethics. The two are
complementary in that it is only the "righteous" who will be
save on that "day." However, to be counted among the righ-
teous one must maintain the statutes of God and "establish
one's heart," as James suggests. Without ethics there is
only judgment for all. Hence, the concern for ethics in
James by no means places James on a chronological scheme in
relation to other early Christian documents (on this issue
see the discussion by C. Münchow, Ethik und Eschatologie
[Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981]). The connection
between ethics and eschatology is merely a form of the re-
lationship between purity and eschatology in early Chris-
tianity and Judaism (on the latter connection at Qumran see
Lawrence H. Schiffman, The Eschatological Community of the
Dead Sea Scrolls, SBLMS 38 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989]).
[118] The theme of the imminent act of God is evident throughout
the prophetic corpus. For instance, Isa. 13:22 states that
"quickly it will come and not tarry" (cf. Hab. 2:4). Early
Christians applied such statements to the return of Christ
(cf. I Clement 23:5; Heb. 10:37).
     A. Feuillet, "Le sens du mot Parousie dans l'Evangile de
Matthieu," in The Background of the New Testament and Its
Eschatology, eds. W. D. Davies & D. Daube (Cambridge: Cam-
bridge University Press, 1964), pp.272-280, has undertaken an
examination of the connection between the parousia and judg-
ment in James 5:1-11. Feuillet is to be commended for making
the explicit connection between 5:1-6 and 5:7ff. However,
his particular interpretation of the judgment is not ade-
quate. He connects the rich with "les Juifs ennemis du
Christ" (p.274) and the "Juifs meurtriers du Christ et en-
nemis du nom chrétien" (p.277), and the parousia of the Lord
is understood as a "jugement historique du peuple juif" (p.
278). Feuillet goes on to suggest that the invectives are ex
eventu prophecy which viewed the destruction of Jerusalem as
the judgment on the Jews (p.280). However, there is little
doubt that James 5:1-11 refers to the return of Christ in the
sense of a final judgment on the wicked. As well, the simple
equation of the "rich" and the "non-Christian Jews" is in-
adequate. The "rich" may well be Jews, but not because the
Jewish people are viewed by the writer as the murders of
Christ or as the official opposition of Christianity.
Rather, if the "rich" are Jews the understanding is much more
along the lines of an inter-Jewish debate (something along
the lines suggested by J. Louis Martyn, History and Theology

176

The theme of eschatological judgment and reversal thus
tie the whole unit of 4:6-5:13 together into a unified whole.
It is evident that the writer has an eschatological event in
view, and that this undergirds the structure of 4:6-5:13.
The eschatological reversal is anticipated, so the writer
calls the believer to submission and humility and condemns
and denounces the rich and proud, announcing the imminent
judgment which awaits them. He then concludes the unit with
further exhortation to the community in light of the impen-
ding judgment. James 4:6-5:13 is formed within an explicit
eschatological horizon. It now remains to be shown that the
opening of the main body is also formed within this same
horizon.

B. The Opening of the Main Body of James[119]

---

in the Fourth Gospel, rev. ed. [Nashville: Abingdon Press,
1979]; J. Andrew Overman, Matthew's Gospel and Formative
Judaism [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990]; Anthony J. Sal-
darini, "The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict
in the Galilee," in The Galilee in Late Antiquity, ed. Lee I.
Levine [New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992], pp.23-
38), which naturally nuances considerably what is meant by
the terms "Jew"/"Jewish."

[119] James 1:1 is outside the realm of discussion in this sec-
tion, forming as it does the introduction to the letter as a
whole. However, the cryptic address ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ἐν τῇ
διασπορᾷ is rather curious, and may in fact be another escha-
tological element in the letter, outside of the opening and
closing of the main body. Traditionally scholars have fol-
lowed Dibelius and suggested that the phrase refers to Chris-
tians who are considered the "spiritual Israel," and the
διασπορά is taken figuratively to refer to the "wandering
people of God" not at home in this world but whose real home
exists in heaven (James, pp.66-67; also see K. L. Schmidt,
"διασπορά," TDNT, Vol 2, pp.98-104). Davids has suggested

177

The other main indication of the eschatological

_____

that perhaps the reference is to be taken as referring to
Jewish Christians outside Palestine; a literal reading of the
text (James, p.64; also cf. Mußner, Der Jakobusbrief, pp.61-
62). The strength of the latter position is the lack of
evidence that Christians adopted the term "twelve tribes of
the diaspora" for themselves, and the strong evidence, par-
ticularly against Dibelius, that the farther in time and
space which Christianity was from its origins, the less in-
terested it was in maintaining a Jewish identity (the late
first and early second century Christian documents, outside
of Jewish Christian ones, show no sense of identification
with "true Israel;" indeed, in documents such as Epistle of
Barnabas it is clear that the church has replaced Israel).
The other way of reading the superscription is that of escha-
tological expectation. If one thing is evident from the
expression ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς, it is that it has important
political and theological overtones. The notion of "the
twelve tribes" was a prominent one in Jewish literature
during the Hasmonean and Roman period where it primarily
symbolized Israel as a whole (Doron Mendals, The Rise and
Fall of Jewish Nationalism [New York: Doubleday, 1992],
pp.96,184). In regards to Israel as a whole, there was the
definite eschatological expectation that God would gather his
people at the end of time. Such sentiments are reflected in
PsSol 8:28, 11, 17:23ff; Baruch 4:6-5:9; and Tobit 14:4b-7
(cf. E. P. Sanders' comments: "the reassembly of the people
of Israel was generally expected;" Judaism: Practice and Be-
lief 63 BCE-66 CE [Philadelphia: Trinity Press International,
1992], p.294).. As well, the possible Q saying in Matt.
19:28/Lk. 22:28ff. also reflects similar views: you who have
followed me in the kingdom will sit on twelve thrones, jud-
ging the twelve tribes of Israel (κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς
τοῦ Ἰσραήλ)" (on this text see further Richard A. Horsley,
Jesus and the Spiral of Violence [San Francisco: Harper &
Row, 1987], pp.199-208; and Wolfgang Trilling, "Zur Ent-
stehung des Zwölferkreises," in Die Kirche des Anfangs, esp.
pp.213-219). The Lucan version of the same passage is par-
ticularly interesting for the study of James since the "jud-
ging of the twelve tribes of Israel" (22:30) is connected to
"those having remained throughout (οἱ διαμεμενηκότες) with me
[i.e., Jesus] in my trials (πειρασμοῖς)" (22:28). The same
words and cognates occur at the beginning of James (1:1: "the
twelve tribes," 1:2: "trials" [πειρασμοῖς] and 1:3,4: the
noun ὑπομονή from the μένω cognate). It is not suggested
that James 1:1-4 is based on the Lucan text or vice versa,
only that the conjunction of themes in both texts is quite
striking, and since they occur in Luke in an eschatological
context, the occurrence in James may well be likewise. In
light of the evidence the suggestion here is that the epis-
tolary introduction to James is an expression of the escha-
tological expectation of the ingathering of Israel from her
dispersion by and among the Gentiles.

framework of the epistle is the introduction to the main
body: 1:2-12. In the following pages an analysis of some of
the more important themes and motifs found in this opening
sections will be undertaken. In the discussion which
proceeds an attempt will be made to highlight the
significance of these in light of the observations already
made in regard to the closing of the main body of the epistle
(4:6-5:13). In this view James 1:2-12 is not a collection of
simple wisdom-like maxims and admonitions, but itself sets
the stage in which the great eschatological intervention by
God will take place and how the believer must live in the
present in light of this imminent event.

Perhaps the overall theme of the framework of James is
best summarized in the opening verses:

> regard it all joy, my brothers, when you might fall
> into many trials (πειρασμοῖς), knowing that the
> testing (δοκίμιον) of your faithfulness (πίστεως)
> produces steadfastness (ὑπομονήν). And let stead-
> fastness (ὑπομονή) have a perfect work in order that
> you might be perfect and complete, lacking in
> nothing...blessed is the man who endures (ὑπομένει)
> trial (πειρασμόν), since being proved (δόκιμος) he
> will receive the crown of life which is promised to
> the ones loving him (James 1:2-4,12).

It is apparent from the key words - πειρασμός, ὑπομονή,
δοκίμιον/δόκιμος - that the introduction to the main body of
the epistle is dealing with crucial eschatological themes and
motifs. The writer is concerned with the end-time trials in
which the readers find themselves. The writer enjoins the
believers to remain firm, endure, and remain steadfast since

those who do will receive vindication at the time of judgment.

In the previous section mention was made of the occurrence of ὑπομονή in 5:11, as well as the cognate verb ὑπομένω (also note the occurrence of their virtual synonyms: μακροθυμέω and μακροθυμία in 5:7,8,10). The noun now occurs in the opening to the main body two times, and is clearly a key term for the writer. The ὑπομονή is a product of the πειρασμός which the believer encounters. If the believer endures the "trials" then "steadfastness" results. The main point of this procedure is to be shown to be proved/tested (δόκιμος) and hence loyal to the commands of God.

Formulated as such, the testing motif has obvious parallels to similar themes found in various intertestamental Jewish works.[120] In the Hebrew Bible God often tests his people in order to find out the nature of their commitment to him, to educate them, or to discipline them (cf. Deut. 8:2,

---

[120] The intention at this point is not to delve full scale into the nature of the testing tradition as found in the Intertestamental Literature and in the Hebrew Bible. Rather, some key elements will be emphasized. For further discussion of the various aspects of the testing tradition see P.H. Davids, "Themes in the Epistle of James that Are Judaistic in Character" (Ph. D. diss., University of Manchester, 1974), pp.12-184,308-360; idem., James, pp.35-38; Schuyler Brown, Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke, AB 36 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969), pp.5-52; J. A. Sanders, Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism (Rochester: Colgate Rochester Divinity School, 1955); and Birger Gerhardsson, The Testing of God's Son, CB 2:1 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966), pp.25-35.

16; Jer. 12:3). In the Intertestamental Jewish literature similar sentiments are expressed. For instance in TJos 2:7, a passage which is similar to James, the patriarch asserts "in ten tests (πειρασμοῖς) he showed me to be approved (δόκιμόν) in all of them I was patient (ἐμακροθύμησα), because patience (μακροθυμία) is a great cure, and steadfastness (ὑπομονή) produces many good things." In the work known as the Testament of Job, ὑπομονή becomes a celebrated characteristic of the tested Job (cf. 4:6,10; 5:1; 21:4; 26:4,5; 27:4,7) as well as καρτερία (stubbornness) and μακροθυμία.[121]

In Sirach 2 similar themes are expressed:

> child, if you come forth to serve the Lord prepare the soul of you for trial (πειρασμόν)...accept all which might come upon you and in changes of humiliation (ταπεινώσεώς) be patient (μακροθύμησον) for gold is tested (δοκιμάζεται) in fire... remain faithful (πίστευσον) to him...woe to you, those losing steadfastness (ὑπομονήν).

One can thus see the same words and themes appearing in Sirach, including a reference to the so-called "double minded" (δίψυχος) person of James 1:8 in 2:12 ("the sinner walking upon two ways" [ἐπὶ δύο τρίβους]), another motif which is closely associated to the larger testing tradition. In

---

[121] For more on these motifs in the TJob see C. Haas, "Job's Perseverance in the Testament of Job," in Studies on the Testament of Job, eds. M. A. Knibb & P. W. van der Horst (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp.117-154. This particular emphasis in TJob stands in marked contrast to the Hebrew Bible book of Job. In the latter the theme of ὑπομονη does not occur at all, and Job is certainly not viewed as a paradigm of steadfastness in the midst of trial.

all these examples, however, what is noticeably lacking is a reference to eschatology. The testing and vindication of the righteous person is generally viewed, as in Sirach, as occurring in this-worldly terms. James, on the other hand, has taken these various themes and placed them in a context of the vindication and judgment by God at the παρουσία, an eschatological event which is imminent.[122] There is, however, some association between testing and eschatology in texts other than James.

For instance, in some of the "testing" texts a connection is made between "steadfastness" and receiving a "crown of life." In James 1:12 this connection is made as the writer enjoins the readers to endure trial so that they might receive τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς. In TJob 4:10 a similar expression, "winning the crown (τὸν στέφανον)," appears not to

---

[122] One example of James' eschatologization of such a theme is the example of Job in 5:11. In TJob the ὑπομονή of Job is not explicitly eschatological. However, when the example of Job is put forth in James 5:11 - an example to be imitated as ὑπόδειγμα indicates - his ὑπομονή is paralleled with the call for the believers to endure (ὑπομένω) in light of the imminent return of Christ. The writer then states that the readers "have seen the end/mercy ("mercy" if τέλος is emended to ἔλεος, cf. pp.170-171) of the Lord, because the Lord is full of pity and compassionate." In the context of James this comes to mean that the Lord will hasten the end and will not prolong the time when judgment is to take place. The ὑπομονή and τέλος/ἔλεος of the Job story thus become placed in an eschatological context where the steadfastness of the believer and the mercy and purposes of the Lord are set in a framework of the imminent return of Christ.

be used in an eschatological context.[123] However, in 1QS the Hebrew equivalent to ὑπομονή, ביצר (cf. 1QS 4:5 and 8:3 where the term means "firm inclination"), is connected to remaining true to God's truth towards the goal of achieving "eternal joy in everlasting life" and "the glorious crown" (כליל כבוד) (4:7). In Rev. 2:10, in a manner similar to James, a more explicit correlation occurs: "...behold, the devil is about to cast some of you into prison so that you might be tested (πειρασθῆτε) and have tribulation (θλῖψιν)...Be faithful (πιστὸς) unto death and I will give to you the crown of life (τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς)." Further on in the same chapter the seer states that those remaining true to God will be given authority over the nations to rule them with an iron rod (2:26-27). The notion expressed again is that of the connection between present steadfastness and eternal reward (in this case, being able to rule with Christ).

Perhaps the eschatological framework of testing is best expressed in those passages which deal with the "fire of refining," for it is here, in the purpose of testing, that one most clearly sees the eschatological horizon loom large. Already in the Hebrew Bible there was the notion of a refining or proving of God's people which would take place on

[123] Even if the prior phrase of 4:9 - "and you might be raised up in the resurrection" - is not a Christian interpolation, this expression is placed alongside recompense in this world to those who endure.

the day of YHWH's judgment. Mal. 3:1-5 is the locus clas

sicus of this notion, though it also occurs elsewhere such as

Zech. 13:9 ("I will test [δοκιμῶ] them as one tests

[δοκιμάζεται] silver"). In the Malachi passage the word used

is καθαρίζω - to cleanse - but, while a different word, the

meaning is clearly that of purifying the believing community.

As well, alongside the concept ofpurifying the community in

order to present it acceptable on the day of judgment, is the

idea of judgment of the wicked, in which group those who

"swear falsely" (cf. James 5:12), those who oppress the widow

and orphan (cf. James 1:27), and those who oppress the "wages

of the hired man" (cf. James 5:4) are of particular note.

There is thus a clear tradition of a day of judgment which

will purify the believing community and destroy the wicked.

In some texts a great day of refining comes into view. Here

there is an expectation of a great end-time "fire" (probably

metaphorical) through which all people would pass, the wicked

being burned and the righteous being purified and proved.

For instance, in II Baruch 48:39-41 the writer asserts that

"a fire will consume [the wicked people's] thoughts and with

a flame the meditations of their kidneys will be examined.

For the Judge will come and not hesitate...and they did not

know my Law because of their pride, but many will surely weep

at that time" (trans., OTP). In 85:15 the writer claims that

"God will make alive those whom he has found and he will

purge them from sins" (trans., OTP).[124]

Similar connections are made in the New Testament. For instance, in I Cor. 3:10-15 parallel themes surface. Here Paul speaks of Christians: "the work of each person will be manifest, for the day will disclose it, because in fire it [probably referring to the "day"] will be revealed, and the fire will test [δοκιμάσει] the sort of work which each person's is." In 4:1-5 Paul goes on to refer to the judgment which is to come at the time of the end, and that one should reserve final judgment until then. Thus, Paul clearly draws on the theme of a final judgment - in this case, one of fire - which will test the works of Christians. As well, like James, he connects this to the theme of judgment in the community.[125] A similar connection is made in Rev. 3:10: "because

---

[124] On the close association of fire, testing, and the punishment of God see Tournay, Seeing and Hearing, pp.149-150.

[125] For more on the pauline text see David W. Kuck, Judgment and Community Conflict, NovTSup 66 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992); Charles W. Fishburne, "I Corinthians III. 10-15 and the Testament of Abraham," NTS 17 (1970-1971): 109-115; and Biörn Fjärstedt, Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians (Sweden: Uppsala, 1974), pp.154-168. For more on the apocalyptic dimension of these pauline themes see Calvin J. Roetzel, Judgement in the Community (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972). For further references to the "trial by fire" and the end-time see Sib 3:618, 8:411, and TAbr 13. There is also a possible reference to a similar theme in the Lord's Prayer. Raymond E. Brown has delivered a very compelling argument for viewing the Lord's Prayer as an eschatological prayer of deliverance ("The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer," rpr. in New Testament Essays [New York: Paulist Press, 1965], pp.217-253). In this understanding the πειρασμός of Math. 6:13/Lk. 11:4 refers to the eschatological battle between God and Satan, or perhaps better, it refers to the final trial which

185

you kept my word of steadfastness [ὑπομονῆς] I will keep you

from the hour of the trial [τοῦ πειρασμοῦ], the one about to

come upon the whole world to test [πειράσαι] the inhabitants

of the earth." The seer goes on to enjoin the people to

"hold on to that which they have" so that no one may take

their crown (στέφανον). Once again, the πειρασμός envisioned

is a end-time trial which will test the hearts, faith, and

works of the wicked and righteous in order to prove some and

damn others.[126]

In some of the Qumran texts a similar time of judgment

is envisioned, the aim of which was to cleanse the believing

community of its יצר הרע: "...until the appointed time of

judgment has been decreed, then God will purify (ברר),

through his truth, all the works (מעשה) of a man. He will

refine (זקק) for himself the sons of man (cf. Mal. 3:3) in

order to destroy every evil spirit from the midst of his

---

will test all people of earth, from which Christians, in
humility, ask for deliverance. For further discussion of the
issues see Anton Vögtle, "Der 'eschatologische' Bezug der
Wir-Bitten des Vaterunser," in Jesus und Paulus, eds. E. E.
Ellis & Erich Gräßer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,
1975), pp.344-362. On the eschatological associations of
πειρασμός in the Synoptics see the brief note by C. H. Dodd,
The Parables of the Kingdom, rev. ed. (New York: Charles
Scribner's Sons, 1961), p.132,n.1.

[126] Schuyler Brown's discussion of this text concludes that
πειρασμος in its occurrence here is a definite eschatological
event which God promises faithful believers he will help them
endure ("'The Hour of Trial' (Rev 3.10)," JBL 85 [1966]:308-
314).

flesh" (1QS 4:20).[127] Thus, one can see that many different groups from a variety of traditions anticipated a final judgment which would purify the believing community and consume the wicked and rebellious.

From the anticipation of a coming eschatological trial which would purify the believers and destroy the wicked it is only a small step to extend this trial to the time immediately preceding the end. In this way the ones in the midst of trial are being purified in the present in order that they may be found "perfect" at the time of judgment. The trial is thus God's means of testing, refining, and purifying his community, since only those who remain steadfast will see the end. This notion is already present in Rev 3:10ff. where the final trial is already viewed as being underway: the events, in the midst of which the seer and his readers live, are already the beginning of the end-time trials and the believer must remain steadfast in order to be saved. Perhaps this understanding is no more apparent and prominent than in the Qumran literature.

---

[127] For a detailed discussion of this text see William H. Brownlee, The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp.261-270. However, Brownlee's argument that this verse refers to a messianic figure who will be "purified more [מ] than the sons of men" does not really fit the larger context of the chapter. Also see the comments by John E. Worrell, "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls" (Ph. D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968), pp.369-375.

In Qumran the notion of a tested, purified or refined people appears in several texts. The imagery used is drawn from Proverbs (esp. 17:3), particularly the concept of the "crucible" (כור/מצרף) in which God tests and refines the righteous. For instance, in 1QH 5:16 the hymnist states: "you have led him [i.e., the poor man, אביון] into the crucible [מצרף] as gold into the works of fire and like silver refined [זקק] in the flame of the forge [כור] to be purified [לטהר] seven times." The crucible consists of the insults and torments of the "wicked of the people" (רשעי עמים). In 1QS 1:17 the initiate is enjoined not to "turn back" from God and his commands on account of "terror, fear, or affliction [מצרף] occurring in the dominion of Belial." Here the "crucible" is viewed as occurring in the time before the end, the time of Belial and his forces.

In 1QS 8:1ff. a similar notion is expressed. Here the "council of the community" is said to "guard the truth upon the earth with steadfastness [ביצר]" and to enter into the "distress of the crucible [צרה מצרף]." The text then goes on to say that once these things have been accomplished then the "council of the community will be established in truth as an eternal planting, a house of holiness for Israel, and an intimate company of holiness..." In 8:7 the "council" is then identified as the "tested [בחן] wall, the precious cornerstone." The ones who constitute the new building of God

are "tested;" they have remained steadfast and have not tur-
ned away from the ordinances of God. The crucible - the
dominion of Belial - has served to test and purify the com-
munity, and thus they can form the basis of the "new temple"[128]
which God is erecting in the wilderness. In the context of
1QS 8 the connection between holiness, affliction, and being
tested is crucial. The "tested wall" is a standard of holi-
ness only because it has endured and remained steadfast in
the crucible.[129]

   Somewhat similar concepts are expressed in 1QM 16:15ff.:
"the heart of his people he has tried [יבחן]...and he will
place them whole through the flames...the ones tested in the
crucible [בחוני מצרף]...make yourselves strong in the cru-

---

[128] The theme of the "new temple" is an important one since it
unites the idea of community (understood as the "new temple"
in the wilderness; cf. 1QS 9:3-5) with themes of cultic and
ethical purity. The degree of importance which purity
(ethical and cultic) is accorded in various Second Temple
Jewish groups (James and Qumran included, though in the for-
mer ethical purity is more clearly in view) is reflected in
the adoption and use of temple imagery by the various groups.
The importance of the purity of community in order to receive
salvation at the judgment is clear in both James and Qumran,
and becomes the motivation for God's testing the heart of his
people. For more on this temple imagery in Qumran and the
New Testament see Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Com-
munity in Qumran and the New Testament, SNTSMS 1 (Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press, 1965); and R. J. McKelvey, The
New Temple: The Church in the New Testament (London: Oxford
University Press, 1969).

[129] For more on this text, and the use of the Isa. 28:16 re-
ference in other Jewish and Christian texts, see Otto Betz,
"Firmness in Faith: Hebrews 11:1 and Isaiah 28:16," rpr in
Jesus Der Herr der Kirche (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990),
pp.425-446.

cible [במצרף] of God until he moves his hand for his afflic-
tions [מצרפיו] to cease." On the one hand this reference can
be viewed as referring to the battle underway against the
"sons of darkness" and the casualties which have been incur-
red.[130] In this understanding the "testing" and the "crucible"
are the losses suffered in the first battle, and are connec-
ted to the test of God through Belial and his army mentioned
in 16:11 (ולבחון בם כול חרוצי המלחמה). Yet, at the same
time, it also fits into the larger "crucible" theme outlined
above. The explicit connection between purification and
testing is still evident, as is the eschatological context of
the "crucible" in which the Qumran covenanters find them-
selves. God puts his people to the test and the expectation
is that they will remain steadfast to the end and will not
falter. Steadfastness, in this context, is at the heart of
the purification and testing process.[131]

---

[130] Cf. Philip R. Davies, 1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran, BO
32 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977), pp.80-81.

[131] One further, more vague, reference to the Qumran "cru-
cible" (כור) tradition should be mentioned. In 1QH 3:1-18
there are several references to the "crucible" and it is
paralleled to the womb of a pregnant woman about to give
birth. It is a somewhat enigmatic passage, but the gist of
the text appears to be that God will deliver the Qumran co-
venanters from the "labor pains" of the "womb." Here the
"womb" is parallel to the "crucible" of affliction which
purifies the sect. Much in the sense of Rev. 3:10, God pro-
mises deliverance from, or better, sustaining power to over-
come, the travail of the last days. In the context of the
text and the larger Hodayot corpus it is most likely that the
"womb"/"crucible" is understood as the persecution by the
enemies of the community (the hymnist has previously compared

Similar notions to those expressed in Qumran emerge elsewhere in early Christian and Jewish texts. In IV Ezra 16:70-73 the writer envisions a time of persecution and trial similar to Revelation:

> For in many places and in neighboring cities there shall be a great insurrection against those who fear the Lord. They shall be like madmen, sparing no one...then the tested quality of my chosen people shall be manifest, as gold that is tested by fire (trans., OTP).

Here the connection between eschatological trial and the "testedness" of God's people is explicit. In Hermas similar connections are made in that the trial of the present time is seen as a purification process which refines God's people and prepares them for membership of the eschatological community.[132] Of particular importance for James is the occurrence of this motif in I Peter 1:6-9. In this passage the believers face "many trials" (ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς) in order that the "genuineness" (δοκίμιον) of their "faith" (πίστεως),

---

"himself" to a ship in trouble and a fortress under siege). After the initial "birth pangs" the community is delivered while their enemies are judged. On this text see further Schuyler Brown, "Deliverance from the Crucible: Some Further Reflexions on 1QH III.1-18," NTS 14 (1967-1968): 247-259; and J. J. Collins, "Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran," in Traditions in Transformation, eds. Baruch Halpern & J. D. Levenson (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1981), pp.366-370. Brown, in my view, rightly rejects the messianic interpretation of this text. See also Svend Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot - Psalms from Qumran, ATD 2 (Denmark: Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus, 1960), pp.51-64, who interprets the text similarly; and Worrell, "Concepts of Wisdom," pp.375-379, who follows a messianic interpretation of the text.

[132] On this see further R.J. Bauckham, "The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas," JTS 25 (1974):27-40.

just as gold is tested by fire (διὰ πυρὸς...δοκιμαζομένου),
"might be proven for praise, glory and honor at the re-
velation [ἀποκαλύψει] of Jesus Christ." The rejoicing
(ἀγαλλιᾶσθε) of vs.6 is connected to the ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ of
vs.5 by the ἐν ᾧ at the beginning of vs.6. Thus, the rejoi-
cing is not in the present, but is a future expression of joy
which will be given at the return of Christ. Consequently,
the I Peter text is quite clearly an eschatologically orien-
ted passage, which views the present trials as a test of the
genuineness of the believer's faith, so that they will
achieve salvation at the "revelation" of Christ.[133] From these
various examples it is clear that the testing of believers in
the "last days" is intended to refine and prove their faith
so that they stand perfect and complete at the παρουσία of
Christ. Both early Christian and Jewish texts connect the
concepts of testing, steadfastness, and proving one's faith
and place them in an eschatological context.[134]

---

[133] The call to rejoice in vs.8 should also be read as a
future oriented expression. On this see further Troy M.
Martin, "The Present Indicative in the Eschatological State-
ments of 1 Pet 1:6, 8," JBL 111 (1992):307-312. The eschato-
logical interpretation of this passage is also accepted by J.
Ramsey Michaels, I Peter WBC 49 (Waco: Word Books, 1988),
pp.25-37. P. H. Davids' attempt to understand the thought as
proleptic expressions of joy is not as satisfactory (The
First Epistle of Peter, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans,
1990], pp.54-60). The occurrence of similar themes in
Rom. 5:3-5 reflects the notion of proleptic rejoicing more
than does the I Peter text.

[134] Even though it is often considered to be a wisdom docu-
ment, the Wisdom of Solomon makes some of the same connec-

Returning now to the opening of the main body (James 1:2-12), it appears, in light of the above outline, that the eschatological context of this passage is key to understanding the combination of themes which occur in this text. In 1:2-4,12 the themes of testing, faith, genuineness, and steadfastness occur in conjunction. The context of 1:2-4 may be somewhat vague, but in vs.12 there is no doubt: the context is eschatological in thrust. In vs.2-4, as in I Pet. 1:6, reference is made to πειρασμοῖς ποικίλοις. These could refer to general trials and temptations of life, especially since the plural lacks a certain specificity. However, the clear context in the parallel of I Pet., and the unmistakable

---

tions. Particularly in the section of chapters 2-5 there are numerous references to the persecution of the righteous and their ultimate exaltation. Of particular note at this point is the connection, once again, of a crucible-like affliction in which the righteous are persecuted, in this process tested (ἐπείρασεν) by God, and proved to be worthy (εὖρεν ἄξιος). At the time of judgment (ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς) these tested believers will rule with God. It is true that the righteous in this context have been killed and that what is promised is future immortality. However, the eschatological notions of future judgment and the promise of ruling with God at that time are clear evidence that eschatological concepts still loom large in the book. In chapter 5 the persecuted righteous man returns and judges those who have put him to death. Clearly apocalyptic-like elements are involved here, and the reversal scheme of humiliation and exaltation is apparent (for further discussion of these themes in Wisd. see Nickelsburg, Resurrection). Thus, while Wisd. is heavily indebted to Greek philosophical concepts, including middle-Platonic thought, there are strong reminiscences of eschatological themes similar to those found in apocalyptic texts (for more on this variegated nature of Wisd. see J. J. Collins, "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age," HR 17 [1977]:121-142).

(and singular) reference to "trial" (πειρασμόν) in an escha-
tological context in Jm 1:12, is clear evidence that the
writer intended vs.2-4 to be understood in a similar light.
Consequently, the thought, similar to the traditions outlined
above, is that trials test and prove (δοκίμιον) the faith and
result in steadfastness (ὑπομονήν). Steadfastness ensures
that at the end-time judgment the believer is found to be
"perfect," "complete," and "lacking in nothing". The notion
of perfection is a key to understanding the thrust of the
opening section, for it is only through remaining steadfast
that perfection is achieved, and it is only those who stand
complete on judgment day who will be saved. Perfection in
James carries the Hebrew Bible notion of remaining true to
God's commands and not faltering, and thus it is a fitting
complement to the demand of humility (cf. 4:10).[135]

The ὑπομονή which results in perfection has already been

---

[135] For more on the understanding of perfection in James see
Paul J. du Plessis, ΤΕΛΕΙΟΣ: The Idea of Perfection in the
New Testament (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959), pp.233-240. It is
fitting that an instructional text such as James would em-
phasize perfection as 1:4 does. In Qumran the Hebrew word
תמם occurs frequently, particularly in 1QS, the community
rule. For instance, in 1QS 2:2 the community is described as
"those walking perfectly in all his ways" (תמים בכול דרכיו
ההולכים). It is important to note that the emphasis on per-
fection at Qumran comes precisely in a community instruction
manual. Thus, like James, the emphasis on perfection is
brought into conjunction with community standards and ideals.
Those being perfect - living according to the rules of the
community - will be found perfect and complete and hence
achieve eschatological salvation.

discussed above. It should be reiterated just how important this theme is for James, and the rest of the New Testament for that matter. The reason for this is that ὑπομονή and its cognate verb almost always carry an eschatological sense when used in the New Testament, and this itself is a very strong case for reading its use in James as eschatological as well.

Already in the LXX version of Hab. 2:4 the text states that the one who "draws back" (ὑποστέλλω) does not please God. On the other hand, the believer is exhorted to "endure" (ὑπόμεινον) until the end (2:3). In Heb. 10:36ff. the ὑπομονή of Hab. 2:3 is placed in a context which anticipates the return of the Messiah, and those who shrink back (ὑποστολῆς) do so to their own destruction while those who remain steadfast are saved. In the LXX of Zech. 6:14 it reads that the "crown" (στέφανος) will be "to the ones remaining steadfast" (τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν). Similarly, in the Theodotion version of Daniel 12:12 states "blessed are the ones remaining steadfast" (μακάριος ὁ ὑπομένων; cf. James 1:12: μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὅς ὑπομένει...). In Revelation the word ὑπομονή occurs several times (1:9; 2:2,19; 3:10; 13:10; and 14:12), always used in an eschatological sense (i.e. one is exhorted to remain faithful until the end at which time the steadfastness will be rewarded).[136] Even in Paul, though it is

---

[136] One could also cull other references in the New Testament which would support the eschatological understanding. For

195

somewhat less prominent than the previously cited texts, the use of ὑπομονή has this eschatological coloring. Thus, it is no surprise when in James 5:11 "steadfastness" is explicitly

---

instance, in the Synoptic apocalypse (Mk. 13:13 and Mt. 24:13; also cf. Mt. 10:22) the phrase "the one remaining to the end will be saved" (ὁ δε ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται). Also, the apocalypse of Didache has a similar reference: "then the creation of men will be brought to the fire of testing/refining [πύρωσιν τῆς δοκιμασίας] and many will be scandalized and destroyed, but the ones enduring [οἱ δὲ ὑπομείναντες) in the faith [ἐν τῇ πίστει] will be saved [σωθήσονται] from the curse/grave [or: by the one who was accursed; the meaning of the last phrase is somewhat ambiguous]" (16:5). The metaphorical trial by fire is mentioned in the connection of refining or testing the believer's faith. Those who remain steadfast in this eschatological trial will be saved, but those who waver and are scandalized will be destroyed. It is interesting to note that the "fiery trial" of the apocalypse can have the sense of a particular day of fire (as in I Cor. 3:13) or it can also refer to a period of time known as the "fiery trial". In the context of the passage it would appear that the second interpretation is in view and that the trial by fire is actually the end-time events described in 16:3-4. Thus, the notion of the great eschatological trial could either refer to a particular day in which the works of believers are tested as to their quality, or as in the Didache and Revelation, refer to a period of end-time tribulation through which believers must pass to be refined and purified for the eschatological judgment (approximating the Qumran understanding). It would appear that the concepts involved were fairly fluid in both Christian and Jewish tradition.

The type of statement found in these New Testament and early Christian references - "the one enduring will be saved" - belong to a common formula employed in various Christian texts in which a promise of salvation and sometimes condemnation is given. Mk. 16:16 does not mention ὑπομένω but does connect πιστεύω with σῴζω (the common thread in all these texts). This common pattern of an oracle of salvation and condemnation, used here in James 1:12 and other New Testament references, clearly posits a relation between present action and future judgment. For more on this formula, especially as it appears in Mk 16:16, see the essay by P. A. Mirecki, "The Antithetic Saying in Mark 16:16: Formal and Redactional Features," in The Future of Early Christianity, pp.229-241.

connected to the παρουσία of Christ, and in 1:3-4,12 it appears again in a context of future reward (τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς).[137] The use of ὑπομονή in the New Testament is essentially eschatological. It does not involve enduring the ordinary temptations and trials of life in order to eventually be exalted in one's own lifetime, but involves remaining steadfast in the trials immediately preceding the judgment of humankind; trials which are not only the prelude to the end, but are part and parcel of its inauguration. The community of believers is enjoined to remain faithful to God and to endure the trials so that they will be judged righteous.[138]

Thus, ὑπομονή is the product of the testing which is occurring in the "last days." The testing is intended to prove (δοκίμιον, δόκιμος) that the faith of the individual is pure and unfaltering so that the believer may be saved at the

---

[137] For more on the eschatological context of ὑπομονή in James see the relevant discussions by F. Hauck, "μένω κτλ," TDNT, Vol 4, pp.585-588; and Strobel, Untersuchungen, pp.254-264. Strobel's study is interesting in that he connects the understanding of ὑπομονή in James (particularly 5:7-11) to the apocalyptic-tradition interpretation of Hab. 2:3. His conclusion regarding 5:7-11 is that "vor allem ergibt sich für ὑπομονή und ὑπομένειν, daß sie noch ganz im Sinne jener durch die vorchristliche Erwartung geprägte Überlieferung stehen" (pp.263-264). In light of the structure of the epistle, a similar context can be postulated for the occurrence of the words in James 1:2-12.

[138] Mußner, Der Jakobusbrief, p.67, comments: "der eschatologische Klang der Termini ὑπομονή, τέλειος, ὁλόκληρος ist unüberhörbar. Der 'Perfektionismus' des Jak ist ein eschatologisher!...Von der 'Ausdauer' zu reden hat für ihn nur Sinn, wenn da ein eschatologisches Ziel klar vor Augen steht (vgl. V 12!)."

judgment which is soon to take place.[139] Seen in this context,
the injunctions to be patient and endure which occur in the
eschatological closing of the letter clearly parallel the
opening exhortations. The call to steadfastness opens and
closes the letter, ties the two sections closely together and
places particularly the opening of the main body of James in
an eschatological context.

The next unit of the opening to the main body of the
epistle (James 1:5-8) also fits in this larger scheme. Here
the writer links the "asking for wisdom" with the previous
notions of enduring trials. The believer is exhorted to ask
"in faith" (ἐν πίστει) and not doubt (μηδὲν διακρινόμενος).

---

[139] In the previous section regarding the close to the main
body of the epistle mention was made of the possible allusion
to Jer. 12 in 4:13-17 and the likely allusion in 5:5. It is
also possible that the same text has had an influence in the
opening section of James. For instance, in Jer. 12:3 the
prophet lodges a complaint against YHWH over the fact that
the wicked always seem to prosper while the righteous suffer.
The prophet then says, "oh Lord, you know me, and have tested
[δεδοκίμακας) my heart before you." In the context of the
passage it is clear that the prophet realizes that he has
been tested by God to examine the extent of his faithfulness.
And, unlike the wicked, who proclaim God in their mouths but
whose hearts are far away from him, the prophet has shown
steadfastness and faithfulness. It is important to note that
the notion of duplicity is evident in this Jer. text (Jer.
12:2), and that it is closely connected to the notion of the
testing/proving of the prophet. As well, it should be noted
that the theme of God testing his righteous occurs several
times in Jeremiah (cf. 11:20; 17:10; 20:12), two of which
have explicit calls by the prophet for God to wreak his ven-
geance upon the wicked. Thus the connection between the
trying of the righteous and the destruction of the wicked is
made several times in Jeremiah.

The one who doubts is unstable like a wave on the sea ("being moved by the wind and tossed about"). The writer goes on to say that a "double-minded man" (ἀνὴρ δίψυχος) is "unstable in all his ways." This section of the opening is also connected to the conclusion through the use of the term δίψυχος. In 4:8 the word is used in the call to humility before the judgment of God. It occurs in the opening to the main body of the epistle as well, and with its occurrence in 4:8, it is closely linked to the call to remaining steadfast in light of the present trials.

δίψυχος is an essential part of the testing tradition outlined early, for it is the opposite of steadfastness and faithfulness to God in trial. In 1QH 4:14 the Hebrew equivalent comes up in the context of the wicked who seek God with a double heart (בלב ולב). Similar notions also occur in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. For instance, in TBen 6:5ff. the writer speaks of the duplicity which the "good mind" avoids. The conclusion is that every work of Beliar is characterized by duplicity (διπλοῦν) and lacks singleness of intent (ἁπλότητα). In TAsh the patriarch encourages the virtue of being "single faced" (μονοπρόσωπος) and this is the theme of the text. The wicked are those with "two faces" (διπρόσωπος). Similarly, in Christian literature the notion also surfaces. In I Clement 23:1ff. the theme of double-mindedness occurs in a clearly eschatological context

where it is stated that "wretched are the double-minded"
(ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι) for they are the ones who doubt
that judgment will fall upon humankind.[140] The theme also
figures prominently in the the Shepherd of Hermas and Di-
dache, especially in their "two ways" material.[141]

---

[140] It is interesting to note that the text of I Clement 23
concludes with a reference to Hab. 2:3: ταχὺ ἥξει καὶ οὐ
χρονιεῖ. In I Clement, as in Hebrews and the LXX, this re-
fers to the coming of a Messiah figure. What is significant,
however, is that in Hab. 2:4 it is precisely the "one drawing
back" (ὑποστέλλω) who does not please God. This is obviously
a parallel to the notion of δίψυχος. Consequently, the Hab.
2:3 eschatological reference in connection with the δίψυχος
terminology may be no mere coincidence, but indeed form part
of a tradition which depicted the integral link between
steadfastness, double-mindedness, and the eschatological
events which were envisioned.
    As far as James is concerned, another intriguing connec-
tion in this text is between ταλαίπωροι and δίψυχοι. In
James 4:9-10 the two terms occur in quick succession as the
"doubleminded" are exhorted to "become wretched" in order to
avoid the later "miseries" (ταλαιπωρία) which will come upon
the rich (5:1). The parallel set up would suggest that the
writer views the "rich" as the actual "doubleminded" in the
context of the epistle (the appearance of the "rich man" in
1:9-11, just after reference to double-mindedness in 1:8, may
also indicate a similar connection in the mind of the wri-
ter). Thus, the fate of the doubleminded in James (humilia-
tion and judgment) also seems to be hinted at in the I Cle-
ment text: the time of judgment is near and the double-minded
shall receive their just reward (in I Clement 23, of course,
the image of judgment of the doubleminded has faded to the
background, but I would argue traces can still be found such
as the reference to the vine coming to fullness).

[141] For more on the various dimensions of the term δίψυχος and
its related terms see W. I. Wolverton, "The Double-Minded Man
in the Light of Essene Psychology," ATR 38 (1956):166-175;
and Davids, "Themes in the Epistle of James," pp.57-65. The
basic thought underlying these terms comes from the "two
ways" traditions current in Second Temple Jewish and early
Christian texts. For an excellent discussion of these tra-
ditions see Otto Böcher, Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusam-
menhang des nachbiblischen Judentums (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn,

Thus, James 1:5-8 makes it clear that the double-minded man is one who lacks faith and steadfastness. Such a person will not endure until the end and consequently stands in judgment (they will receive nothing from God). As well, the double-minded person lacks wisdom, an essential possession of those who would remain steadfast.[142] As in I Enoch 5:8ff., wisdom is the element which allows one to turn from sin and to be humble before God. The double-minded person, lacking wisdom, can thus be viewed as being on par with the wicked and the proud/rich. It is exactly this which the epistle warns against as the believer is exhorted not to be double-minded, for to be so is to be counted among the wicked and the proud and to fall under judgment. Hence, after mentioning δίψυχος, it is no surprise that the writer now turns to a discussion of the rich/proud in 1:9-11 and their impending judgment and destruction.

The last unit of our analysis of the opening of the main body of the epistle is James 1:9-11, in some senses the capstone to the opening section of the main body as 1:12 simply summarizes and reiterates the main themes of 1:2-4. In this section the reversal motif resurfaces and clearly connects the opening section of the main body to the similar elements

---

1965), pp.79-96; and Nickelsburg, Resurrection, pp.144-169.
[142] On this see Davids, James, pp.55-56; and J. A. Kirk, "The Meaning of Wisdom in James," NTS 16 (1969):24-38.

Thus, James 1:5-8 makes it clear that the double-minded man is one who lacks faith and steadfastness. Such a person will not endure until the end and consequently stands in judgment (they will receive nothing from God). As well, the double-minded person lacks wisdom, an essential possession of those who would remain steadfast.[142] As in I Enoch 5:8ff., wisdom is the element which allows one to turn from sin and to be humble before God. The double-minded person, lacking wisdom, can thus be viewed as being on par with the wicked and the proud/rich. It is exactly this which the epistle warns against as the believer is exhorted not to be double-minded, for to be so is to be counted among the wicked and the proud and to fall under judgment. Hence, after mentioning δίψυχος, it is no surprise that the writer now turns to a discussion of the rich/proud in 1:9-11 and their impending judgment and destruction.

The last unit of our analysis of the opening of the main body of the epistle is James 1:9-11, in some senses the capstone to the opening section of the main body as 1:12 simply summarizes and reiterates the main themes of 1:2-4. In this section the reversal motif resurfaces and clearly connects the opening section of the main body to the similar elements

---

1965), pp.79-96; and Nickelsburg, Resurrection, pp.144-169.
[142] On this see Davids, James, pp.55-56; and J. A. Kirk, "The Meaning of Wisdom in James," NTS 16 (1969):24-38.

to the events of the "last days."[145] In <u>Sibylline Oracles</u> 3:680 and 8:234 allusions to Isa. 40:3 and 40:4 respectively occur in the context of eschatological judgment. In <u>II Baruch</u> 82 Isa 4:6 is alluded to in a passage which deals with coming judgment of the wicked. In all these texts, particularly the ones referring to judgment, Isa. 40 is viewed as referring to the punishment of the wicked at the time of God's judgment.[146] Perhaps this is no clearer than in the

---

[145] The importance of the wilderness as the place of God's final eschatological war with Israel's enemies carried over into the Qumran texts (see Marcus, <u>The Way of the Lord</u>, p.23). As far as the Mk. 1:2 reference is concerned, it is quite likely that the previous eschatological associations of Isa. 40 naturally gave way to messianic ones as well. In Lk. 3:2-3 Isa. 40:3-5 is cited, while in Mt. 3:3 just Isa. 40:3 (on the debate over whether any of these texts were part of Q or not, see the brief notations by John Kloppenborg, <u>Q Parallels</u> [Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1988], p.6). The context in these passages is clearly that of impending judgment and a warning for people to change their ways in light of this. Lk. 3:7-9, 16-17/Mt. 3:7-10, 11-12 are clearly referring to the eschatological judgment which will soon be upon the inhabitants of the earth. In Q these texts had a similar context: "Q 3:7-9 is a threat of imminent judgment and a call to repentance, while Q 3:16-17 is an apocalyptic prediction concerning a figure who will effect both fiery judgment and salvation of the elect" (Kloppenborg, <u>The Formation of Q</u>, pp.102-103). Thus, the Isa. 40 citations in the Synoptics fit into the eschatological interpretations of that text.

[146] There are of course cases where allusions to Isa. 40 do not occur in a strict eschatological context. The reference in I Peter 1:24-25, for instance, does not appear in an eschatological framework. The case with 4Q185 (4QTann) is different in my opinion. Though here it occurs in a "wisdom poem," it is clear that the wicked who do not seek God's wisdom are the one's who fade away and perish since they are not sustained by God. Later on the text suggests that God will redeem his people and put to death those who hate and reject his wisdom. This is evidently a judgment passage which more than likely has based itself loosely on the Isa.

Isaiah Targum. Here the interpreter has made it clear that

it is the "wicked" who are "as grass" and will perish (כעשבא

רשיעיא ;אבדו עשתוהוהי מית רשיעא). This is an important in-

terpretation since it makes explicit what was implicit in the

Hebrew text.[147] Thus, it is not humans in general who fade and

die off (as in the wisdom tradition), but the wicked in par-

ticular. Consequently, the reference to Isa. 40 in James

---

40 text cited earlier in the poem. In the larger context,
then, it appears that the Isa 40 reference in 4Q185 is taken
as referring to the eschatological judgment which will come
upon those who do not seek wisdom. These insights are con-
firmed by the study by Thomas Tobin who, while acknowledging
that much of the imagery in this poem has been borrowed from
wisdom texts, does recognize the influence of apocalyptic
traditions in the passage (see "4Q185 and Jewish Wisdom Li-
terature," in Of Scribes and Scrolls, eds. Harold W. Attridge
et al. [Lanham: University Press of America, 1990], pp.145-
154).

[147] On the date and provenance of the Isaiah Targum see Bruce
D. Chilton, The Glory of Israel, JSOTSup 23 (Sheffield: JSOT
Press, 1982). He argues that the essence of the targumic
framework goes back to 70-135 C.E. Seen in this light the
eschatological visions of the targum are even more striking.
For instance, the use of "the righteous" (צדיקיא) in the
targum has a constant eschatological ring as it comes to
symbolize the hope of the righteous for deliverance from
their present context of oppression by the Gentile nations
(see Chilton, pp.81-86).
        K. F. Morris, "An Investigation of Several Linguistic
Affinities Between the Epistle of James and the Book of
Isaiah" (Th. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary [Virginia],
1964), pp.138-187, attempts to argue that the language of
James, when reflecting Isaianic texts, is closer to the tar-
gum than it is to either the Masoretic or the Septuagint
texts of Isaiah. This interesting hypothesis is not convin-
cingly demonstrated by Morris. Rather, it appears that the
targum and James, at least as far as Isa. 40 is concerned,
share a common interpretive tradition. For further discus-
sion of the possible influence of the Isaiah Targum in early
Christianity see Bruce D. Chilton, A Galilean Rabbi and His
Bible, GNS 8 (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984), pp.57-147

1:9-11 is significant in that it partakes of a long history of associating this text with God's eschatological judgment on the wicked and his salvation of the elect.[148]

The influence of Isa. 40 can be seen in James 1:9-11 in several aspects of its composition. First of all, in Isa. 40:2 (LXX only) the prophet states that the "humiliation (ἡ ταπείνωσις) has been brought to an end/has been completed." In Isa. 40:4, in the process of God delivering his people, every mountain and hill will be made low (ταπεινωθήσεται). Thus, the parallel is set up that God will deliver his people who are in the state of humiliation and in the process will do his own leveling (in 40:4 the land is leveled to make way for God's people; in 40:6-8 the wicked are leveled in God's judgment on mortal flesh). Turning to James 1:9, mention is made of the "humble brother" (ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινὸς) who will

---

[148] For more on the influence of Isa. 40 in early Christianity and Judaism see Klyne R. Snodgrass, "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament," JSNT 8 (1980):24-45; and the brief discussion by Marcus, The Way of the Lord, pp.18-23. On the importance of Deutero-Isaiah as a whole in the New Testament see Werner Grimm, Die Verkündigung Jesu und DeuteroJesaja, ANTI 1, 2nd. ed. (Frankfurt: Verlag Peter Lang, 1981). Snodgrass makes the connection between Mal. 3:1 and Isa. 40:3, and argues that the former is influenced by the latter. The Malachi text was viewed as messianic by the early Christians, and as a result Isa. 40:3 may well have been subsumed under the same category as well. If so, Isa. 40 becomes a specific messianic reference in the early Christian context, referring to the coming of the Messiah in judgment (Mk. 1:2 has taken it as a reference to the Messiah's first coming, but the eschatological shades should not be missed in Mark).

be exalted, while the "rich person" will end up in humiliation (ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει). The reversal is clear: the one who is humble now (in the proper sense, but also in the state of humiliation because of the rich person) will be exalted, while the one who is now exalted will be placed in the state of humiliation. The occurrence of a similar theme - reversal - and the use of the same word - ταπείνωσις - provide clear links to the Isa. 40 text.

Secondly, it is interesting to note that in James 1:11 reference is made to the "way" of the rich man. The Greek word, πορεία, is a direct translation of the Hebrew דרך which occurs in Isa. 40:3. In 1:8, the verse immediately preceding the present section, the word ὁδός occurs, which is the word the LXX uses to translate the Hebrew דרך of Isa. 40:3. This point may be more significant than is first apparent. The occurrence of ὁδός at the end of 1:5-8 and πορεία at the end of 1:9-11 may be a conscious linking device on the part of the writer. The parallel would then be between the "double-minded man" who is unstable in all his "ways" and the rich man who will perish in the midst of his "ways." The writer, then, on the basis of a play on the Greek words ὁδός/πορεία, has linked the two middle sections of the chiastic structure which forms the opening of the main body of the epistle.

Thirdly, there are important verbal parallels between James 1:10-11 and Isa. 40:6-7:

James 1:10: ...ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου...

Isa. 40:6: ...ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου...

James 1:11: ...ἐξήρανεν τὸν χόρτον καὶ τὸ ἄνθος...ἐξέπεσεν

Isa. 40:7: ...ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος´´´ἐξέπεσεν

This appears to be further confirmation that Isa. 40 lies at the heart of James 1:9-11, since the linguistic parallels are striking, even given the fact that this image of "fading grass" is a traditional one[149]

It thus appears that Isa. 40:1-8 plays a formative role in the development and interpretation of James 1:9-11.[150] The

_____

[149] By way of interest it should also be noted that the other text which has come up in the discussion several times, Jer. 12, also has similar wording to the above cited Isa. 40:6-7 parallel in James 1:10-11. Jer. 12:4 reads: πᾶς ὁ χόρτος τοῦ ἀργοῦ ξηρανθήσεται. There have already been several important parallels shown between Jer. 12 and James, both in verbal and thematic parallels. While it is true that the parallel put forth here is only verbal and not thematic since the context of the parallel in Jer. 12 is quite different from that in Isa. 40 and James 1:9-11, on the other hand it may well have been this verbal link which brought Isa. 40 and Jer. 12 together in the mind of the writer. That is, the verbal link from Isa. 40 to Jer. 12 may have suggested the latter text to the writer of James (or vice versa). The association of texts on the basis of verbal analogy was, of course, an important technique in both early Christian and Jewish exegesis.

[150] Isa. 40 also supplies other parallels to James outside of vv. 1-8. For instance, in Isa. 40:24, a similar passage to Isa. 40:6-8, mention is made again of the withering of plants (ἐξηράνθησαν). As well, the reference to the "tempest" which carries the withered parts off like stubble is reminiscent of the storm on the sea which tosses the waves about in James 1:6. Also, the reference to God creating the stars in Isa. 40:26 may be connected to the enigmatic phrase in James 1:17: "father of lights". Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, Isa. 40:31 refers to the "ones waiting upon God" (οἱ...ὑπο-μένοντες τὸν θεὸν). This, of course, has several parallels

interpretation of James 1:9-11 in light of Isa. 40:1-8 and
4:6-5:6 leaves little doubt that what is in the writer's mind
is imminent eschatological reversal of the present states of
the believer and the rich. As mentioned earlier, in 4:6-5:6
the proud/rich person is laid low by God, while the believer,
who is called to humility and at the same time, ironically,
experiences humiliation at the hand of the rich, will be
exalted. The thrust of 1:9-11 is similar: the one who is
humble will be exalted, while the rich person will be brought
into a state of humiliation. The opposition of God to the
"proud" in 4:6 finds a parallel in 1:9 as the humble and rich
man are told, obviously facetiously, that they should boast
(καυχάσθω) in their respective conditions . It is here that
the explicit connection between the rich and the proud is
made. The rich person boasts in his position at present
(4:16), but the believer is told that in reality he should
boast (an important reversal) since he will be the one exal-
ted in the end. The ironic part comes in when the writer
states that the rich person should also boast in his humilia-
tion, a statement which obviously is not meant to be taken
seriously. Rather, the writer taunts the wicked/proud/rich

---

throughout both the opening and closing sections of the main
body of the epistle. It is true that these parallels are not
as convincing as the the ones from Isa. 40:6-8, but they may
well indicate the further use and influence of Isa. 40 in
James.

by saying that their end will be destruction (ἀπόλλυμι).

In James 1:9-11 there is also a play on the ταπειν-cognates. First of all, while humility is the ideal state of the believer (cf. 4:10), the believer is also placed in a state of humiliation by the rich person (5:1-6). Thus, just as Jerusalem is humiliated in exile in Isa. 40:2 so the humble person finds themselves in a present state of humiliation. And, to press the parallel further, just as the mountains are laid low in order to prepare a path for God's people, so too the rich person must be leveled in order that the humble person may be exalted. In similar tone to 4:13-17, 1:9-11 emphasizes the insignificance of the rich/proud person, and the ultimate nature of their end-time judgment. To ensure that the play on the various elements is not missed there is a simple but effective chiasm constructed which adequately demonstrates the writer's point:

<div align="center">

(A) ὁ ταπεινὸς

(B) ὕψει

(B) ὁ πλούσιος

(A) ταπεινώσει

</div>

The scheme amply demonstrates the writer's play on the various terms. The rich person is presently exalted, but will be humiliated, while the humble person, presently in the state of humiliation, will be exalted. The vision expressed here is clearly eschatological and fits well within the

framework outlined previously for 4:6-5:12.

To conclude this discussion, it would appear that the opening section of the main body - James 1:2-12 - is best understood within an eschatological framework. Both prophetic and eschatological concerns, motifs, and language continually appear in the text. The themes of steadfastness and testing are evidently understood within a Christian eschatological context wherein the judgment of God is viewed as taking place at the imminent παρουσία of Christ. The trials of the believer are those associated with the "last days," and the believer is urged to remain steadfast so that their perfection in their loyalty to God will be demonstrated. Conversely, the testing itself refines the believer and prepares him/her for membership in the eschatological community. As well, the refining process also prepares the believer for final judgment and ensures that the believer will be found righteous by the Judge. This whole presentation of the testing of the believer is fueled by the promise of eschatological reversal: those humble in the present will be exalted in the near future. The promise of deliverance and imminent reversal provides the motivation for the call to steadfastness and endurance. Hence, James 1:2-12 forms an excellent complement to 4:6-5:12, and both function as an eschatological inclusio to the main body of the letter.

V. The Framework of the Epistle of James

This chapter has been concerned with several aspects of the epistle of James. It began with a discussion of the different ways in which various scholars have attempted to understand the nature and character of James. These various attempts were found to be helpful in their different emphases, and indeed both the thematic and structural approaches were utilized in this study. The thesis then moved to a delineation of the nature of James as a letter and as paraenesis. It was determined that in both cases the opening or introduction to the main body could be essential for understanding the thrust of the letter, and that the conclusion may also contribute by summarizing key themes. Next an attempt was made to delineate the extent of the opening and closing sections of the main body of the epistle. It was determined that 1:2-12 formed the opening to the main body, while 4:6-5:12 formed the conclusion. Both these sections were then briefly studied in order to demonstrate that eschatological themes and motifs dominate and control the reading of the opening and closing sections of the main body of the letter. Consequently, 1:2-12 and 4:6-5:12 form an eschatological inclusio to the main body of the epistle.

The intentional connection between James 1:2-12 and 4:6-5:12 has been demonstrated in the structural discussion of James and undergirded by the delineation of the content of

both sections. Besides the various and numerous verbal links, several crucial themes and motifs for the epistle are prominent in both sections: the reversal at the time of judgment (4:6-5:6/1:9-11); the need for steadfastness and patience in light of the imminence of God's return (5:7-12/1:2-4,12); the nature and character of steadfastness (4:7-12, 5:7-12/1:2-8); God's judgment on the rich and proud (4:6,13-17,5:1-6/1:9-11) and the importance of staying clear of double-mindedness (4:7-10/1:5-8). There is little doubt that these two sections are intended to frame the main body of James 1:13-4:5, and that this was a conscious effort on the part of the writer of the epistle. As well, the eschatological character of this framework is clearly evident. The only matter which remains, then, is to outline the difference this makes for reading the epistle as a whole.

Since the third chapter will briefly extend some of the issues presented here, the following points will be presented in summary fashion. First of all, the epistle's framework deals explicitly with the call to remain steadfast in the trials of the "last days" and to do so with the expectation that the παρουσία of Christ will soon take place at which time the Judge will bring justice to the righteous and judgment to the wicked/rich/proud. Such a framework should control how the main body, 1:13-4:5, is viewed, and it does so by providing the horizon into which the main body fits and

the key themes which undergird the letter.

Naturally, since the key themes of the framework of the main body occur very rarely in the main body, one may ask in what way the framework is significant. The response, in short, is that the main body provides the means and content of what the framework intends by the phrases "remaining steadfast," "being humble," "not being double-minded," and "being perfect." These various themes which appear in the framework obviously have a very specific content in the mind of the writer. However, the framework does not spell out the details of the various themes. Rather, the opening and closing sections provide the general framework into which the specified content of the main body fits.

If one is to define genre as a cross-section of form, content and function,[151] then the epistle of James may be regarded as a paraenetic letter of community instruction. If

---

[151] This particular understanding of genre is the one adopted by J. J. Collins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," _Semeia_ 14 (1979):1-20; and Adela Yarbro Collins, "Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism," _Semeia_ 36 (1986):1-11 in respective discussions of the genre of "apocalypse." For the nature of genre criticism see William G. Doty, "The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis," _SBLSP_ (1972):413-448; J. Arthur Baird, "Genre Analysis as a Method of Historical Criticism," _SBLSP_ (1972):385-411; Tremper Longman, "Form Criticism, Recent Developments in Genre Theory, and the Evangelical," _WTJ_ 47 (1985):46-67; and the general discussion on genre in F. D. Mazzaferri, _The Genre of the Book of Revelation from a Source-Critical Perspective_ (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1989), which summarizes the main issues involved in genre criticism and deals with past use of genre categories in biblical studies.

this is the case, then the eschatological framework comes closely into focus for it provides the horizon into which the community instruction is placed. The letter of community instruction is written to a group of people who view themselves as the eschatological community of God. Hence, the eschatological focus of the framework pushes the community instruction in a particular direction: the community instruction is for the people living in the "last days," awaiting the imminent return of the Judge, and who desire to be found perfect and complete at the time of judgment. The main body of the letter is exactly that: the content to which one must remain faithful in order to be judged righteous. It is the eschatological wisdom from God given to his elect (cf. 1:5; 3:15) and defines them as the locus of God's revelation in history.[152] In the short third chapter which follows the un-

---

[152] G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Early Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity," in "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, and "Others" in Late Antiquity, eds. J. Neusner & E. S. Frerichs (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), p.89, summarizes the matter thus:
>   ...wisdom is mediated through an eschatological
>   revelation possessed by the chosen. Outsiders are
>   damned because they lack or reject the revelation
>   that enables them properly to observe divine Law and
>   to read the signs of the times.
The function of the community viewing itself as the sole possessor of eschatological wisdom is clearly one of sharply defining group boundaries and legitimating the group's own understanding of itself and its instruction. The writer of the epistle obviously wants to encourage his readers in this self-understanding, and implicitly does so by placing the community instruction within a context of imminent eschato-

derstanding of James as eschatological community instruction
will be pursued a little further, particularly with reference
to two other community documents: 1QS from Qumran and Q from
early Christianity.

Excursus: "The Rich" in the Epistle of James

The use of the term "rich" in James is quite complex.
Dibelius, following the lead of other German scholars, sug-
gested that in James one finds poverty as a "religious con-
cept" (James, pp.39-45). The background to this is believed
to be the Hebrew Bible, where as was seen before it is the
ענו (humble) and the עני (poor/wretched) who are saved by
God. Dibelius' notion of Armsein as equivalent to Christsein
is not adequate, however. The use of poor-terminology in the
New Testament and early Judaism is a complex subject, es-
pecially given the literal and symbolic (and combinations
thereof) uses of the terminology (for more on the terminology
see the discussions by L. E. Keck, "The Poor Among the Saints
in the New Testament," ZNW 56 [1965]:100-129"; Gildas Hamel,
Poverty and Charity in Roman Palestine, First Three Cen-
turies C.E., NES 23 [Berkley: University of California Press,
1990], pp.164-211; Thomas D. Hanks, "Poor, Poverty {New Tes-
tament}," ABD, Vol. 5, pp.414-424; Davids, James, pp.41-47;
and Mußner, Der Jakobusbrief, pp.76-84). There are several
things which are clear in this discussion: first, it would
appear that, as was discussed previously, there is some over-

---

logical judgment and the battle for the believer's allegiance
which is now taking place before the end. I do not want, at
this point, to enter into a full-blown treatment of the so-
ciological and anthropological dimensions of early Christian
community commitment. Some of the more important treatments
in this regard are John G. Gager, Kingdom and Community
(Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1975); Bruce J. Malina,
Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology, (Atlanta: John
Knox Press, 1986); Richard A. Horsley, Sociology and the
Jesus Movement (New York: Crossroad, 1989); and Bengt Holm-
berg, Sociology and the New Testament (Minneapolis: Fortress
Press, 1990) for a good summary and critique of recent
studies.

lap in the use and understanding of Hebrew Bible vocabulary:
the actual state of being afflicted became the expected state
of those who would be saved by God.   In this way the actual
nature of being afflicted tended to be obscured at times
(thus, in James, for example, the ταπεινός and the πτωχός are
brought into close association).   Secondly, it does seem that
various words for rich and poor were used as topoi in early
Christian and Jewish discourse.   Traditional topoi, however,
do not necessarily indicate that the person employing them is
regarding these notions as literal categories: they are evo-
cative words drawn from stock vocabulary.   Thirdly, it should
be recognized that early Christianity participated in the
wide-spread poverty of the Greco-Roman world (on the nature
of this see Hamel, Poverty, pp.8-163), and this is often
reflected in the use of language.   Consequently, in light of
these various aspects it is apparent that the simplistic
distinctions made by Dibelius are in need of revision.   The
use of poverty-terminology is a multi-leveled phenomenon
infused with traditional, literal, and spiritual meanings,
and convoluted by sociological and anthropological factors.

On the concept of wealth in James see the various dis-
cussions in Maynard-Reid, Poverty and Wealth; C. W. Boggan,
"Wealth in the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., Southern Bap-
tist Theological Seminary, 1982); and F. X. Kelly, "Poor and
Rich in the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., Temple Univer-
sity, 1972).   The impression which one receives from the text
is that the understanding of "poor" and "rich" in James is
formed from the use of various topoi and has a distinct so-
ciological function.   Thus, one must be careful how the lan-
guage is understood.   This is not to say that the categories
used as not meant to be taken literally, but this cannot be
assumed outright, especially since the language itself is
highly symbolic in the context of eschatological and apoca-
lyptic literature.   As well, in light of the nature of judg-
ment under which the rich will fall, it is hard to see how
the writer could view the rich as believers (contra Maynard-
Reid and Martin).   The rhetoric and the use of the topoi of
"rich," "wealth," "pride," "humble," and "poor" would indi-
cate that the writer intends to set up sharp contrasts be-
tween the two groups: one set for salvation, the other for
damnation.   When the epistle does refer to the rich of its
own community it tends to do so via circumlocution, such as
in 2:2, reserving πλούσιος for the enemies of the community
(cf. Davids, James, p.46).   The vocabulary used in James is
meant to be evocative, associating various themes and motifs
with each word.   The language is also highly symbolic in the
way it creates and sustains boundary demarcations.   Con-
sequently, one must refrain from simplistic mirror readings
of the text.   For further discussions of these and related
issues in the New Testament and early Christianity see Thomas
E. Schmidt, Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Tradition,

JSNTSup 15 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); Martin Hengel, _Property and Riches in the Early Church_, trans. J. Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974); and David L. Mealand, _Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels_ (London: SPCK, 1980).

Chapter Three: The Character of James

I. Introduction: Summary of Chapters One and Two

The first two chapters were concerned with mapping out a new way of reading the Epistle of James. In the first chapter an effort was made to delineate four basic areas of scholarly discussion which have a bearing on the interpretation of the letter. Two of the areas, namely language/style and the supposed anti-Paulinism, have affected the dating of the epistle, while the other two areas, Hellenistic/Palestinian Christianity/Judaism and wisdom/apocalyptic, have affected the interpretation of the framework of the epistle. The conclusions to the first chapter were that James cannot be dated late on the grounds of either its language and style nor its supposed anti-Paulinism. As well, it was concluded that James could not be viewed a priori as evincing a either a wisdom or Hellenistic framework, but rather that the letter of James must be analyzed a fresh in light of its own categories and structures. Chapter two was an attempt to do just that.

Chapter two was given over to an analysis of the structure of the letter, particularly the opening and closing framework. The importance of the introduction to both letters and paraenetic documents was outlined, and the framework of James was delineated and discussed. The main argument of

chapter two of this thesis was that James evinces a clear
opening and closing to the main body of the epistle and that
these two units form an inclusio for the main body and pro-
vide the context for reading the epistle. The framework of
the epistle is clearly eschatological and its immediate con-
text is the expectation of the imminent return of the Lord to
judge both the wicked and the community of Christians. The
whole letter thus serves the dual purpose of denouncing the
rich with prophetic threats of judgment and warning the be-
lieving community to purify itself so that it will be found
"perfect" on the day of judgment in order to be saved. In
this third chapter, growing out of the discussion of the
previous two chapters, some further thoughts on the character
and nature of James will be set forth.

II. The Character of the Epistle of James[1]

---

[1] The purpose of this thesis has not been to develop a par-
ticular argument one way or the other for the actual writing/
editing of James. This area is beyond the scope of the
present inquiry. In chapter one the argument that James has
two or more strata due to either translation of an Aramaic
original into Greek, a Semitic vorlage being redacted by a
later writer, or a secretary used in the writing process, was
rejected. There is little evidence for strata in the epis-
tle. Indeed the genre of the document makes it exceedingly
difficult to identify levels and strata in the text. There
appears to be traditional material in the letter. As with
much paraenesis, traditional (both Christian and otherwise)
images, topics, topoi, expressions, language and such are
worked into the argument of the writer. Dibelius argued that
the nature of James qua paraenesis was that it was eclectic,
that is, large sections of text were simply drawn from tra-
ditional ethical instruction (James, rev. ed. Heinrich Gree-

The Epistle of James is obviously not a unified whole in the sense that there is a logical connection between every unit of the letter, with one unit flowing out of the argument of a previous one. Rather, in the style of many paraenetic texts , James is a letter which exhorts and urges readers on

---

ven, trans. M. A. Williams [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975], p.5). Dibelius example of catchword association does not prove his point that the material is traditional (pp.7-11). Several of the examples he uses come from documents and texts in which the traditional nature of the material is not necessarily the case, in fact even in the Jesus logia of the Synoptics it is not clear that the catchword association is traditional as opposed to redactional. In fact, several of the examples from Mark (9:37-38, 12:28-40) demonstrate the use of catchword association in narrative composition. Catchword association does not prove a text is traditional since it was a common method of composition, both in ad hoc and traditional composition. Its significance lies in its common use in paraenetic texts and units, not in the fact that it indicates the use of traditional materials. The random nature of composition which comes about through Dibelius' notion of catchword association is really quite implausible and is clearly a residue of the old formgeschichte methodology. Furthermore, the repetition of themes does not indicate that the material is traditional in nature, as Dibelius suggested (p.11). Rather, as was suggested in chapter two, the device of repetition may be quite consciously utilized by a writer. Consequently, the lack of originality of the various units with the writer of James can neither be denied nor affirmed. What is important to recognize, though, is that the writer was not developing one long treatise on a particular topic, but was interweaving various topics into a whole. This style of exhortation and paraenesis is common not only in the larger paraenetic texts, but also as they appear in smaller form in the other New Testament letters (cf. Gal. 6:1-10). As well, if the analysis of the next few pages holds up, then the genre of James as community instruction clearly is the control for how the material has come together: it has necessitated the structure of the letter. Also, one cannot help but wonder if too large a distinction has been drawn between James and the Pauline letters. The latter also have their share of discontinuity, lack of cohesion, and digression.

a variety of topics, weaving traditional and original ele-
ments together within the larger unit and units. It is
exactly this basic structure of James which has lead scholars
such as Dibelius to maintain that James had no identifiable
"situation in life"[2] and others such as Stephen Patterson to
suggest that "aside from the three treatises in 2:1-3:12 and
the fictional epistolary introduction, James is simply a
collection of wisdom sayings..."[3]   However, what these
scholars have failed to recognize is that the independent
units of James not only have a high degree of logical struc-
ture in their relation to each other, but also that the
framework of the main body of the epistle gives the parae-
netic units cohesion, purpose, and meaning. It is for this
reason that the framework of James is so important for under-
standing the epistle itself.

It has been argued in this thesis that the eschato-
logical framework of James is quintessential for interpreting
the epistle as a whole. Following the lead of R. B. Ward, it
has been suggested that the primary thrust of the various

---

[2] Cf. James, p.11. For Dibelius James' lack of continuity,
its eclectic nature, as well as the impossibility of con-
structing a single situational framework to make sense of the
whole were all due to the fact that James was composed of
isolated and traditional units.

[3] The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus (Sonoma: Polebridge Press,
1993), p.187.

elements of James is that of concern for the community.[4] The

analysis of the framework of the letter bears this out in

part, as one perceives the importance of instruction for the

believer alongside denunciation of the wicked. As has pre-

viously been noted, the believer is provided with exhortation

to live in such a way that the Judge will judge the believer

righteous. The actual main body of the letter continues with

more detailed exhortation, primarily directed at the com-

munity as a whole. Thus, the importance of communal concern

in the main body cannot be ignored, and when coupled with the

eschatological framework of the epistle, suggests that the

writer of the epistle is keenly concerned that the community

be found righteous at the final judgment.

However, the argument of chapter two did not insist that

communal concern is the unifying element of the letter.

Unlike the various attempts of other scholars to unify James

on the basis of theology alone,[5] the argument of chapter two

was that the framework of the epistle must also be considered

---

[4] See his "The Communal Concern of the Epistle of James"
(Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1966).

[5] Notably P. H. Davids, Commentary on James, NIGNT (Grand
Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982), p.38 (the theology of suf-
fering); R. Hoppe, Der theologische Hintergrund des Jakobus-
briefes, FzB 28 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1977), p.146 (the
centrality of faith and wisdom); F. Mußner, Der Jakobusbrief,
HTKNT, 5th. ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1987), p.210 (the es-
chatological Interimsethik); R. Wall, "James as Apocalyptic
Paraenesis," RestQ 32 (1990):11-22 (the apocalyptic/eschato-
logical content); and Ward, "Communal Concern," (concern for
the community).

in this discussion. Thus not only theology, but also the structure of the letter must be used in understanding the unity and genre of the text. In the case of James this led to the view that the community instruction of the main body was deliberately framed within the eschatological horizon of the framework in order to provide a community manual to instruct the believers in the proper means of existence in light of the coming eschatological judgment. The theme of eschatology, however, is not isolated to the framework alone for it both undergirds and influences the actual community instruction, but it does come out most explicitly in the opening and closing sections of the main body. What this means, in essence, is that if one analyzes James in light of its form, content and function, the designation of James as "eschatological community instruction" properly mediates the various elements of genre categorization and ends in a fairly specific designation of the text in regards to form (paraenesis within a controlling framework), content (community instruction within an eschatological context) and function (sustains and defines the community in relation to its religio-eschatological belief system).

The importance of the framework in this whole discussion should not be missed. Outside of the context in which the paraenesis is placed the actual segments of the epistle are difficult to interpret, and it is precisely those scholars

who fail to recognize the contextual importance of the framework of the main body who most often insist that James is a wisdom document. The various segments and units of James can easily be perceived as being similar to wisdom forms[6] essentially because they are not viewed in the context of the framework of the epistle as whole, and thus the context for interpretation of the individual unit is distorted.[7] Con-

---

[6] Actually, to be more precise, the notion that aphorism, diatribe, treatise, etc... are wisdom genres or, better, literary types or forms, is a misnomer. As was mentioned in chapter one, a wisdom literary type is often designated as such because it predominates in wisdom literature. However, an aphorism, for instance, is not content specific, and hence it cannot be designated as a wisdom literary type per se. Rather, it is simply a short pithy saying which may or may not be present in any number of types of texts (the same goes for proverbs, parables, and other traditionally ascribed wisdom forms). This generic misnomer has been at the root of much discussion over the use of the wisdom tradition by the prophets for instance (cf. J. William Whedbee, Isaiah & Wisdom [Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971]), as well as the role of wisdom in the Jesus tradition (cf. R. A. Piper, Wisdom in the Q-tradition, SNTSMS 61 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989]). In the latter case presence of so-called wisdom forms have lead to reflections over the composition of early Christian texts. It may well be the case that wisdom motifs do predominate the initial layer of Q tradition for instance, but this must be proved on analysis of the content and context of the logia, not their form.

[7] This is an important point. The synoptic logia in Mk. 4:22, "for nothing is hidden except that it might be made manifest, nothing is made secret but that it might be brought into the open," finds itself in several different versions in several different contexts (cf. Matt. 10:26; Lk. 8:17; 12:2; GThom. 5:2; 6:4). In and of itself the meaning of the logia is difficult to determine. What gives it a more obvious meaning is the larger context in which it is found. Thus, in GThom. 5:2 appears to have a wisdom context in view, while Lk. 12:2 places the logia in a larger collection of eschatological logia. It is precisely the larger context and framework in which the logia are placed which help determine the

sequently, Patterson's statement that "James is simply a collection of wisdom sayings" outside of the introduction and the three treatises, demonstrates a complete lack of regard for the larger framework of the epistle.

Insight into the character of the epistle of James in its combining community instruction within an eschatological context can be had through examining the motif which lies behind this phenomenon, particularly the formative role which the so-called "two ways" tradition played in the ethical instruction of Second Temple Jewish and early Christian texts.[8] Indeed, a great deal and depth of the ethical in-

---

meaning. In James the units are often larger than the aphorisms of Jesus, but the same principle is valid: the larger framework and context are essential for interpreting the unit in relation to the text as a whole.

[8] For further discussion of the "two ways" tradition and its role in Jewish and Christian texts see Otto Böcher, Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), pp.79-96; Robert Kraft, The Didache and Barnabas (New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965), pp.4-16; L. W. Barnard, "The Dead Sea Scrolls, Barnabas, the Didache and the Later History of the 'Two Ways'," in Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and their Background (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), pp.87-107; George W. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, HTS 26 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), pp.156-165; Kurt Niederwimmer, Die Didache, KAV 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), pp.48-64; and Clayton N. Jefford, The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, VCSup 11 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989), pp.22-29. The origins of the "two ways" tradition probably lies in the Hebrew Bible covenantal texts reflected in Deuteronomy (cf. 30:15-19) and in other Old Testament texts (cf. Ps. 1; Prov. 4:18-21). In the context of the covenantal texts material and physical prosperity and happiness was promised to those who walked in the way of righteousness, but curses were imprecated against those who did not walk accor-

struction prevalent among Jewish and Christian groups in the Second Temple Period was at least partially indebted to the "two ways" background: that God has mapped out a way for the righteous and the wicked are those who reject this path. Obviously the interpreted Law/Torah of the various Jewish groups was viewed as the path of the righteous, and those who did not affirm the interpretation and practice of a particular Jewish group were condemned as wicked. Thus, the "two ways" tradition, at least at a general level, was fairly consonant with the Jewish and Christian religious experience.

In the post-biblical Jewish texts it is interesting to note that there is a marked tendency to associate the "two ways" tradition with eschatological sections as closings to the material. Klaus Baltzer attempted to map out the development of the covenant formulary in post-biblical Jewish and Christian literature.[9] His observation was that the Old Testament covenant formulary was taken up and used in several different ways: in liturgy, preaching, community instruction, and in purely literary form. In these various forms the basic pattern remained somewhat similar, particularly the

---

ding to the ordinances of God. The context of these blessings and curses is related to the present world, much like the context of the wisdom writings as a whole. For more on the covenantal blessings and curses see Moshe Weinfeld, Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992 rpr.).

[9] The Covenant Formulary, trans. David E. Green (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).

presence of a dogmatic or narrative preamble, an ethical
section, and a blessing and cursing conclusion. Regarding
the blessing and cursing section, Baltzer made the obser-
vation that this form had undergone a transformation in the
post-biblical literature, particularly as it became under-
stood in a more eschatological sense:

> Blessings and curses were originally two equally
> open possibilities. In the Old Testament, they were
> first of all historicized, so that the present
> became the fulfillment of the blessing, while the
> curse was threatened in case the covenant was
> broken. Later this relationship was reversed. The
> present was perceived as the time of the curse,
> while salvation was expected in the future. Between
> the time of disaster and the time of salvation comes
> 'repentance.'[10]

In his examination of the Community Rule, the Damascus Docu-
ment, Didache, Epistle of Barnabas, Second Clement, and the
Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs Baltzer has shown that
the relationship between blessing and cursing takes on an
increasing eschatological significance.[11] Thus, developing

---

[10] The Covenant Formulary, p.180.

[11] This point will not be taken up in detail here, however a
few observations will be made. In 1QS the "two ways"
tradition is placed in the context of the eschatological
battle between the two spirits in humans (cf. J. J. Collins,
"Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran," in Traditions in Trans-
formation, eds. B. Halpern & J. D. Levenson [Winona Lake:
Eisenbrauns, 1981], pp.363-365). The larger eschatological
drama unfolding in the Qumran community obviously provides a
specific context for the ethical instructions prevalent in
1QS and CD. At Qumran the present "way of the righteous" not
only is the pattern for salvation, but actually mirrors the
future time of perfection (see Lawrence A. Schiffman, The Es-
chatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls, SBLMS 38
[Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989]). In Barnabas the eschato-

out of the literary transformation of the Hebrew Bible cove-
nant formulary, ethical traditions including the "two ways"
motif were taken in a more eschatologically oriented direc-
tion.

The importance of Baltzer's analysis of the covenant
formulary is important in two respects. First of all, it
demonstrates how the ethical traditions of the Old Testament
further developed into a recognizable literary form in the
post-biblical period, and how different types of literature

---

logical context of the "two ways" tradition is most explicit.
Not only does the theme of coming judgment occur in the sec-
tion on the "way of the righteous" (cf. 19:10), but the con-
clusion to the "two ways" tradition states:
> Therefore it is good to walk in these things, having
> learned the commands of the Lord (as many as have
> been written). For the one doing these things will
> be glorified in the kingdom of God; the one choosing
> the other will perish with his works. For this
> reason there is resurrection; for this reason there
> is recompense (21:1-2).
Besides this explicit connection the "two ways" theme occurs
in other places in Barnabas in explicitly eschatological
contexts (cf. 4:9-14). In the Didache the "two ways" tra-
dition in its present form lacks the explicit eschatological
context, but when viewed in relation to the whole document it
clearly partakes of the larger eschatological concerns of the
text which are encapsulated in chapter 16. As well, a case
has been made that the original tradition incorporated into
Didache (1:1-6:2) originally had 16:1 and possibly 16:2 as
its conclusion (on this see the brief comments by J. A. Dra-
per, "A Commentary on the Didache in the Light of the Dead
Sea Scrolls and Related Documents" [Ph. D. diss., University
of Cambridge, 1983], p.297; Niederwimmer, Didache, pp. 247-
248. Against this view see Baltzer, The Covenant, p.130).
As a whole, it is fairly clear that the "two ways" traditions
in specific, and ethics in general, had clear connections to
the eschatological beliefs of various early Christian and
Jewish groups.

could utilize a common pattern of ethical instruction.

Second, regardless of the correctness of Baltzer's formal analysis - that there is an identifiable literary covenantal formula - the connection which he has shown, in at least many of these texts, between eschatology and ethics is important. There has been a tendency among scholars to isolate these two elements, and to view eschatology as a somewhat embarrassing, later addition to biblical ethics.[12] The insights from Balt-

---

[12] This point may be seen in several respects. Stanley W. Theron, "Motivation of Paraenesis in 'The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs'," NeoTest 12 (1981):133-150, appears to want to place "love of one's neighbor" as the primary motivation of ethics and to place the role of recompense as a secondary aspect. In recent Q studies there has been an increasing attempt to separate the wisdom ethics of the "original" Jesus strata from the accrued and secondary levels of apocalyptic and its eschatology (cf. most recently Burton L. Mack, The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1993]). However, the transformation of this-worldly recompense into an eschatological event is hardly an innovation of apocalyptic literature. The Hebrew prophetic books are marked by continued reference to future oriented recompense, the Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sira have this in the background, and the New Testament is pervaded with the notion of eschatological recompense (cf. for eg. Blaine Charette, The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel, JSNTSup 79 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], who traces this theme back to Old Testament influence). If embarrassment with this material is no longer an issue, one does get the distinct impression that this material is viewed by many as having little theological value, and that separating eschatology from ethics in the New Testament would prevent one from taking a position similar to Jack T. Sanders' in his Ethics in the New Testament (London: SCM Press, 1975), where New Testament ethics as a whole must be rejected due to their intimate connection with the imminent return of Christ (interestingly enough Sanders does not include James in this dismissal). This is not to say that in some cases eschatological elements were added at a secondary stage to particular documents, but the motivation for this argument is

229

zer and others, however, argue that at least in some quarters ethics and eschatology were intimately and indeed inseparately connected.[13]

Coming back to the character and nature of the epistle of James the following discussion is relevant in several ways. First of all, James has some resemblances to the covenant formulary outlined by Baltzer. It has the dogmatic prologue (1:2-18), the ethical section (1:19-4:5), and the eschatological conclusion of blessings and curses (4:6-5:12). It is not necessarily certain that this is the exact model of the writer, and clearly James does not correspond in all respects. However, the presence of the common pattern is illustrative of James' similarity to other early Jewish and Christian texts. Secondly, and perhaps most important, is that the connection between ethics and eschatology in James which has been emphasized in this thesis finds confirmation

---

sometimes suspect (as it is in Bultmann, and possibly J. M. Robinson and H. Koester). For the larger context of this attempt to separate the New Testament from apocalyptic see the excellent discussion by Klaus Koch, The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic (London: SCM Press, 1972).

[13] Christoph Münchow, Ethik und Eschatologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), has argued that in the apocalyptic literature there is indeed a interdependence between ethics and eschatology (p.142), though his assertion that this is unique or its originality lies with apocalyptic circles (pp. 137-138) does not appear to be wholly true. The apocalyptic texts have merely taken the prophetic notion of recompense and placed it in an apocalyptic context; the notion of future blessing and reward is clearly present in the prophetic texts and in almost all the Jewish and Christian texts of the Second Temple Period.

in its comparison with the larger spectrum of Jewish and Christian literature of the same time period. The role which eschatology plays in James - forming as it does the horizon and context of the community instruction is by no means an anomaly, and may in fact have roots in the development of post-biblical views of recompense for one's behavior in life. The eschatology expectation that all stand under judgment and that there would be retribution on the wicked and blessing on the righteous informed a great deal of the ethical perspective of the Second Temple Period, and itself played a formative role in the development of the biblical tradition of God's covenant into the intertestamental "two ways" tradition where the explicit dualism between the wicked and righteous in laid out.

In order to elucidate more fully the character of James, a brief attempt will be made to compare James with two other documents which evince some similarity to the covenant formulary outlined by Baltzer. The first is the Qumran document 1QS, particularly 3:13-4:26, but also the remaining text as well, and the second, less obvious one is the Q document of early Christianity. Both of these texts, it is argued, conform to the community instruction/rule form, and both evince clear connections between ethics and eschatology within this larger community instruction format. As well, both appear to have thematic and structural parallels with Baltzer's cove-

nant formulary and with the epistle of James as outlined in chapter two of this thesis.

1QS, otherwise known as the <u>Manual of Discipline</u> or the <u>Community Rule</u>, is a document which outlines the various theological beliefs and practices of the Qumran community. Itself a composite document,[14] 1QS also has two appendices, 1QSa (known as the <u>Rule of the Congregation</u> and consisting of halakah for the eschatological community)[15] and 1QSb (known as the <u>Book of Blessings</u>). David Beck has previously attempted to show in great detail the similarities between James and 1QS.[16] His conclusion that James has used a vorlage of 1QS, based on his attempt to show extensive chronological unit by unit parallels between the two documents, is somewhat tenuous. However, Beck was the first to draw attention to the significance of 1QS in understanding James.[17]

1QS in its final form is made up of several parts. The

---

[14] On the composite nature of 1QS see the summary by J. Murphy-O'Connor, "Community, Rule of the (1QS)," <u>ABD</u>, Vol 1, pp.1110-1112; and the more detailed study by J. Pouilly, <u>La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân</u> (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1976).

[15] For more on this text see Schiffman, <u>The Eschatological Community</u>, itself a study of the eschatology of 1QSa.

[16] "The Composition of the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1973).

[17] Or, at least the first systematic study of its kind. Previous studies had noticed some similarities between the two documents as regards certain phrases and concepts. On these previous connections see Herbert Braun, <u>Qumran und das Neue Testament</u>, Vol. I (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966), pp. 278-282.

introductory section (1-4:26) is comprised of an introduction to the goals of the community (1:1-15); a description of the entry ceremony (1:16-2:18) and annual census of the community (2:19-25); and a setting out of the contrast between the righteous community members and the wicked unbelievers (beginning in 2:26-3:12 and then moving into the discussion of the "two spirits" in 3:13-4:26). The section which follows (5:1-9:26) is the manual proper, though it is full of theological digressions. The document ends with a liturgical section which recalls some of the community's regulations as well as providing more theological digression (10:1-11:21). Of note in the actual structure of the document is that there is both an opening (1:1-2:25) and a closing (10:1-11:21) section to the main body of the document which consists of community rules and regulations. This provides a loose parallel to the structure of James as it was previously outlined. What is noticeable, though, is the connection between ethics and eschatology which pervades 1QS, particularly the notion of recompense at the future judgment for one's actions in the present age.

1QS is text-book example of the traditional juxtaposition of the two ways which God has laid before humankind. The way of the righteous is that of the Qumran sect, and the wicked are those who do not walk in this path. 1QS 9:23 makes it quite clear that the one who has "zeal" for the

righteous commands of God will be rewarded on the "Day of Vengeance" (ליום נקם). This is the day of God's judgment against the proud, the rich, and the wicked; a day in which the righteous Judge will wreak vengeance on those who have had contempt for the way of the righteous. The wicked indeed have scorned the covenant of God and thus have brought upon the curses of the covenant (1QS 5:12) and in fact are cursed repeatedly by the covenanters themselves (cf. 1QS 2:6-9) in prophetic style. What becomes clear is that the Qumran community believed that there were strict boundaries between the righteous and the evil, and that both groups would receive blessing and reward at the time of judgment when each would be awarded according to their works. The sharp dichotomy established between the two groups of people, the setting forth of the "way of the righteous" in the form of community instruction, and the close connection between the "way of perfection" and the coming eschatological judgment are all quite similar to the epistle of James.

Alongside these above similarities are even more specific ones of content. In the community instructions, for instance, there is a great emphasis on the place of speech within the community and at the time of the communal speech of the assembly (cf. 5:25-26; 7:1ff.).[18] The speech of the

---

[18] Carol Newsome has drawn attention to this point. See "Apocalyptic and the Discourse of the Qumran Community," JNES

community was carefully regulated regarding what was deemed
proper and what was not. As well, the community emphasized
the importance of being humble (3:8) and walking in perfec-
tion (3:9). Alongside this, perhaps the most noticeable
theme is that of judgment in the community. Not only does
the community anticipate the time of future judgment when
they will stand before God along with the wicked, but the
righteous judgment of God is also reflected in the com-
munity's own judgment.[19] The community itself makes it quite
clear that ultimate judgment is with God (10:17-18), and that
their part in God's judgment will only take place at the end
time (10:19). At the same time the community and its leaders
do judge the individual members of the community and in fact
the council of the community (the group of fifteen men) were
called the "covenant of justice" (לברית משפט) (8:9) and were
understood to "decree the judgment of wickedness" (8:10).
The community, simultaneously, strove for just judgment and
believed themselves to be reflecting God's coming judgment in
their own judicial decisions.

Within the larger text of 1QS there exists a smaller

---

49 (1992):142-143.

[19] On judgment in general in the Qumran documents see Calvin
J. Roetzel, Judgement in the Community (Leiden: E. J. Brill,
1972), pp.41-50; and David W. Kuck, Judgment and Community
Conflict, NovTSup 66 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), pp.77-88.

unit known as the "two spirits" section (3:13-4:26).[20] It is
in this text which the melding of ethics and eschatology is
most clearly seen. The unit begins with a dogmatic treatise
which outlines the doctrine of the "two spirits" (3:13-4:1)
which is proceeded by an ethical outline of the various
traits which characterize the righteous and the unrighteous
intermingled with blessings and cursings (ethical [4:2-6a]
followed by blessing [4:6b-8]; ethical [4:9-11] followed by
cursing [4:12-14]). The whole unit is then concluded with an
eschatological closing (4:15-26). The blessing and cursing
units themselves are viewed in an eschatological sense, and
thus the eschatological closing is essentially a further
dogmatic elaboration of the nature of the blessing and cur-
sing which will follow at the judgment. The community thus
looks forward to the time of "Visitation" (מפקד) and God will
purify the righteous (4:20-21) at this time of "renewal"
(עשות חדשה) (4:25). The community member is well aware that
life hangs in the balance, and that one must have fear in the
heart over the coming judgment of God (4:2-3). It is pre-

[20] For a fuller discussion of this text see the fine study by
A.R.C. Leaney, The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning (London:
SCM Press, 1966), pp.37-56,143-161. There is evidence to
suggest that this unit, or at least a good portion of it,
originally existed independently of its present context. See
the discussion by Pouilly, La Règle, pp.75-79. For a discus-
sion of this text in light of the covenant formulary see
Baltzer, The Covenant Formulary, pp.99-109. Also see the
brief comments by Nickelsburg, Resurrection, pp.156-159,
165-166.

cisely the same conceptual framework as was previously un-covered in James: one will receive recompense for present life at the judgment, the righteous will be purified and the wicked will be destroyed. As well, the structural similari-ties are interesting: the pattern of opening dogmatic section - main body ethical section - and concluding eschatological unit. In the "two spirits" text the doctrinal opening is in fact eschatological in thrust (the present is the dominion of Belial and this will continue until the "appointed time" [3:23] or the "time of Visitation" [3:18]), and with the closing eschatological section forms an inclusio to the ac-tual ethical portion of the text. The similarities in word and concept between the opening and closing sections are an indication that they are being viewed in tandem. This struc-tural similarity to James is on a smaller scale than the epistle, but it is noticeable all the same.

As far as the epistle of James is concerned, then, the following points may be mentioned from the above brief com-parison with 1QS. First, the structure of James outlined in the previous chapter bears some similarity to the structure of 1QS as a whole, and some marked similarity in structure to the "two spirits" unit in 1QS. Particularly striking is the occurrence of community instruction within an eschatological framework. Second, several key themes which are important in James also appear in 1QS, most notably speech, humility,

perfection, and judgment.[21] As well, the general emphasis on community instruction, eschatological renewal and purification, and the notion of recompense for present action, all provide clear parallels to the epistle of James. Third, the place of judgment in James is similar to that in 1QS. The writer of James anticipates a future judgment in which God will bless the righteous and punish the wicked. At the same time, the community also judges its own members (James 2:1ff.)[22] and is at one and the same time expected to judge with impartiality (2:1) and to refrain from false judgment (4:11-12). It would thus appear that as in the Qumran community, judgment in the Jamesian community was meant to reflect the righteous judgment of God. Fourth, and most important, the connection between eschatology and ethics in 1QS is a clear parallel to the epistle of James. In both these

---

[21] These are of course only basic parallels. Beck, "Composition," has provided a much more detailed comparison and has adequately, in my view, found parallels in 1QS for every theme and motif in James.

[22] On James 2:1ff. as reflecting a judicial as opposed to religious assembly see R. B. Ward, "Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4," HTR 62 (1969):87-97. On the use of "synagogue" to refer to the non-religious gathering of the community to conduct local affairs, including judicial matters see Richard A. Horsley, "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses," Semeia 55 (1991):176. It appears that some early Christian communities, in their breaking off from Judaism, replaced the Jewish judicial system with their own, and hence some Christian communities appear to have conducted court and judicial sessions (on this phenomenon in the Matthean community see J. Andrew Overman, Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990], pp.108-109).

texts of community instruction eschatology provides both the framework and context of the instruction as well as the motivation of paraenesis.

In the final analysis, the suggestion is not that James has used a Vorlage of 1QS as Beck has argued, but that James and 1QS both reflect a common type of literature in which community instruction is placed in an eschatological horizon.[23] It may also be the case that one is dealing here with a particular and recognizable genre of texts; one in which community instruction is framed by eschatological openings and closings (as in the "two spirits" section). While one may not want to push this latter point, the fact that James and 1QS reflect similar types of documents does appear to be the case, a similarity noticeable even above the fact that one is written in Hebrew and the other in Greek, or that one has reminiscences of Hellenistic moral philosophy and the other does not. The similarity is not one which comes from direct dependence. Rather, what appears to be the case is that both partake of a similar worldview (in so far as escha-

---

[23] The fact that 1QS has different stages in its composition does not mitigate the insights as far as its eschatology is concerned. It may be the case that there were significant shifts over time in the community's perception of eschatology and that the various stages of 1QS do reflect some of these changes, but the overall eschatological framework is in many respects consistent throughout its existence. There is no indication, for instance, that there was an original non-eschatological community which was apocalypticized over a period of time.

tology and community are key) and view of the ways in which
to construct community instruction texts.

Turning now to the Q document of early Christianity some
further lines of parallel will be established within the
context of Christian texts. Q research is at the heart of a
great amount of scholarly discussion over Christian origins,
and for obvious reasons a full analysis of Q cannot be
broached in this thesis.[24] As in the case of the Epistle of

---

[24] For summaries of past research and analyses of Q in
general see C. M. Tuckett, "Q (Gospel Source)," ABD, Vol. 5,
pp. 567-572; Arland D. Jacobson, The First Gospel (Sonoma:
Polebridge Press, 1992); James M. Robinson, "The Q Trajec-
tory: Between John and Matthew via Jesus," in The Future of
Early Christianity, ed. Birger A. Pearson (Minneapolis:
Fortress Press, 1991), pp.173-194; John S. Kloppenborg, The
Formation of Q (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987); and F.
Neirynck, "Recent Developments in the Study of Q," in Logia,
ed. J. Delobel (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1982), pp.
29-75.
    One of the major areas of discussion in recent times has
been the relation of the various themes of eschatology, pro-
phecy, and wisdom, an issue first raised in the North Ameri-
can scene by Richard A. Edwards, A Theology of Q (Philadel-
phia: Fortress Press, 1976). Already in 1971 James M. Robin-
son had argued that Q lay on a wisdom trajectory in early
Christianity (see his "LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q,"
rpr. in Trajectories through Early Christianity (Philadel-
phia: Fortress Press, 1971)), an article which was to be
formative for much of the current discussion (also see his
"On Bridging the Gulf from Q to the Gospel of Thomas (or Vice
Versa)," in Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity),
eds. Charles W. Hedrick & Robert Hodgson [Peabody: Hendrick-
son Publishers, 1986], pp.127-175). In recent times, with
the work of John Kloppenborg in the lead, scholars have sug-
gested that the original layer of Q consisted of a wisdom
stratum, that this was followed by a second layer which was
predominated by prophetic forms (oracles of warning, woes,
blessings, judgment oracles, etc...), and then finally cul-
minating in a proto-biographical genre (the introduction of
the temptation narrative) in which the sayings of the wise

James, many current biblical scholars have emphasized the
wisdom elements in Q over the eschatological elements, and
indeed, on comparison with the Gospel of Thomas, wisdom is
viewed as the formative strata of Q.[25] However, as Richard

---

were placed (on this view of the formation of Q see Kloppen-
borg, The Formation; idem., "Literary Convention, Self-
Evidence and the Social History of the Q People," Semeia 55
[1991]:77-102; and Mack, The Lost Gospel). Helmut Koester,
Ancient Christian Gospels (London/Philadelphia: SCM Press/
Trinity Press International, 1990), has argued that not all
the eschatological elements can be relegated to the secondary
strata. He suggests that the original wisdom strata did
contain some eschatological elements, but they were non-
apocalyptic (p.150). The problem, of course, is attempting
to separate the various eschatologies, especially since Koes-
ter is speaking of some form of radically realized eschato-
logy.

Without going into a detailed discussion of the issues,
I would suggest that the above understanding of Q is in-
adequate. The reason why is because it a priori assumes that
a separate wisdom layer is present and then proceeds to un-
cover it. H. Koester is representative here. On comparison
with the Gospel of Thomas Koester assumes the first layer of
Q is a wisdom genre and then proceeds to eliminate as ori-
ginal everything which does not adhere to wisdom theology and
form. Kloppenborg's approach fundamentally differs from
Koester's in that he attempts to analyze Q on the basis of
literary/redactional evidence (framing devices, interrup-
tions, etc...) and not on the basis of prior category for-
mations. Thus, while his conclusions are similar to Koes-
ter's, their methods are quite distinct. Though it makes
little difference for the discussion which follows (since one
could always argue that the analysis proceeds from final form
rather than redactional levels), the compositional view adop-
ted in this thesis is that Q is a collection of units of
material which formed in complexes and whose individual units
never had a purely original wisdom or prophetic setting (on
this see Migaku Sato, Q und Prophetie, WUNT 2.29 [Tübingen:
J. C. B. Mohr, 1988]; Richard A. Horsley, "Q and Jesus," pp.
175-209; idem., "Logoi Propheton? Reflections on the Genre of
Q," in The Future of Early Christianity).

[25] For Gospel of Thomas as a wisdom document see Stevan L.
Davies, The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom (New York:
The Seabury Press, 1983); Ron Cameron, "Thomas, Gospel of,"

Horsley has recently pointed out, the composition of Q in

clusters of related material is quite distinct from what one

finds in GThom, and indeed places it much closer to Didache,

a manual of community instruction.[26] It is in this under-

standing of Q, that it lies close to the genre of community

instruction,[27] that one finds the heart of the similarity

ABD, Vol. 6, pp.535-540; idem., "The Gospel of Thomas and
Christian Origins," in The Future of Early Christianity, ed.
B. A. Pearson (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), pp.381-
392; Patterson, The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus; and Koester,
Ancient Christian Gospels, pp.75-128. It appears that part
of the problem in the designation of Thomas as wisdom lies in
the use of aphoristic types of speech, as well as proverbs,
parables, etc... Koester, for instance, on the basis of the
method of "stringing sayings together into a written docu-
ment" identifies Thomas, Didache 1-6 and James as "wisdom
documents" (p.82). As was mentioned earlier, however, this
particular method of composing texts and the types of lite-
rary forms which characterize them are not content specific.
Regarding the Gospel of Thomas specifically, if a wisdom
framework is not a priori assumed, there is strong evidence
to suggest an apocalyptic framework and context for the text
rather than a wisdom one (on this see Horsley, "Logoi Pro-
pheton?," pp.200-201; and the excellent study by Margaretha
Lelyveld, Les Logia de la vie dans l'Evangile selon Thomas,
NHS 34 [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987]).

[26]   See "Logoi Propheton?," pp.207-209.

[27]   The designation of Q as "community instruction" is not new
in modern scholarship. John Kloppenborg, The Formation of Q,
pp.263-322, has argued that Q, in the technical literary
sense, is instruction, particularly its formative stratum.
The thoughts expressed here are similar, though the usage of
"instruction" in this thesis is somewhat more casual than
Kloppenborg's literary definition. As well, I would suggest
that Q in its final form functions primarily as instruction
and that there is no shift to a proto-biographical stage in
its composition (cf. Kloppenborg, p.327). Other scholars
have avoided the term instruction and opted for "sayings of
the wise" as the generic designation of Q. While there is no
doubt that Q is a sayings collection, the origin of Q ma-
terial must be viewed as distinct from its present context

between James and Q.[28]

---

and function. Thus, if the sayings of Jesus are being used
to instruct a community of believers, then the Q document is
not a sayings collection as much as it is a community in-
struction manual which just happens to be characterized by
sayings material. This is an important distinction since it
takes seriously the integration of form, content, and func-
tion, the latter often omitted in the discussion of the genre
of Q. In this way R. A. Horsley can assert that Q lies close
to Didache "in the function or focus (and the sequence) of
certain clusters" ("Logoi Propheton?," p.207). The view
expressed here is different from the older suggestion that Q
is a collection of catechesis for church instruction (cf.
C.H. Dodd, "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of
Jesus," in New Testament Essays, ed. A.J.B. Higgins [Manches-
ter: Manchester University Press, 1959], pp.106-118). The
perceived background to this understanding of Q is much dif-
ferent than that reflected by Horsley (for instance, the
former has a different view of both the early Jesus movement
and the evolution of the early church). For a more nuanced
discussion of Q and its relation to community instruction and
catechesis see W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the
Mount, BJS 186 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989 rpr.), pp.366-
386. On the larger role of paraenesis and catechesis in
early Christianity and its world see James I. McDonald, Ker-
ygma and Didache, SNTSMS 37 (Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 1980), pp.69-100.

[28] As previously with 1QS, some scholars have suggested that
the similarities between James and Q are due to the writer of
James having had access to a text of Q^{MT} (on this see Patrick
J. Hartin, James and the Q Sayings of Jesus, JSNTSup 47
[Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991]). As with similar theories
regarding 1QS, this approach is not particularly convincing
(see appendix three to chapter one for further discussion).
There is no doubt that the Epistle of James uses Jesus tra-
dition or that there are some very direct parallels in theo-
logy and thought with Matthew (see Charles N. Dillman, "A
Study of Some Theological and Literary Comparisons of the
Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle of James" (Ph. D. diss.,
University of Edinburgh, 1978). One striking comparison is
Matthew's high frequency use of ἀδελφός to denote a fellow
member of the community in that Gospel's community instruc-
tion [on this see Overman, Matthew's Gospel, p.95] compared
with similar uses of the term in James), but there is no need
to posit the letter's use of a Matthean Q tradition to ac-
count of this phenomenon. James evinces many parallels with
Luke as well as the Pauline tradition, and the Q and Matthean
parallels have to be viewed in this larger context.

Without going into a full blown analysis of the text of Q[29] there are several key points of comparison with James which are striking. First of all, as Horsley has pointed out "the kingdom of God provides the unifying theme of the whole document, with its double-edged effect of salvific benefits for those who respond but implications of judgment for those who do not."[30] This is an important observation, for it has clear parallels to the underlying themes in James, particularly the notion of salvation for those who respond to the message of God and judgment for those who reject God's present work. As well, the basic thrust of Q is two-fold: it is made up of community instruction (e.g., Q 6:20-45) and prophetic warning to the believers (e.g., Q 6:46-49) and denunciation to the unbelievers (Q 11:39b-52). There is of course other material such as mission instructions (Q 9:57-10:12) and material relating to John the Baptist (Q 7:18-28), and it is clear that the division between community instruction and prophetic judgment is not as neat and tidy as it is in James. However, there is little doubt that the themes of community instruction and prophetic judgment are important ones for Q. As well, the clusters of community instruction deal with

---

[29] The reconstruction of Q being used for the purposes of this thesis is that by Athanasius Polag, translated in Ivan Havener, Q: The Sayings of Jesus (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990 rpr.).

[30] "Q and Jesus," p.181.

similar topics as the Jamesian community instruction: prayer
(Q 11:2-4; 11: 9-13), judgment in the community (Q 6:36-38),
and the importance of proper concerns (Q 12:22-24). Also,
what is important to notice is that Q begins with a unit on
the testing (πειρασμός) of Jesus (Q 4:1-13), and this has
obvious parallels with the testing of believers in James.[31]
Thus, while the overall organization of Q is less uniform
than James, and despite the emphasis on a variety of non-
communal issues, Q does have a great similarity to James in
its mixture of community instruction and prophetic announce-

---

[31]   The testing of Jesus in the wilderness is a deliberate
parallel to the testing of Israel in the wilderness. The
"son of God" is shown to be steadfast and the examination of
his heart shows a stable and firmly inclined character and a
perfect and upright individual. This is exactly the context
of the testing tradition in James. Jesus' overcoming of the
testing of Satan is not only the paradigm for the testing of
believers, but to a certain degree this initial overcoming
breaks the reign of Belial. For more on the temptation nar-
rative in this light see Birger Gerhardsson, The Testing of
God's Son, CBSNTS 2:1 (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1966); and
William Richard Stegner, Narrative Theology in Early Jewish
Christianity (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1989),
pp.33-51.
      Given the the role and function of the temptation nar-
rative in Q it appears that there is no contradiction with
viewing the final form of Q as "community instruction." The
paradigm of Jesus is essential to the instruction of the
community of the last days. Thus, the temptation appears not
to be so much the movement towards proto-biography in which
the temptation "serves to demonstrate the trustworthiness of
the sage, and hence, to undergird and buttress his teachings"
(Kloppenborg, The Formation, p.327), but the example which
the community is to follow in the midst of the temptations of
Belial (Kloppenborg asserts a similar point when he maintains
that the temptation narrative also illustrates the particular
ethic of Q and thus serves a dual purpose: both legitimation
and role modelling).

245

ment and denunciation. As in the case of James, particular
sayings divorced from the larger framework appear to have a
wisdom context, but when viewed in light of the larger Q
context the individual units of instruction and judgment are
clearly eschatological in thrust: the kingdom of God is at
hand and the believers must live with a view to the imminent
judgment which will take place. The precise nature of escha-
tology in Q is difficult to ascertain at points since some of
the eschatological statements are ambiguous,[32] but, as in

---

[32] The basic reason for this is that some of the logia in Q
have been transmitted as independent maxims, and thus have
been divorced from the context of a larger unit. For in-
stance, Q 6:37-38 and 12:2-3 probably are meant to be under-
stood in an eschatological light (the admonition receives its
clarity in view of future expectation), yet as independent
logia they have been assigned by Kloppenborg, The Formation,
pp.180-181,210-211, to the sapiential layer of the Q tra-
dition. Now in Q these sayings are placed in the larger
eschatological framework of Q given to it my the collector(s)
of the logia and tradition. However, if divorced from this
context these sayings become more ambiguous and indeed can
appear to lose their eschatological thrust. The ambiguity of
eschatology in Q is attributed to this factor, for outside of
the framework of Q certain independent maxims, if divorced
from their context, appear to obscure their own eschato-
logical thrust. Now, if Jesus can be said to have "under-
stood himself and was understood in an apocalyptic or resto-
ration-eschatological context" (A. Y. Collins, "The Apoca-
lyptic Son of Man Sayings," in The Future of Early Chris-
tianity, p.227), then the sayings which go back to Jesus can
be understood in this larger context. However, once they
have become divorced from the context of the life and minis-
try of Jesus and placed in a community instruction manual the
shift in context and function may well mutate both the form
of the logia (becoming maxim and aphorism) as well as obscure
its meaning (having the appearance of wisdom-like admoni-
tion). Regardless of how one envisons the transmission of
Jesus logia, it is most likely that in all cases the sayings
have been passed down in forms which obscure their original

James, the basic context of the eschatological vision of the main body of Q is given by its framework, which itself is much more explicit.

Perhaps the most striking parallel to James is the way in which the material in Q is framed. In a similar manner to James the Q document is framed by explicitly eschatological units. As Horsley has noted: "the keynotes with which the whole (hypothetical) document apparently begins and ends... are prophetic threat and promise."[33]   Q 3:2-4,7,9,16-17,21-22

---

context in Jesus' ministry. This is not to suggest that there is a hermeneutical shift, but rather a shift in function and form as the logia take their place in community instruction, mission preaching, liturgy, etc.... The ethos of the original sayings is separated from the transmission process since this is transmitted in a very different manner. Now, in all likelyhood the ethos of the original Jesus logia is very close to that of the framework of Q since there is no reason to deny continuity in this regard. The conclusion that suggests itself from this observation is that there never was an original "wisdom" layer in Q, but rather that the segments which make up this so-called layer are in fact the units of Jesus tradition in which the eschatological context is more obscured than others. In the final analysis, then, what is determinative for understanding Q is two things: 1) one's view of the continuity of Q in its present form with the ministry of Jesus; and 2) whether one begins with a reconstruction of Jesus' teachings or the traditions about his life as the matrix through which to understand the logia of Jesus. This last point is important, for if one begins with the traditions about the life of Jesus and uses this as the hermeneutic for understanding the teachings of Jesus one will arrive at a very different point then if one uses a reconstructed wisdom layer as the matrix through which to view the life and teachings of Jesus (on this methodological point see the excellent comments by E.P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism [Philadelphia: Fortress Press,1985],pp.3-13).

[33]   "Logoi Propheton," p.208.

form the opening to Q.[34] Not only does the reference to the
eschatological text of Isa. 40 occur, but the whole context
is one of blessing for the faithful (baptism with the holy
spirit; gathering of the wheat into the granary) and judgment
on the wicked (baptism with fire; burning of the chaff). As
well, despite the references to judgment in the main body of
Q, the conclusion to Q is explicit regarding its eschato-
logical context. Q 17:23-24,26-35,37c; 19:12-13,15-24,26;
22:29-30 form the conclusion to the text and contain the
themes of judgment at the revelation of the "son of man", the
establishment of the followers of Jesus as judges of Israel,
and the parable of the talents with its strong message of
recompense for one's actions on earth, all explicitly escha-
tological motifs. If this analysis is correct then Q begins
and ends with warnings of eschatological judgment and the
importance of the believer being found perfect in order to
receive blessing instead of judgment. Thus, as in the case
of James and other texts with parallels to the post-biblical
development of the covenant formulary, the material of Q is
framed by an eschatological opening and closing. This
opening and closing to the text, as in James, provides the
context for reading the material which is framed, and places

---

[34] There is some question over whether or not Q 3:2-4 was
originally part of Q. For the discussion see John
Kloppenborg, Q Parallels (Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1988),
p.6.

the community instruction and prophetic announcement of Q within an eschatological horizon.[35] Hence, the Q document of early Christianity appears to stand in a similar tradition as James and 1QS. Q is a document of community instruction which mixes exhortation to the believer with traditions of prophetic announcement common in the Jesus tradition.[36]

---

[35] The importance of the ending of Q for understanding the document as a whole was first proposed by E. Bammel, "Das Ende von Q," in Verborum Veritas, eds. O. Böcher & K. Haacker (Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970), pp.39-50, in his suggestion that Q was a testament of Jesus. In recent times the eschatological framework of Q and its significance for Q as a whole have been pursued by H. Fleddermann in a series of articles: "John and the Coming One (Matt 3:11-12//Luke 3:16-17) SBLSP 23 (1984):377-384; "The Beginning of Q" SBLSP 24 (1985):153-159; "The Q Saying on Confessing and Denying" SBLSP 26 (1987):606-616; and "The End of Q" SBLSP 29 (1990): 1-10. On the prophetic dimensions of the beginning of Q see D. R. Catchpole, "The Beginning of Q: A Proposal" NTS 38 (1992):205-221; as well as the comments on Q and prophecy as a whole by M. E. Boring, The Continuing Voice of Jesus (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991), pp.191-234.

[36] In the final analysis, then, the attempt to relate prophetic, eschatological, and sapiential themes in Q appears to be more the creation of a problem by modern scholarship. Q as a community instruction manual would most naturally mix and match forms and content often associated with individual sapiential, prophetic, and apocalyptic contexts (though not the exclusive property of any of these contexts). The presence of sapiential themes and forms in Q are easily explainable on the basis of the function of Q as community instruction and exhortation, the eclectic nature of Q, the tendency in the Second Temple Period to combine sapiential and prophetic/eschatological motifs together in apocalyptic theology, as well as the multiformity of early Christianity and its indebtedness to a variety of various traditions without committing itself in toto to any one in particular. Even the most sapientially oriented units of Q such as Q 10:21-22 or Q 7:35 clearly understand wisdom in an apocalyptic sense. That is, that wisdom is revealed only to God's elect (cf. I Enoch 5:7-9; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to

---

In the above discussion Q and 1QS have been used to illustrate that parallel texts to James existed in early Christian and Jewish traditions. The argument is not that James is dependent on either of these two documents, though it does obviously draw upon some storehouse of early Jesus tradition and is certainly related to the theological climate of 1QS. What the brief analysis 1QS and Q demonstrates is that the combination of ethics and the eschatology of imminent judgment in the context of reversal and recompense, as well as the combination of community instruction and prophetic announcement is not unique to the Epistle of James, but indeed is a common feature of much early Christian and Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period, drawing on the post-biblical adaption of the Hebrew Bible covenant formulary into the "two ways" theology. The notion of developing community instruction within an eschatological horizon, and

---

Early Christianity," in "To See Ourselves as Others See Us," eds. J. Neusner & E. S. Frerichs [Chico: Scholars Press, 1985], pp.73-91; and Celia Deutsch, Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke, JSNTSup 18 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987]. Deutsch's study deals with Q 10:21-22 and the Matthean redaction of the two independent Q logia. Her conclusion that a "wisdom Christology" is reflected in this text is not entirely adequate. If anything this is "apocalyptic Christology," a Christology in which wisdom is hidden and revealed only to those who actively seek after it. It has close ties to the mantic wisdom literature of Daniel and the Merkavah traditions reflected in I Enoch and other early Jewish documents. Thus, the term "wisdom" hardly appears to be an adequate term in and of itself, and her constant demarcation between "wisdom" and "apocalyptic" elements in this text is hardly warranted).

indeed shaping the structure of texts in light of this, was not confined to James, but has definite parallels in both 1QS and Q. In fact, James, 1QS and Q may themselves form the basis of an identifiable genre of community instruction formed within a prophetic eschatological horizon of a future and imminent blessing of the righteous and cursing of the wicked.[37]

---

[37] The particular argument developed in this chapter regarding the comparison of the eschatological framework in James with Q and 1QS may be seen to contradict one of the working premises of chapter two. In that chapter it was suggested that the introduction and conclusion to the main body were important in James due to the interpretive role these (particularly the opening) play in both letters and paraenetic documents. In this chapter, however, it has been suggested that the presence of the framework in James (as a letter) is paralleled by non-epistolary community documents. The question may then be asked to which phenomena James owes its framework: James as letter or James as community manual? There are several responses. First, the importance of the opening in epistolary literature was an essential point to establish since it provided one of the justifications for using the framework of James for interpreting the main body of the letter and for placing the latter in a particular context. Second, there is no reason to view the presence of the framework in James and Q/1QS as mutually incompatible. If the writer of James understood himself as writing a text which is both a letter and a manual, it may not be possible to separate out entirely which was the primary motivation for formulating the opening (i.e., was the opening developed in light of its importance in letter writing or in light of its role in community manuals). In fact, it may well have been a mixture of the two. The opening to the main body in James (1:2-12) is very much consonant with other opening sections of letters. The conclusion to the main body (4:6-5:12), however, is different in its length and style in comparison with other letters (literary, non-literary, and early Christian). Yet, when compared with the closing to the "two spirits" section of 1QS and to the closing of Q, it appears to be quite similar in formulation, thrust, and intention (the eschatological blessing and cursing section). In this

III. Conclusion

In The Formation of Q John Kloppenborg has a brief discussion of the forms and content of particular phrases and units and how it is often difficult, when these units are divorced from contexts, to determine if they originally had prophetic or wisdom meanings. The following comment is a propos:

> Sirach's statement [that the prayer of a poor man is heard immediately] is identified as sapiential because it occurs in the context of a wisdom instruction. Were it to occur in the middle of a prophetic indictment of the rapacity of the rich and powerful, it would doubtless be read differently.

---

case, then, James may reflect a mixture of influences: the importance of the opening is derived from the epistolary context; the role of the conclusion from its didactic milieu (of course, no hard and fast lines of demarcation between the two influences should be established since the point of chapter two was to suggest that James was a "letter of community instruction," thus indicating the understanding that James has combined features from both epistolary and non-epistolary [i.e., manuals of instruction] literature). Third, the role of the framework in James and its parallel in Q, 1QS, Didache, and Barnabas etc... may indicate the larger general importance of openings (and closings) in many different types of documents in antiquity. Chapter two pointed out the importance of openings in letters, gospels, and paraenetic documents, so it appears that the essential role of the framework and/or the opening and closing sections of a text was not isolated to only letters or to only gospels. Rather, it was part of a larger phenomenon in which the contextualization of a particular content was established via the use of inclusio, framework, or opening and closing formula/units.

As well, the larger genre designation of James as "community manual" need not detract from the categorization of James as a "letter." The latter is not a pure genre, but rather a form. "Community manual," on the other hand, is much closer to a generic designation. There is thus no reason to exclude James as a "letter of community instruction" from the larger genre of "community manual."

> This illustrates the importance of the framing
> devices and formulae for determining the overall
> genre. Content is not enough because it is too
> often ambiguous.[38]

It is exactly this particular point which has been applied to

the Epistle of James in this thesis. Rather than take merely

the content or particular forms as the determining factor in

discussing generic aspects of the epistle, the structure and

framework of James were given a determining role. The con-

text in which the individual units appear was viewed as pri-

mary for understanding the letter as a whole.

Having used this particular approach it was determined

that James was not a wisdom document per se, but was rather a

letter of community instruction which combined exhortation to

the community with prophetic eschatological announcement.

The framework of this text was the imminent eschatological

judgment in which the righteous would be rewarded and the

wicked would receive recompense for their evil deeds. In the

examination of the structure of James it was determined that

James has its main body deliberately framed by opening and

closing eschatological units which provide an eschatological

horizon to the community instruction and provide a context

for the material.

The third chapter of this thesis has attempted, in a

rather brief fashion, to place the insights into the charac-

---

[38] The Formation of Q, p.38.

253

ter of James within the larger literary context of early Christianity and Judaism. The combination of ethics and eschatology, prophetic announcement and community instruction, and particular themes of instruction were seen to appear in other early Christian texts, particularly the Community Rule of Qumran (1QS) and the Q document of early Christianity. It was suggested that the unique content and structure of these various texts was influenced, at least in part, by the post-biblical development of the Old Testament covenant formulary and the Intertestamental theology of the "two ways" tradition. From these influences community instruction is placed in the context of the threat and promise of eschatological reversal and recompense.

In the beginning of this study the possible importance of James for the understanding of early Christianity was mentioned. If James does indeed prove to be reflective of an early form of Christianity,[39] then the role of community instruction and prophetic announcement of judgment are key cornerstones of early Christian thought, and both James and Q demonstrate that the implications of the coming of God's

---

[39] The ultimate judgment on this has been left out of the present thesis, as has all discussion of the possible dating and placing of James. The reason for this omission is that these areas of discussion are so vast that another chapter would need to be devoted to them. There are a few comments which should be made in passing, however. For these see the "excursus" at the end of this chapter.

254

kingdom were both anticipated and viewed as foundational for community existence. As Richard Bauckham has remarked earlier concerning the Epistle of Jude and the early Christians, so one could also assert regarding the Jamesian Christian community and its view of Jesus:

> His contemporaries live in the last generation of world history, in which Jesus, the greater than Enoch and the greater than David, will inaugurate the kingdom of God, a new age beyond the generations of this world's history. In its own way this is faithful to the apocalyptic dimension of Jesus' own message.[40]

What this in essence implies is that James, at the very least, lies on a trajectory with early Christianity and does not necessarily represent a later Hellenized formation. The emphasis on community and prophetic announcement most likely goes back to the ministry of Jesus himself,[41] and places James

---

[40] *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), p.377.

[41] On the role of community in the teaching of Jesus see Gerhard Lohfink, *Jesus and Community*, trans. John P. Galvin (New York/Philadelphia: Paulist Press/Fortress Press, 1984). On Jesus as prophet and the prophetic dimensions of his ministry see the excellent study by Félix Gils, *Jésus Prophète D'Après les Évangiles Synoptiques*, OBL 2 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1957). Also see the studies by Horsley, "Q and Jesus;" "Logoi Propheton;" Marcus Borg, *Conflict, Holiness & Politics in the Teaching of Jesus* (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984). On the social and political context of prophetism in the time of Jesus see the discussions by Richard A. Horsley & John S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), pp.135-189; and Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet*, JSNTSup 62 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp.307-348 (the latter's treatment is particularly good, however his distinction between "popular" and "sapiential" prophet seems a little too rigid since the lines between the two are not always easily drawn). On the larger phenomenon of New Testmanet prophecy see D. E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Chris-*

within the same world and ethos as Q, the Synoptics, and

other early Christian traditions. Thus, the so-called

"Rätsel" of James is really a puzzle over Christian origins

in general, and if James proves to be a valuable contri-

bution to our knowledge of early Christian communities and

teaching, we may well be one step closer to recovering the

earliest "layer" of Christianity evidenced in the New Tes-

tament.

Excursus: The Date and Provenance of James

        In light of chapter three of this thesis there are some
aspects of the dating and placing of James which should be
dealt with. While the larger issues will remain untouched,
several brief comments are in order. First, the parallels
between James and 1QS, Q, and Didache should not be viewed in
and of themselves as evidence for James' date or place of
composition. Of the various documents 1QS is probably to be
dated to the second century B.C.E. and placed in Judaea (cf.
Murphy-O'Connor); Q to an early first century date possibly
in the Galilee; and Didache is usually placed in Syria in the
second century (some scholars date Didache to the first cen-

------

tianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World (Grand Rapids:
Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1983); D. Hill, New Testament Prophecy (At-
lanta: John Knox Press, 1979); and Boring, The Continuing
Voice of Jesus. For the connection between Jesus as prophet
and his role as teacher and instructor, as well as the larger
issues involved in the discussion of Jesus as teacher, see
the well-nuanced discussion by Rainer Riesner, Jesus als
Lehrer, WUNT 2.7, 3rd ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988);
and his "Jesus as Preacher and Teacher," in Jesus and the
Oral Gospel Tradition, JSNTSup 64, ed. Henry Wansbrough
(Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), pp.185-210. The role of Jesus
as teacher may well have some connection to the importance of
"teachers" and teaching in the Epistle of James. On the
larger phenomenon of early Christian teachers see Alfred F.
Zimmermann, Die urchristlichen Lehrer, WUNT 2.12, 2nd ed.
(Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988).

tury, but the arguments adduced in support are not always convincing; cf. J. A. T. Robinson, Redating the New Testament [London: SCM Press, 1976], pp.322-327). Thus, similarity alone is not grounds to either date or place James in the context of early Christianity.

Second, having said this, it should be noted that the similarities between James and Q (cf. Hartin, James and the Q Sayings), between James and Matthew (cf. Dillman, "A Study of Some Theological and Literary Comparisons"), and between James and 1QS (cf. Beck, "Composition") may well be one indication among others that James is to be dated earlier in the first century rather than later. The formal and content parallels between these various documents (themselves quite striking), and the seeming lack of dependence of James on them, is at least one argument for the thesis that James derives from a similar ethos and environment, and may also indicate that James antedates the composition of Matthew (this, of course, comes close to the position taken by Hartin. However, as suggested in "excursus three" of chapter one, Hartin's arguments for literary dependence of James on Q [and Q^{MT} in particular] are far from convincingly established).

Third, the main point of this thesis has been to analyze the character of James arguing for the primacy of its eschatological framework in interpretation of the epistle. From this study, one of the conclusions which has been drawn is that James is not as distinct from early first century Palestinian documents (e.g., Q and 1QS) as has sometimes been made out by other scholars (e.g., Dibelius, Bousset). As far as its form and content are concerned there is no reason James could not be dated to Palestine in the first century (even early first century). Chapter one of this thesis has tried to clear the way for this assertion in its attempt to cut away assumptions which control the way in which the material in James is read.

Fourth, there are some important features in James which, in my view, do indicate an early first century date (possibly in Palestine): 1) its combination of eschatology and christology parallels very closely the similar pattern in Paul and thus attests to an early tradition (cf. L. J. Kreitzer, Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology, JSNTSup 19 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987]); 2) the use of Jesus tradition in James appear to be independent of the Gospels (cf. P. H. Davids, "James and Jesus," in Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels, GP5, ed. D. Wenham [Sheffield: JSOT Press], pp.63-85; and Dean B. Deppe, "The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James" [Ph. D. diss., The Free University of Amsterdam, 1989) and may well include Jesus logia not attested elsewhere (though these are, for obvious reasons, difficult to ferret out); 3) references to possible practices of the community, notably the judicial gathering (Jm. 2:1ff), appear to have affinity with similar practices among Jews in Palestine and

in the Gospel of Matthew (cf. Overman, Matthew's Gospel, pp.108-109); 4) the independence of James from Paul, and its reliance on the common tradition reflected in James 2 (cf. chapter one of this thesis), suggests that James lies as close to early Christian tradition as Paul; and 5) its affinities with Q and 1QS at the very least clearly place James in the ethos of early Christianity in Palestine. It should be noted, however, that an early date in Palestine in no way should imply that the letter was written by James "the brother of the Lord." The authorship of James is another matter in itself, and there is no evidence other than the common name, to link the author of the epistle to "James the Just." To make such an identification as quickly as it is often made simply replaces one a priori framework of interpretation (James as "hellenistic Jewish wisdom") for another equally unsatisfying one (James as the product of the battle between Jewish Christians and Pauline Christianity; cf. Gerd Luedemann, Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity, trans. M. Eugene Boring [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989], for a treatment of the history of the discussion and his own interpretation of the phenomenon). Unfortunately, most scholars arguing for an early dating of James do so for traditional reasons: to connect the work to "James of Jerusalem" (a connection which can be made whether one views James as entirely or only partially written by "James the Just"). The understanding is that this connection will then shed light on both the person and the epistle. However, given the nature of the material in James and the lack of a fully developed picture of early Christian origins and relations, it is unlikely that the author of James will ever be fully recovered from history and tradition. Nevertheless, the ethos, date, and provenance of the epistle may, in fact, be possible to recover, at least in part.

Bibliography

I. Texts, Translations, Commentaries, and Reference Works (Excluding Lexica and Concordances).

Adamson, James. _The Epistle of James_. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.

Betz, H. D. _2 Corinthians 8 and 9_. Ed. G. W. MacRae. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Black, M. _The Book of Enoch or I Enoch_. SVTP 7. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.

Brownlee, W. H. _The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk_. SBLMS 24. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

Brox, N. _Der Hirt des Hermas_. KAV 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.

Cathcart, K. J. & R. P. Gordon. _The Targum of the Minor Prophets_. The Aramaic Bible 14. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1989.

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. _The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha_. 2 Vols. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1983, 1985.

Childs, B. S. _The New Testament as Canon: An Introduction_. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Chilton, B. D. _The Isaiah Targum_. The Aramaic Bible 11. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987.

Crossan, J. D. _Sayings Parallels_. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Davids, P. H. _The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text_. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1982.

Davids, P. H. _The First Epistle of Peter_. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1990.

Dibelius, M. _James_. Rev. H. Greeven. Trans. M. A. Williams. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Draper, J.A. "A Commentary on the Didache in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents." Ph. D. diss., Cambridge University, 1983.

Dupont-Sommer, A. The Essene Writings from Qumran. Trans. G. Vermes. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973 rpr.

Elliger, K. & W. Rudolph, eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967-77.

Guthrie, D. New Testament Introduction. Rev. 4th Ed. Downers Grove: IVP, 1990.

Holladay, W. L. Jeremiah 1. Ed. P. D. Hanson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

Hollander, H. W. & M. de Jonge. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary. SVTP 8. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.

Holm-Nielsen, S. Hodayot - Psalms from Qumran. ATD 2. Denmark: Universitetsforlaget I Aarhus, 1960.

van der Horst, P. W. The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

Hort, F. J. A. The Epistle of James. London: MacMillan & Co., 1909.

Johnson, L. T. The Writings of the New Testament: An Interpretation. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

de Jonge, M. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text. PVTG 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

Kittel, B. The Hymns of Qumran. SBLDS 50. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.

Kloppenborg, J. S. Q Parallels. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1988.

Kraft, R. The Didache and Barnabas. New York: Thomas Nelson, 1965.

Kümmel, W. G. Introduction to the New Testament. Rev. Ed. Trans. H. C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1975.

Lake, K. Apostolic Fathers. Loeb Classical Library. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985 rpr.

Laws, S. A Commentary on the Epistle of James. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1980, rpr.

Leaney, A. R. C. The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning.
London: SCM Press, 1966.

Lightfoot, J. B. & J. R. Harmer. The Apostolic Fathers.
2nd Ed. Trans. & Ed. M. W. Holmes. Grand Rapids:
Baker Book House, 1989.

Lindemann, A. Die Clemensbriefe. HNT 17/AV 1. Tübingen:
J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.

Lohse, E. Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch.
4th Ed. Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1986.

Marshall, I. H. Commentary on Luke. NIGTC. Grand Rapids:
Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978.

Martin, R. P. James. WBC 48. Waco: Word Books, 1988.

Mayor, J. B. The Epistle of James. Grand Rapids: Kregel,
1990 rpr.

McLean, B. H. Citations and Allusions to Jewish Scripture
in Early Christian and Jewish Writings Through 180
C.E.. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1992.

McNeile, A. H. An Introduction to the Study of the New
Testament. 2nd Rev. Ed. by C. S. C. Williams.
Oxford: 1953.

Michaels, J. R. I Peter. WBC 49. Waco: Word Books, 1988.

Moffat, J. Introduction to the Literature of the New
Testament. 3rd. Ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1961 rpr.

Moulton, J. H. & N. Turner. Grammar of New Testament Greek.
4 Vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Mußner, F. Der Jakobusbrief. HKNT XIII. 5th Ed. Freiburg:
Herder, 1987.

Nestle, E. et al. Novum Testamentum Graece. 26th Ed.
Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1978.

Niederwimmer, K. Die Didache. KAV 1. Göttingen: Vanden-
hoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

Pearson, B. A. "James, 1-2 Peter, Jude." In The New
Testament and Its Modern Interpreters. Eds. E. J. Epp
& G. W. MacRae. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.

Rahlfs, A. Septuaginta. 9th Ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibel-
gesellschaft, 1979.

Ropes, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916.

Selwyn, E. G. *The First Epistle of St. Peter*. 2nd Ed. Grand Rapids: Baker House, 1981 rpr.

Sperber, A. *The Bible in Aramaic*. 4 Vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959-1973.

Stroker, W. D. *Extracanonical Sayings of Jesus*. SBLRBS 18. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Vermes, G. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 3rd Ed. London: Penguin Books, 1987.

Vielhauer, P. *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*. 4th Ed. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1975.

Vouga, F. *L'Épitre De Saint Jacques*. CNT XIIIa. Genéve: Labor et Fides, 1984.

Wikenhauser, A. *New Testament Introduction*. Herder & Herder, 1958.

Winston, D. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. AB 43. New York: Doubleday, 1979.

Zahn, T. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1977 rpr.

II. Secondary Works on the Epistle of James

Adamson, J. B. *James: The Man & His Message*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1989.

Agourides, S.C. "The Origin of the Epistle of James: Suggestions for a Fresh Approach." *GOTR* 9 (1963):67-78.

Amphoux, C.-B. "Systemes anciens de division de l'épitre de Jacques et composition littéraire." *Bib* 62 (1981):390-400.

Baasland, E. "Der Jakobusbrief als Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift." *ST* 36 (1982):119-139.

Baasland, E. "Literarische Form, Thematik und geschicht-
    liche Einordnung des Jakobusbriefes." ANRW 2.25/5,
    3646-3684.

Bartlett, D. L. "The Epistle of James as a Jewish-Christian
    Document." SBLSP 19 (1979; Volume 2):173-186.

Bauckham, R. "James, I and 2 Peter, and Jude." In It is
    Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Eds. D. A. Carson
    & H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge University Press,
    1988, 303-317.

Beck, D. L. "The Composition of the Epistle of James." Ph.
    D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1973.

Bolich, G. G. "On Dating James: New Perspectives on an
    Ancient Problem." Ed. D. diss, Gonzaga University,
    1983.

Boggan, C. W. "Wealth in the Epistle of James." Ph. D.
    diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982.

Boyle, M.O. "The Stoic Paradox of James 2.10." NTS 31
    (1985):611-617.

Burge, G. M. "'And Threw Them Thus on Paper': Recovering
    the Poetic Form of James 2:14-26. StBibT 7 (1977):31-
    45.

Burchard, C. "Gemeinde in der strohernen Epistel: Mutmas-
    sungen über Jakobus." In Kirche. Eds. D. Lührmann &
    G. Strecker. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1980, 315-328.

Cooper, R. M. "Prayer: A Study in Matthew and James."
    Encounter 29 (1968):268-277.

Dautzenberg, G. "Ist das Schwurverbot Mt 5,33-37; Jak 5,12
    ein Beispiel für die Torakritik Jesu?" BZ 25
    (1981):47-66.

Davids, P. H. "The Epistle of James in Modern Discussion."
    ANRW II 25.5, 3621-3645.

Davids, P. H. "James and Jesus." In Gospel Perspectives
    Volume 5: Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels. Ed. D.
    Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 63-84.

Davids, P. H. "The Meaning of apeirastos in James I.13."
    NTS 24 (1978):386-392.

Davids, P. H. "Themes in the Epistle of James that are Judaistic in Character." Ph. D. diss., University of Manchester, 1974.

Davids, P. H. "Tradition and Citation in the Epistle of James." In Scripture, Tradition, and Citation. Ed. W. W. Gasque & W. S. LaSor. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978.

Deppe, D. "The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James." Ph. D. diss., Free University of Amsterdam, 1989.

Dillman, C. N. "A Study of Some Theological and Literary Comparisons of the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle of James." Ph. D. diss. Edinburgh, 1978.

Donker, C. E. "Der Verfasser des Jak und sein Gegner: Zum Problem des Einwandes in Jak 2:18-19." ZNW 72 (1981):227-240.

Edsman, C-M. "Schöperwille und Geburt Jac 1.18: Eine Studie zur altchristlichen Kosmologie." ZNW 38 (1939):11-44.

Eisenman, R. "Eschatological 'Rain' Imagery in the War Scroll from Qumran and in the Letter of James." JNES 49 (1990):173-184.

Elliott-Binns, L. E. "James I.18: Creation or Redemption?" NTS 3 (1956):148-161.

Felder, C. H. "Wisdom. Law and Social Concern in the Epistle of James." Ph. D. diss., Columbia University, 1982.

Feuillet, A. "Le sens du mot Parousie dans l'Evangile de Matthieu: Comparaison entre Matth. xxiv et Jac. v. 1-11." In The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Eds. W. D. Davies & D. Daube. Cambridge: University Press, 1964, 261-280.

Francis, F.O. " The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and I John." ZNW 61 (1970):110-126.

Frankemölle, H. "Gesetz im Jakobusbrief: Zur Tradition, kontextuellen Verwendung und Rezeption eines belasteten Begriffes." In Das Gesetz Im Neuen Testament. Ed. K. Kertelge. Freiburg: Herder, 1986, 175-211.

Frankemölle, H. "Zum Thema des Jakobusbriefes im Kontext der Rezeption von Sir 2,1-18 und 15,11-20." BN 48 (1989):21-49.

264

Fry, E. "The Testing of Faith: A Study of the Structure of the Book of James." BT 29 (1978):427-435.

Gertner, M. "Midrashim in the New Testament." JSS 7 (1962):267-292.

Geyser, A. S. "The Letter of James and the Social Condition of His Addressees." Neotestamentica 9 (1975):25-33.

Gordon, R. P. "KAI TO TELOS EIDETE (JAS V.11)." JTS 26 (1975):91-95.

Halson, B. R. "The Epistle of James: 'Christian Wisdom?'." SE 4/TU 102 (1968):308-314.

Hartin, P. J. James and the Q Sayings of Jesus. JSNTSup 47. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Hartin, P. J. "James and the Q Sermon on the Mount/Plain." SBLSP 28 (1989):440-457.

Hengel, M. "Der Jakobusbrief als anti-paulinische Polemik." In Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament. Eds. G. F. Hawthorne & O. Betz. Grand Rapids/Tübingen: Wm. B. Eerdmans/J. C. B. Mohr, 1987, 248-278.

Hoppe, R. Der theologische Hintergrund des Jakobusbriefes. FzB 28. Würzburg: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977.

Jacobs, I. "The Midrashic Background for James II.21-3." NTS 22 (1975):457-464.

Johnson, L. T. "Friendship with the World/Friendship with God: A Study of Discipleship in James." In Discipleship in the New Testament. Ed. F. F. Segovia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985, 166-183.

Johnson, L. T. "James 3:12-4:10 and the Topos peri phthonou." NovT 25 (1983):327-347.

Johnson, L. T. "The Mirror of Remembrance (James 1:22-25)." CBQ 50 (1988):632-645.

Johnson, L. T. "Taciturnity and True Religion: James 1:26-27." In Greeks, Romans, and Christians. Eds. D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson, & W. A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990, 329-339.

Johnson, L. T. "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James." JBL 101 (1982):391-401.

Kelly, F. X. "Poor and Rich in the Epistle of James." Ph. D. diss., Temple University, 1973.

Kirk, J. A. "The Meaning of Wisdom in James: Examination of a Hypothesis." NTS 16 (1969):24-38.

Kittel, G. "Der geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes." ZNW 41 (1942):71-105.

Kittel, G. "Der Jakobusbrief und die Apostolischen Väter." ZNW 43 (1950):54-112.

Kittel, G. "Der Stellung des Jakobus zu Judentum und Heidenchristentum." ZNW 30 (1931):145-157.

Kloppenborg, J. S. "Review of James and the Q Sayings of Jesus." CBQ 54 (1992):567-568.

Kürzdörfer, K. "Der Charakter des Jakobusbriefes: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit den Thesen von A. Meyer und M. Dibelius." Ph. D. diss., Eberhard-Karls-Universität, 1966.

Laws, S. "Does the Scripture Speak in Vain? A Reconsideration of James iv,5." NTS 20 (1973-1974):210-215.

Lodge, J. G. "James and Paul at Cross-Purposes? James 2,22." Bib 62 (1981):195-213.

Longenecker, R. N. "The 'Faith of Abraham' Theme in Paul, James and Hebrews: A Study in the Circumstantial Nature of New Testament Teaching." JETS 20 (1977):203-212.

Luck, U. "Der Jakobusbrief und die Theologie des Paulus." TGl 61 (1971):161-179.

Marcus, J. "The Evil Inclination in the Epistle of James." CBQ 44 (1982):606-621.

Martin, R. P. "The Life-Setting of the Epistle of James in the Light of Jewish History." In Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. Ed. G. A. Tuttle. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978, 97-103.

Marynard-Reid, P. U. Poverty and Wealth in James. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1987.

McKnight, S. "James 2:18a: The Unidentifiable Interlocutor." WTJ 52 (1990):355-364.

Meyer, A. Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes. BZNW 10. Gießen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1930.

Morris, K. F. "An Investigation of Several Linguistic Affinities Between the Epistle of James and the Book of Isaiah." Th. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary (Virginia), 1964.

Mußner, F. "'Direkte' und 'Indirekte' Christologie Im Jakobusbrief." Catholica 24 (1970):111-117.

Noack, B. "Jakobus wider die Reichen." ST 18 (1964):10-25.

Perdue, L. G. "Paraenesis and the Epistle of James." ZNW 72 (1981):241-256.

Popkes, W. Adressaten, Situation und Form des Jakobus- briefes. SBS 125/126. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986.

Prockter, L. J. "James 4.4-6: Midrash on Noah." NTS 35 (1989):625-627.

Rendall, G. H. The Epistle of St. James and Judaic Christianity. Cambridge University Press, 1927.

Schmitt, J. J. "You Adulteresses! The Image in James 4:4." NovT 28 (1986):327-337.

Schökel, L. A. "James 5,2 and 4,6." Bib 54 (1973):73-76.

Seitz, O. "James and the Law." SE 2 Part I (1964):472-486.

Seitz, O. J. F. "Relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James." JBL 63 (1944):131-140.

Shepherd, M. H. "The Epistle of James and the Gospel of Matthew." JBL 75 (1956):40-51.

Sigal, P. "The Halakhah of James." In Intergerini Parietis Septvm (Eph. 2:14). Ed. D. Y. Hadidian. Pittsburgh: The Pickwick Press, 1981, 337-353.

Soards, M. L. "The Early Christian Interpretation of Abraham and the Place of James Within that Context." Irish Biblical Studies 9 (1987):18-26.

Stauffer, E. "Das 'Gesetz der Freiheit' in der Ordensregel von Jericho." TLZ 9 (1952):527-532.

Townsend, M. J. "Christ, Community and Salvation in the Epistle of James." EvQ 53 (1981):115-123.

Trocmé, E. "Les Eglises pauliniennes vues du dehors: Jac- ques 2,1 á 3,13." SE 2 (1964):660-669.

Wall, R. W. "James as Apocalyptic Paraenesis." RestQ 32 (1990):11-22.

Wanke, J. "Die Urchristlichen Lehrer nach dem Zeugnis des Jakobusbriefes." In Die Kirche des Anfangs. Eds. R. Schnackenburg et al. Freiburg: Herder, 1978, 489-511.

Watson, D. F. "'Can a Fig Tree Yield Olives or a Grapevine Figs?' Rhetoric of James 3:1-12." Presentation given at SBL Seminar. Kansas City. November, 1991. To be published in NovT.

Watson, D. F. "James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation." NTS 39 (1993): 94-121.

Ward, R. B. "The Communal Concern of the Epistle of James." Ph. D. diss., Harvard University, 1966.

Ward, R. B. "Partiality in the Assembly: James 2:2-4." HTR 62 (1969):87-97.

Ward, R. B. "The Works of Abraham: James 2:14-26." HTR 61 (1968):283-290.

Wifstrand, A. "Stylistic Problems in the Epistles of James and Peter." ST 1 (1948):170-182.

Wordsworth, J. "The Corbey St. James [ff] and Its Relation to Other Latin Versions and to the Original Language of the Epistle." StBib 1 (1885):113-123.

Wuellner, W. H. "Der Jakobusbrief im Licht der Rhetorik und Textpragmatik." LingBib 43 (1978):5-66.

Young, F. W. "The Relation of I Clement to the Epistle of James." JBL 67 (1948):339-345.

Zmijewski, J. "Christliche 'Vollkommenheit': Erwägungen zur Theologie des Jakobusbriefes." In Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Series A. Volume 5. Ed. A. Fuchs. Linz, 1980, 50-78.

III. General Secondary Works

Allison, D. C. The End of the Ages Has Come. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Allison, D. C.   "The Pauline Epistles and the Synoptic Gos-
     pels: The Pattern of the Parallels." NTS 28 (1982):1-
     32.

Amir, Y.   "Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the
     Writings of Philo." In Mikra. CRINT II.1. Ed. J.
     Mulder. Assen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press,
     1988, 421-453.

Aune, D. E.   "The Apocalypse of John and the Problem of
     Genre." Semeia 36 (1986);65-96.

Aune, D. E.   The Cultic Setting of Realized Eschatology in
     Early Christianity. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Aune, D. E.   "Eschatology (Early Christian)." ABD.   Vol. 2,
     594-609.

Aune, D. E.   The New Testament in Its Literary Environment.
     Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987.

Aune, D. E.   "Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus."
     In Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition. JSNTSup 64.
     Ed. H. Wansbrough. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991, 211-
     265.

Aune, D. E.   Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient
     Mediterranean World. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans,
     1983.

Bailey, J. L. & L. D. Vander Broek.   Literary Forms in the
     New Testament. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox
     Press, 1992.

Baird, J. A.   "Genre Analysis and the Method of Historical
     Criticism." SBLSP (1972):385-411.

Balch, D. L.   "Comments on the Genre and a Political Theme
     of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Comparison of Two
     Hellenistic Historians." SBLSP 28 (1989):343-361.

Baltzer, K.   The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament,
     Jewish, and Early Christian Writings. Trans. D. E.
     Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Bammel, E.   "Das Ende von Q." In Verborum Veritas. Eds. O.
     Böcher & K. Haacker. Wuppertal: Rolf Brockhaus, 1970,
     39-50.

Banks, R.   Paul's Idea of Community. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
     Eerdmans, 1980.

Barker, M. The Older Testament. London: SPCK, 1987.

Barnard, L. W. "The Dead Sea Scrolls, Barnabas, the Didache and the Later History of the 'Two Ways'." In Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background. New York: Schocken Books, 1966, 87-107.

Barr, J. "Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in the Hellenistic Age." In The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Hellenistic Age. Eds. W. D. Davies & L. Finkelstein. Cambridge University Press, 1989, 79-114.

Barr, J. "Jewish Apocalyptic in Recent Scholarly Study." BJRL 58 (1975):9-35.

Barton, J. The Oracles of God. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1986.

Bauckham, R. J. "The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas." JTS 25 (1974):27-40.

Bauckham, R. J. Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.

Bauckham, R. A. "The Study of Gospel Traditions Outside the Canonical Gospels: Problems and Prospects." In Gospel Perspectives: Volume 5: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels. Ed. D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984, 369-403.

Bauer, W. Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity. Eds. R. Kraft & G. Krodel. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Beardslee, W. A. "The Wisdom Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels." JAAR 35 (1967):231-240.

Berger, K. Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984.

Berger, K. "Die impliziten Gegner: Zur Methode des Erschliessens von 'Gegner' in neutestamentlichen Texten." In Kirche. Eds. D. Lührmann & G. Strecker. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1980, 373-400.

Betz, H. D. "Eschatology in the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain." SBLSP 24 (1985):343-350.

Betz, H. D. "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre in Greek and Hellenistic Literature: The Case of the Oracle of Trophonius." In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 577-597.

Betz, H. D. "On the Problem of the Religio-Historical Understanding of Apocalypticism." JTC 6 (1969):134-156.

Betz, O. "Firmness in Faith: Hebrews 11:1 and Isaiah 28:16." Rpr. in Jesus Der Herr der Kirche. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990, 425-446.

Beyer, K. Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament. SUNT 1. 2nd. Ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.

Boccaccini, G. Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Böcher, O. Der johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965.

de Boer, M. C. "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology." In Apocalyptic and the New Testament. Eds. J. Marcus & M. L. Soards. JSNTSup 24. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989, 169-190.

Borg, M. Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1984.

Borgen, P. "Catalogues of Vices, the Apostolic Decree, and the Jerusalem Meeting." In The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism. Eds. J. Neusner et al. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988, 126-141.

Borgen, P. "The Early Church and the Hellenistic Synagogue." Rpr. in Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity. BJS 131. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987, 207-232.

Boring, M. E. The Continuing Voice of Jesus. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Boring, M. E. Sayings of the Risen Jesus. SNTSMS 46. Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Bousset, W. Kyrios Christos. Trans. J. E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1970.

Bousset, W. Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter. 3rd. Ed. Rev. H. Gressmann. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926.

Bovon, F. Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-1983). Trans. K. McKinney. Allison Park: Pickwick Publications, 1987.

Braun, H. Qumran und das Neue Testament. 2 Vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966.

Brooks, S. H. "Apocalyptic Paraenesis in Matthew 6.19-34." In Apocalyptic and the New Testament. Eds. J. Marcus & M. L. Soards. JSNTSup 24. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989, 95-112.

Brown, R. E. "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity." CBQ 45 (1983):74-79.

Brown, R. E. "The Pater Noster as an Eschatological Prayer." Rpr. in New Testament Essays. New York: Paulist Press, 1965, 217-253.

Brown, S. Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke. AB 36. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

Brown. S. "Deliverance from the Crucible: Some Further Reflections on 1QH III.1-18." NTS 14 (1967-1968):247-259.

Brown, S. "The Hour of Trial (Rev 3:10)." JBL 85 (1966):308-314.

Brown, S. K. "James: A Religio-Historical Study of the Relation Between Jewish, Gnostic, and Catholic Christianity in the Early Period Through an Investigation of the Traditions About James the Lord's Brother." Ph. D. diss., Brown University, 1972.

Brownlee, W. H. The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Bruce, F. F. "The Acts of the Apostles: Historical Record or Theological Reconstruction." ANRW 2.25/3, 2569-2603.

Bultmann, R. History of the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. J. Marsh. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1963.

Bultmann, R. <u>Jesus and the Word</u>. Trans. L. P. Smith & E.
     H. Lantero. London: Collins, 1958.

Burnett, F. W. <u>The Testament of Jesus-Sophia: A Redaction-
     Critical Study of the Eschatological Discourse in
     Matthew</u>. New York: University Press of America, 1981.

Cameron, R. "The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Origins."
     In <u>The Future of Early Christianity</u>. Ed. B. A.
     Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 381-392.

Cameron, R. "Thomas, Gospel of." <u>ABD</u>. Vol. 6, 535-540.

Campbell, B. G. "An Analysis of the Jacobean Tradition of
     the First Four Centuries A.D., With Special Interest in
     the Apostolic Age." M. A. thesis, Regent College,
     1981.

Carlston, C. E. "Proverbs, Maxims, and the Historical
     Jesus." <u>JBL</u> 99 (1980):87-105.

Carlston, C. E. "Wisdom and Eschatology in Q." In <u>Logia:
     Les Paroles de Jésus - The Sayings of Jesus</u>. Ed. J.
     Delobel. Leuven University Press, 1982, 101-119.

Carrington, P. <u>The Primitive Christian Catechism: A Study
     in the Epistles</u>. Cambridge University Press, 1940.

Carroll, K. L. "The Place of James in the Early Church."
     <u>BJRL</u> 44 (1961):49-67.

Casey, M. <u>From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God</u>. Louisville:
     Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Catchpole, D. R. "The Beginning of Q: A Proposal." <u>NTS</u> 38
     (1992):205-221.

Catchpole, D. R. <u>The Quest for Q</u>. Edinburgh: T&T Clark,
     forthcoming.

Charette, B. <u>The Theme of Recompense in Matthew's Gospel</u>.
     JSNTSup 79. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Charlesworth, J. H. "The Triumphant Majority as Seen by a
     Dwindled Minority: The Outsider According to the
     Insider of the Jewish Apocalypses, 70-130." In <u>"To See
     Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others"
     in Late Antiquity</u>. Eds. J. Neusner & E. S. Frerichs.
     Chico: Scholars Press, 1985, 285-315.

Chilton, B. D. <u>A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible</u>. GNS 8.
     Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1984.

Chilton, B. D. The Glory of Israel. JSOTSup 23. Shef-
    field: JSOT Press, 1982.

Christensen, D. L. Transformation of the War Oracle in Old
    Testament Prophecy. HDR 3. Missoula: Scholars Press,
    1975.

Clements, R. Prophecy and Tradition. Atlanta: John Knox
    Press, 1975.

Collins, A. Yarbro. "The Apocalyptic Son of Man Sayings."
    In The Future of Early Christianity. Ed. B. A.
    Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 220-228.

Collins, A. Yarbro. The Combat Myth in the Book of
    Revelation. HDR 9. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.

Collins, A. Yarbro. "Early Christian Apocalyptic Litera-
    ture." ANRW II 25.6, 4665-4711.

Collins, A. Yarbro. "Insiders and Outsiders in the Book of
    Revelation and Its Social Context." In "To See Our-
    selves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in
    Late Antiquity. Eds. J. Neusner & E. S. Frerichs.
    Chico: Scholars Press, 1985, 187-218.

Collins, A. Yarbro. "Introduction: Early Christian Apoca-
    lypticism." Semeia 36 (1986):1-11.

Collins, J. J. The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction
    to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity. New York: Cross-
    road, 1984.

Collins, J. J. "Apocalyptic Literature." In Early Judaism
    and Its Modern Interpreters. Eds. R.A. Kraft & G. W.
    E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986, 345-70.

Collins, J. J. "Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and
    Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age." HR 17 (1977):121-
    142.

Collins, J. J. "The Court Tales in Daniel and the Develop-
    ment of Apocalyptic." JBL 94 (1975):218-234.

Collins, J. J. "The Genre Apocalypse in Hellenistic
    Judaism." In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World.
    Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apoca-
    lypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hell-
    holm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 530-548.

Collins, J. J. "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a
    Genre." Semeia 14 (1979):1-20.

Collins, J. J. "The Jewish Apocalypses." Semeia 14 (1979): 21-59.

Collins, J. J. "Patterns of Eschatology at Qumran." In Traditions in Transformation. Eds. B. Halpern & J. D. Levenson. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1981, 351-375.

Collins, J. J. "A Symbol of Otherness: Circumcision and Salvation in the First Century." In "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity. Eds. J. Neusner & E. S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985, 163-186.

Conzelmann, H. Gentiles/Jews/Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era. Trans. M. E. Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Cope, O. L. "'To the Close of the Age': The Role of Apocalyptic Thought in the Gospel of Matthew." In Apocalyptic and the New Testament. Eds. J. Marcus & M. L. Soards. JSNTSup 24. Sheffield:JSOT Press, 1989, 113-24.

Coughenour, R. A. "Enoch and Wisdom: A Study of the Wisdom Elements in the Book of Enoch." Ph. D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1972.

Coughenour, R. A. "The Woe Oracles in Ethiopic Enoch." JSJ 9 (1978):192-197.

Court, J. M. "Paul and the Apocalyptic Pattern." In Paul and Paulinism. Eds. M. D. Hooker & S. G. Wilson. London: SPCK, 1982, 57-66.

Cronbach, A. "The Social Ideals of the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha." HUCA 18 (1944):119-156.

Crossan, J. D. The Cross That Spoke: The Origins of the Passion Narrative. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988.

Crossan, J. D. The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1991.

Crouch, J. E. The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel. FRLANT 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Dahl, N. A. "Christ, Creation and the Church." In The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology. Eds. W. D. Davies & D. Daube. Cambridge University Press, 1964, 422-443.

Daniélou, J. The Theology of Jewish Christianity. Trans.
    J. A. Baker. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.

Davies, P. R. 1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its
    Structure and History. BO 32. Rome: Biblical
    Institute Press, 1977.

Davies, P. R. "Qumran and Apocalyptic or Obscurum per
    Obscurius." JNES 49 (1990):127-134.

Davies, S. L. "The Christology and Protology of the Gospel
    of Thomas." JBL 111 (1992):663-682.

Davies, S. L. The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom.
    New York: The Seabury Press, 1983.

Davies, W. D. "Paul and Jewish Christianity According to
    Cardinal Danielou: A Suggestion." RSR 60 (1972):69-
    79.

Davies, W. D. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. BJS
    186. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989 rpr.

Dawsey, J. M. "Characteristics of Folk-Epic in Acts."
    SBLSP 28 (1989):317-325.

Delling, G. "Die Begegnung zwischen Hellenismus und
    Judentum." ANRW 2.20/1, 3-39.

Deutsch, C. Hidden Wisdom and the Easy Yoke: Wisdom, Torah
    and Discipleship in Matthew 11:25-30. JSNTSup 18.
    Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Dodd, C. H. The Parables of Jesus. Rev. Ed. New York:
    Charles Scribner's Sons, 1961.

Dodd, C. H. "The Primitive Catechism and the Sayings of
    Jesus." In New Testament Essays. Ed. A. J. B. Hig-
    gins. Manchester University Press, 1958, 106-118.

Donahue, P. J. "Jewish Christianity in the Letters of
    Ignatius of Antioch." VC 32 (1978):81-93.

Doty, W. G. "The Concept of Genre in Literary Analysis."
    SBLSP (1972):413-448.

Doty, W. G. Letters in Primitive Christianity. Philadel-
    phia: Fortress Press, 1973.

Downing, F. G. The Church and Jesus: A Study in History,
    Philosophy and Theology. SBT 2.10. London: SCM Press,
    1968.

Downing, F. G. Cynics and Christian Origins. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.

Draper, J.A. "The Jesus Tradition in the Didache." In Gospel Perspectives: Volume 5: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels. Ed. D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984, 269-87.

Dungan, D. L. The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Dunn, J. D. G. "Mark 2.1-3.6: A Bridge Between Jesus and Paul on the Question of the Law." Rpr. in Jesus, Paul, and the Law. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990, 10-36.

Dunn, J. D. G. "The New Perspective on Paul." Rpr. in Jesus, Paul, and the Law. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990, 183-214.

Dunn, J. D. G. The Partings of the Ways. London/ Philadelphia: SCM Press/TPI International, 1991.

Dunn, J. D. G. Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1977.

Edwards, D. R. "First Century Urban/Rural Relations in Lower Galilee: Exploring the Archaeological and Literary Evidence." SBLSP 27 (1988):169-182.

Edwards, D. R. "The Socio-Economic and Cultural Ethos of the Lower Galilee in the First Century: Implications for the Nascent Jesus Movement." In The Galilee in Late Antiquity. Ed. L. I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992, 53-73.

Edwards, R. A. A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, and Wisdom. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Elliott, J. H. A Home for the Homeless. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Elliott-Bines, L. E. Galilean Christianity. SBT 16. Chicago: Alec R. Allenson, 1956.

Ellis, E. E. The Old Testament in Early Christianity. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.

Ellis, E. E. "Paul and His Opponents: Trends in Research." Rpr. in Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1978, 80-115.

Esler, P. F. Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivation of Lucan Theology. SNTSMS 57. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Evans, C. A. Non-Canonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992.

Evans, C. A. & J. A. Sanders, eds. Paul and the Scriptures of Israel. JSNTSup 83/SSEJC 1. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Exler, F. X. J. The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1923.

Fannon, P. "The Influence of Tradition in St. Paul." SE 4/TU 102 (1968):292-307.

Feldman, L. H. "Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism in Retrospect." JBL 96 (1977):371-382.

Feldman, L. H. "How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine." HUCA 57 (1986):83-111.

Fine, H. A. "The Tradition of a Patient Job." JBL 74 (1955):28-32.

Fishbane, M. Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Fishburne, C. W. "I Corinthians III.10-15 and the Testament of Abraham." NTS 17 (1970-1971):109-115.

Fiorenza, E. Schüssler. The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Fiorenza, E. Schüssler. "The Phenomenon of Early Christian Apocalyptic: Some Reflections on Method." In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 295-316.

Fischer, U. Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im Hellenistischen Diasporajudentum. BZNW 44. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1978.

Fitzgerald, J. T. "Paul, the Ancient Epistolary Theorists, and 2 Corinthians 10-13." In Greeks, Romans, and Christians. Eds. D. L. Balch et al. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 190-200.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "The First Century Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI." Rpr. in A Wandering Aramean. Chico: Scholars Press, 1979, 161-182.

Fjärstedt, B. Synoptic Tradition in 1 Corinthians. Sweden: Uppsala, 1974.

Fleddermann, H. "The Beginning of Q." SBLSP 24 (1985):153-159.

Fleddermann, H. "The End of Q." SBLSP 29 (1990):1-10.

Fleddermann, H. "John and the Coming One (Matt 3:11-12//Luke 3:16-17)." SBLSP 23 (1984):377-384.

Fleddermann, H. "The Q Saying on Confessing and Denying." SBLSP 26 (1987):606-616.

Freyne, S. "Vilifying the Other and Defining the Self: Matthew's and John's Anti-Jewish Polemic in Focus." In "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity. Eds. J. Neusner & E. S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985, 117-143.

Gager, J. G. Kingdom and Community: The Social World of Early Christianity. Prentice-Hall, 1975.

Gager, J. G. "Some Attempts to Label the Oracula Sibyllina, Book 7." HTR 65 (1972):91-97.

Gamble, H. The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans. SD 42. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977.

Gammie, J. G. "Paraenetic Literature: Toward the Morphology of a Secondary Genre." Semeia 50 (1990):41-77.

Gärtner, B. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Georgi, D. Remembering the Poor. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1992.

Gerhardsson, B. The Testing of God's Son. CB 2:1. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1966.

Geyser, A. S. "Jesus, the Twelve and the Twelve Tribes in Matthew." Neotestamentica 12 (1981):1-19.

Gilbert, M. "Wisdom Literature." In <u>Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period</u>. CRINT II/2. Ed. M. E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984, 283-324.

Giles, F. <u>Jésus Prophete D'Apres les Évangiles Synoptiques</u>. OBL 2. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1957.

Glasson, T. F. <u>The Second Advent</u>. 3rd. Ed. London: The Epworth Press, 1963.

Goodenough, E. R. & A. T. Kraabel. "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity." In <u>Religions in Antiquity</u>. Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968, 23-68.

Grabbe, L. L. <u>Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian</u>. 2 Vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Gray, J. <u>The Biblical Doctrine of the Reign of God</u>. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979.

Grimm, W. <u>Die Verkündigung Jesu und DeuteroJesaja</u>. ANTI 1. 2nd. Ed. Frankfurt: Verlag Peter Lang, 1981.

Gruenwald, I. <u>Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism</u>. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980.

Gruenwald, I. "Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." <u>ANRW</u> II 19.1, 89-118.

Grundmann, W. "<u>tapeinos ktl</u>." <u>TDNT</u>. Vol. 8, 1-26.

Grundmann, W. "Weisheit im Horizont des Reiches Gottes: Eine Studie zur Verkündigung Jesu nach der Spruch-überlieferung Q." In <u>Die Kirche des Anfangs</u>. Eds. R. Schnackenburg et al. Freiburg: Herder, 1978, 175-199.

Guelich, R. A. "The Matthean Beatitudes: 'Entrance-Requirements' or Eschatological Blessings?" <u>JBL</u> 95 (1976):415-434.

Guenther, H. O. "Greek: Home of Primitive Christianity." <u>TJT</u> 5 (1989):247-279.

Guenther, H. O. "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins." <u>Semeia</u> 55 (1991):41-76.

Gunkel, H. <u>Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit</u>. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.

Gunther, J. J.   St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background: A
     Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings.
     NovTSup 35.   Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Gurevich, A.   Medieval Popular Culture.   Trans. J. M. Bak &
     P. A. Hollingsworth.   Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Haas, C.   "Job's Perseverance in the Testament of Job."   In
     Studies on the Testament of Job.   SNTSMS 66.   Eds. M.
     A. Knibb & P. W. van der Horst.   Cambridge University
     Press 1989, 117-154.

Hadas, M.   Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion.   New
     York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Hamel, G.   Poverty and Charity in Roman Palestine.   NES 23.
     Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.

Hanks, T. D.   "Poor, Poverty (New Testament)."   ABD.   Vol.
     5, 414-424.

Hanson, A. T.   The Living Utterances of God.   London: Dar-
     ton, Longman & Todd, 1983.

Hanson, A. T.   "Rahab the Harlot in Early Christian
     Tradition."   JSNT 1 (1978):53-60.

Hanson, P. D.   "Apocalyptic sm."   In IDBSup, 28-34.

Hanson, P. D.   "Apocalyptic Literature."   In The Hebrew
     Bible and Its Modern Interpreters.   Eds. D. A. Knight &
     G. M. Tucker.   Chico: Scholars Press/Philadelphia:
     Fortress Press, 1985, 465-488.

Hanson, P. D.   The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and
     Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology.
     Rev. Ed.   Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Hartman, L.   "The Function of So-Called Apocalyptic Time-
     tables."   NTS 22 (1976):1-14.

Hartman, L.   Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some
     Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Dis-
     course Mark 13 Par..   Uppsala: CWK Gleerup, 1966.

Hartman, L.   "Survey of the Problem of Apocalyptic Genre."
     In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World.
     Proceedings of the International Colloquium on
     Apocalypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979.   Ed. D.
     Hellholm.   Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 329-343.

Hasel, G. "The Four World Empires of Daniel 2 Against Its Near Eastern Environment." JSOT 12 (1979):147-30.

Hauck, F. "meno ktl." TDNT, Vol. 4, 574-588.

Havener, I. Q: The Sayings of Jesus (With a Reconstruction of Q by Athanasius Polag). Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1990.

Hay, D. M. "The Psychology of Faith in Hellenistic Judaism." ANRW 2.20/2, 881-925.

Hay, R. B. Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Hellholm. D. "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John." Semeia 36 (1986):13-64.

Hemer, C. The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History. Ed. C. H. Gempf. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990 rpr.

Hengel, M. Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity. Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Hengel, M. "Between Jesus and Paul." Rpr. in Between Jesus and Paul. Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983, 1-29,133-156.

Hengel, M. The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century After Christ. Trans. J. Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1989.

Hengel, M. "Jesus als Messianische Lehrer der Weisheit und die Anfänge der Christologie." In Sagesse et Religion. Colloque de Strasbourg (Octobre 1976). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1979, 147-188.

Hengel, H. Jews, Greeks and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period. Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Hengel, M. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period. Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Hengel, M. "Messianische Hoffnung und politischer 'Radikalismus' in der 'jüdisch-hellenistischen Diaspora': Zur Frage der Voraussetzungen des jüdischen Aufstandes unter Trajan 115-117 n. Chr." In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 655-686.

Hengel, M. Property and Riches in the Early Church: Aspects of a Social History of Early Christianity. Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Hengel, M. "Qumran und der Hellenismus." In Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu. Ed. M. Declor. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978, 333-372.

Hiers, R. H. "Day of Christ." ABD. Vol. 2, 76-79.

Hiers, R. H. "Day of Judgment." ABD. Vole. 2, 79-82.

Hiers, R. H. "Day of the Lord." ABD. Vol. 2, 82-83.

Hill, C. C. Hellenists and Hebrews: Reappraising Division within the Earliest Church. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Hill, D. New Testament Prophecy. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.

Hollenbach, P. "Defining Rich and Poor Using Social Sciences." SBLSP 26 (1987):50-63.

Holmberg, B. Sociology and the New Testament. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Holtz, T. "Jesus - Überlieferung und Briefliteratur: Zur Frage des Ortes der Jesus-Überlieferung in der frühen Gemeinde." Rpr. in Geschichte und Theologie des Urchristentums: Gesammelte Aufsätze. Eds. E. Reinmuth & C. Wolff. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1991.

Holtz, T. "Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition." In Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition. JSNTSup 64. Ed. H. Wansbrough. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991, 380-393.

Hopkins, W. J. "The City Region in Roman Palestine." PEQ 112 (1980):19-32.

Horsley, G. H. R. "The Fiction of 'Jewish Greek'." New Docs. Vol. 5, 5-40.

Horsley, R. A.   _Jesus and the Spiral of Violence_.   San
      Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

Horsley, R. A.   "Logoi Propheton? Reflections on the Genre
      of Q."   In _The Future of Early Christianity_.   Ed. B. A.
      Pearson.   Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 173-209.

Horsley, R. A.   "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches and
      Analyses."   _Semeia_ 55 (1991):175-209.

Horsley, R. A.   "Questions about Redactional Strata and the
      Social Relations Reflected in Q."   _SBLSP_ 28 (1989):186-
      203.

Horsley, R. A.   _Sociology and the Jesus Movement_.   New York:
      Crossroad, 1989.

Horsley, R. A. & J. S. Hanson.   _Bandits, Prophets, and
      Messiahs_.   San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.

van der Horst, "Pseudo-Phocylides and the New Testament."
      ZNW 69 (1978):187-202.

Hultgard, A.   _L'Eschatologie des Testaments des Douze
      Patriarches_.   2 Vols.   AUUHR 6,7.   Stockholm: Almqvist
      & Wiksell Int., 1977, 1981.

Hurtado, L. W.   "The Gospel of Mark: Evolutionary or
      Revolutionary Document."   _JSNT_ 40 (1990):15-32.

Hurtado, L. W.   "New Testament Christology: A Critique of
      Bousset's Influence."   _TS_ 40 (1979):306-317.

Jacobson, A. D.   _The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q_.
      Sonoma: Polebridge, 1992.

Jefford, C. N.   _The Sayings of Jesus in the Teaching of the
      Twelve Apostles_.   VCSup 11.   Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989.

Jeske, R.   "Wisdom and the Future in the Teaching of Jesus."
      Dialog 11 (1972):108-117.

Jewett, R.   "Paul, Phoebe, and the Spanish Mission."   In _The
      Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism_.
      Eds. J. Neusner et al.   Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
      1988, 142-161.

Johnson, E. E.   _The Function of Apocalyptic and Wisdom Tra-
      ditions in Romans 9-11_.   SBLDS 109.   Atlanta: Scholars
      Press, 1989.

Johnson, M. D. "Reflections on a Wisdom Approach to Matthew's Christology." <u>CBQ</u> 36 (1974):44-64.

de Jonge, M. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Central Problems and Essential Viewpoints." <u>ANRW</u> 2.20/1, 359-420.

Judge, E. A. <u>The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century</u>. London: The Tyndale Press, 1960.

Käsemann, E. "The Beginnings of Christian Theology." <u>JTC</u> 6 (1969):17-46.

Käsemann, E. "On the Topic of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic." <u>JTC</u> 6 (1969):99-133.

Keck, L. E. "The Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament." <u>ZNW</u> 56 (1965):100-129.

Kee, H. C. <u>Christian Origins in Sociological Perspective</u>. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1980.

Kee, H. C. "Early Christianity in the Galilee: Reassessing the Evidence from the Gospels." In <u>The Galilee in Late Antiquity</u>. Ed. L. I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992, 3-22.

Kim, C.-H. <u>The Familiar Letter of Recommendation</u>. SBLDS 5. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972.

Klauck, H.-J. <u>Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum</u>. SBS 103. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.

Klein, G. <u>Der älteste Christliche Katechismus und die Judische Propaganda-Literatur</u>. Berlin, 1909.

Klijn, A. F. J. "The Study of Jewish Christianity." <u>NTS</u> 20 (1973-74):419-431.

Klijn, A. F. J. & G. J. Reinink. <u>Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects</u>. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.

Kloppenborg, J. S. "City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q)." <u>Semeia</u> 52 (1990):145-160.

Kloppenborg, J. S. "'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q." <u>Semeia</u> 49 (1990):71-99.

Kloppenborg, J. S. "The Formation of Q Revisited: A Response to Richard Horsley." <u>SBLSP</u> 28 (1989):204-215.

Kloppenborg, J. S.   The Formation of Q: Trajectories in
     Ancient Wisdom Collections.   Philadelphia: Fortress
     Press, 1987.

Kloppenborg, J. S.   "The Function of Apocalyptic Language in
     Q."   SBLSP 25 (1986):224-235.

Kloppenborg, J. S. "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and
     the Social History of the Q People."   Semeia 55
     (1991):77-102.

Kloppenborg, J. S.   "Nomos and Ethos in Q."   In Gospel
     Origins and Christian Beginnings.   Eds. J. E. Goehring
     et al. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1990, 35-48.

Kloppenborg, J. S.   "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apoca-
     lypticism of Q."   HTR 80 (1987):287-306.

Kloppenborg, J. S.   "Wisdom Christology in Q."   LTP 34
     (1978):129-147.

Knibb, M. A.   "Prophecy and the Emergence of the Jewish
     Apocalypses."   In Israel's Prophetic Tradition.   Eds.
     R. Coggins et al.   Cambridge University Press, 1982,
     155-180.

Koch, K.   The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic.   London: SCM
     Press, 1972.

Koester, H.   Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and
     Development.   London/Philadelphia: SCM Press/TPI
     International, 1990.

Koester, H.   "Q and Its Relatives."   In Gospel Origins and
     Christian Beginnings.   Eds. J. E. Goehring et al.
     Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1990, 49-63.

Kraabel, A. T.   "The Disappearance of the God-fearers."
     Numen 28 (1981):113-126.

Kraabel, A. T.   "The God-fearers Meet the Beloved Disciple."
     In The Future of Early Christianity.   Ed. B. A. Pear-
     son.   Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 276-284.

Kraabel, A. T.   "Unity and Diversity among Diaspora   Syna-
     gogues."   In The Synagogue in Late Antiquity.   Ed. L.
     I. Levine.   Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental
     Research, 1987, 49-60.

Kraft, R. A.   "In Search of 'Jewish Christianity' and its
     'Theology': Problems of Definition and Methodology."
     RSR 60 (1972):81-92.

Kreitzer, L. J. <u>Jesus and God in Paul's Eschatology</u>.
    JSNTSup 19. Sheffield:JSOT Press, 1987.

Küchler, M. <u>Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen: Zum Fortgang</u>
    <u>weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen</u>
    <u>Jahweglaubens</u>. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,
    1979.

Kuck, D. W. <u>Judgment and Community Conflict</u>. NovTSup 66.
    Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

Kyrtatas, D. J. <u>The Social Structure of the Early Christian</u>
    <u>Communities</u>. London: Verso, 1987.

Larsson, E. "Die paulinischen Schriften als Quellen zur
    Geschichte des Urchristentums." <u>ST</u> 37 (1983):33-53.

Leaney, A. R. C. "The Eschatological Significance of Human
    Suffering in the Old Testament and the Dead Sea
    Scrolls." <u>SJT</u> 16 (1963):286-296.

Lease, G. "Jewish Mystery Cults Since Goodenough." <u>ANRW</u>
    2.20/2, 858-880.

Lelyveld, M. <u>Les Logia de la vie dans l'Evangile selon</u>
    <u>Thomas</u>. NHS 34. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987.

Lightstone, J. N. <u>The Commerce of the Sacred: Mediation of</u>
    <u>the Divine Among the Jews in the Graeco-Roman Diaspora</u>.
    BJS 59. Chico: Scholars Press, 1984.

Lindemann, A. <u>Paulus im ältesten Christentum</u>. BHT 58.
    Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1979.

von Lips, H. <u>Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament</u>.
    WMANT 64. Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.

Lipscomb, W. L. & J. A. Sanders, "Wisdom at Qumran." In
    <u>Israelite Wisdom</u>. Eds. J. G. Gammie et al. Missoula:
    Scholars Press, 1978, 277-285.

Lohfink, G. <u>Jesus and Community: The Social Dimension of</u>
    <u>the Christian Faith</u>. Trans. J. P. Galvin. Philadel-
    phia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Longman, T. "Form Criticism, Recent Developments in Genre
    Theory, and the Evangelical." <u>WTJ</u> 47 (1985):46-67.

Luedemann, G. "Acts of the Apostles as a Historical
    Source." In <u>The Social World of Formative Christianity</u>
    <u>and Judaism</u>. Eds. J. Neusner et al. Philadelphia:
    Fortress Press, 1988, 109-125.

Luedemann, G. <u>Early Christianity According to the Tra-</u>
<u>ditions in Acts: A Commentary</u>. Trans. J. Bowden. Min-
neapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Luedemann, G. <u>Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity</u>.
Trans. M. E. Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress Press,
1989.

Lührmann, D. <u>Die Redaktion der Logienquelle</u>. WMANT 33.
Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

Lund, N. W. <u>Chiasmus in the New Testament</u>. Peabody: Hend-
rickson Publishers, 1992 rpr.

Lyons, G. <u>Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understan-</u>
<u>ding</u>. SBLDS 73. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Maccoby, H. <u>Paul and Hellenism</u>. London/Philadelphia: SCM
Press/TPI International, 1991.

MacDonald, D. R. <u>The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for</u>
<u>Paul in Story and Canon</u>. Philadelphia: The Westminster
Press, 1983.

Mack, B. L. "The Kingdom That Didn't Come: A Social History
of the Q Tradents." <u>SBLSP</u> 27 (1988):608-635.

Mack, B. L. "Lord of the Logia: Savior or Sage?" In <u>Gospel</u>
<u>Origins and Christian Beginnings</u>. Eds. J. E. Goehring
et al. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1990, 3-18.

Mack, B. L. <u>The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian</u>
<u>Origins</u>. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1993.

Mack, B. L. <u>A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian</u>
<u>Origins</u>. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Mack, B. L. <u>Rhetoric and the New Testament</u>. Minneapolis:
Fortress Press, 1990.

Mack, B. L. & V. K. Robbins. <u>Patterns of Persuasion in the</u>
<u>Gospels</u>. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1989.

MacMullen, R. <u>Paganism in the Roman Empire</u>. New Haven:
Yale University Press, 1981.

MacRae. G. W. "Apocalyptic Eschatology in Gnosticism." In
<u>Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World</u>. Proceedings
of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism;
Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hellholm.
Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 317-325.

Malherbe, A. J. Social Aspects of Early Christianity. 2nd
    Ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Malina, B. J. Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology:
    Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation. Louis-
    ville: John Knox Press, 1986.

Malina, B. J. "Jewish Christianity or Christian Judaism:
    Toward a Hypothetical Definition." JSJ 7 (1976):46-57.

Malina, B. J. The New Testament World: Insights from
    Cultural Anthropology. Louisville: John Knox Press,
    1981.

Marcus, J. The Way of the Lord. Louisville: Westminster/
    John Knox Press, 1992.

Marshall, I. H. "Is Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian
    Theology?" In Tradition and Interpretation in the New
    Testament. Eds. G. F. Hawthorne & O. Betz. Grand
    Rapids/Tübingen: Wm. B. Eerdmans/J. C. B. Mohr, 1987,
    33-42.

Martin, J. D. "Ben Sira - A Child of His Time." In A Word
    in Season. JSOTSup 42. Eds. J. D. Martin & P. R.
    Davies. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986, 141-161.

Martin, T. M. "The Present Indicative in the Eschatological
    Statements of 1 Pet 1:6, 8." JBL 111 (1992):307-312.

Martyn, J. L. History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel.
    Rev. Ed. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979.

Mattill, A. J. Luke and the Last Things. Dillsboro: Wes-
    tern North Carolina Press, 1979.

Mattill, A. J. "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Recon-
    sidered." In Apostolic History and the Gospel. Eds.
    W. W. Gasque & R. P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Wm. B.
    Eerdmans, 1970, 108-122.

Mazzaferri, F. D. The Genre of the Book of Revelation from
    a Source-Critical Perspective. BZNW. Berlin: W. de
    Gruyter, 1989.

McDonald, J. I. H. Kerygma and Didache: The Articulation
    and Structure of the Earliest Christian Message.
    SNTSMS 37. Cambridge University Press, 1980.

McKelvey, R. J. The New Temple: The Church in the New
    Testament. London: Oxford University Press, 1969.

McKnight, S.   A Light Among the Gentiles: Jewish Missionary
    Activity in the Second Temple Period.   Minneapolis:
    Fortress Press, 1991.

Mealand, D. L.   Poverty and Expectation in the Gospels.
    London: SPCK, 1980.

Meier, J. P.   A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical
    Jesus.   New York: Doubleday, 1991.

Melcher, S.   "Douglas and the Dead Sea: An Anthropological
    Reading of the Doctrine of the Two Spirits."   Presen-
    tation given at SBL Seminar.   Kansas City.   November,
    1991.

Mendals, D.   The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism.   ABRL.
    New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Meyer, P. D.   "The Community of Q."   Ph. D. diss., Univer-
    sity of Iowa, 1967.

Meyers, E. M.   "The Cultural Setting of Galilee: The Case of
    Regionalism and Early Judaism."   ANRW II 19.1, 686-702.

Meyers, E. M. & J. F. Strange.   Archaeology, the Rabbis, and
    Early Christianity.   Nashville: Abingdon, 1981.

Michaels, J. R.   "Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Letters:
    I Peter, Revelation, and 2 Baruch 78-87."   SBLSP 26
    (1987):268-275.

Mirecki, P. A.   "The Antithetic Saying in Mark 16:16: Formal
    and Redactional Features."   In The Future of Early
    Christianity.   Ed. B. A. Pearson.   Minneapolis: For-
    tress Press, 1991, 229-241.

Mitchell, M.   Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation.
    Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Moessner, D. P.   Lord of the Banquet.   Minneapolis: Fortress
    Press, 1989.

Moxnes, M.   Theology in Conflict.   NovTSup 53.   Leiden: E.
    J. Brill, 1980.

Münchow, C.   Ethik und Eschatologie: Ein Beitrag zum Ver-
    ständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik mit einem Aus-
    blick auf das Neue Testament.   Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
    Ruprecht, 1981.

Munck, J. "Primitive Jewish Christianity and Later Jewish Christianity: Continuation or Rupture?" In _Aspects Du Judéo-Christianisme_. Colloque de Strasbourg 23-25 Avril 1964. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, 77-93.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. "Community, Rule of the (1QS)." _ABD_. Vol. 1, 1110-1112.

Murray, R. "Defining Judaeo-Christianity." _HeyJ_ 15 (1974):303-10.

Murray, R. "'Disaffected Judaism' and Early Christianity: Some Predisposing Factors." In _"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity_. Eds. J. Neusner & E.S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985, 261-281.

Murray, R. "Jews, Hebrews and Christians: Some Needed Distinctions." _NovT_ 24 (1982):194-208.

Neirynck, F. "Recent Developments in the Study of Q." In _Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus - The Sayings of Jesus_. Ed. J. Delobel. Leuven University Press, 1982, 29-75.

Neumann, J. _The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis_. SBLDS 120. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Neusner, J. "The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism." _ANRW_ 2.19/2, 3-42.

Neusner, J. _From Politics to Piety_. 2nd. Ed. New York: KTAV, 1979.

Neusner, J., et al., eds. _Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era_. Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Newsom, C. "Apocalyptic and the Discourse of the Qumran Community." _JNES_ 49 (1990):135-144.

Newsom, C. "Knowing and Doing: The Social Symbolics of Knowledge at Qumran." _Semeia_ 59 (1992):139-153.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "The Apocalyptic Message of I Enoch 92-105." _CBQ_ 39 (1977):309-328.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. _Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism_. HTS 26. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity." In "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others" in Late Antiquity. Eds. J. Neusner & E. S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985, 73-91.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in I Enoch 92-105 and the Gospel According to Luke." NTS 25 (1979):324-344.

Nickelsburg, G. W. E. "Social Aspects of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypticism." In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 641-654.

Niebuhr, K.-W. Gesetz und Paränese: Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur. WUNT 2/9. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987.

Norden, E. Agnostos Theos. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956 rpr.

Oakman, D. E. Jesus and the Economic Questions of his Day. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986.

O'Brien, P. T. Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul. NovTSup 49. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.

Overman, J. A. Matthew's Gospel and Formative Judaism: The Social World of the Matthean Community. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Overman, J. A. "Who Were the First Urban Christians? Urbanization in Galilee in the First Century." SBLSP 27 (1988):160-168.

Painter, J. Theology as Hermeneutics: Rudolf Bultmann's Interpretation of the History of Jesus. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1987.

Parsons, M. C. "Reading a Beginning/Beginning a Reading: Tracing Literary Theory on Narrative Openings." Semeia 52 (1990):11-31.

Paterson, S. The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1993.

Patte, D. Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine. SBLDS 22. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.

Perdue, L. G. "The Death of the Sage and Moral Exhortation: From Ancient Near Eastern Instructions to Graeco-Roman Paraenesis." <u>Semeia</u> 50 (1990):81-109.

Perdue L. G. "The Social Character of Paraenesis and Paraenetic Literature." <u>Semeia</u> 50 (1990):5-39.

Pervo, R. I. "Must Luke and Acts Belong to the Same Genre?" <u>SBLSP</u> 28 (1989):309-316.

Pervo, R. I. <u>Profit With Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles</u>. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.

Piper, R. <u>Wisdom in the Q Tradition: The Aphoristic Teachings of Jesus</u>. SNTSMS 61. Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Pleins, J. D. "Poverty, Poor." <u>ABD</u>. Vol. 5, 402-414.

du Plessis, P. J. <u>TELEIOS: The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament</u>. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1959.

Pouilly, J. <u>La Regle de la Communauté de Qumrân</u>. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1976.

Pratscher, W. <u>Der Herrenbruder Jakobus und die Jakobustradition</u>. FRLANT 139. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.

Praeder, S. "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel." <u>SBLSP</u> 20 (1981):269-292.

Pratscher, W. "Der Herrenbruder Jakobus und sein Kreis." <u>EvT</u> 47 (1987):228-244.

Priest, J. "A Note on the Messianic Banquet." In <u>The Messiah</u>. Ed. J. H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992, 222-238.

Pritz, R. A. <u>Nazarene Jewish Christianity: From the End of the New Testament Period Until Its Disappearance in the Fourth Century</u>. Jerusalem: Magnes Press/Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988.

Quispel, G. "The Discussion of Judaic Christianity." <u>VC</u> 22 (1968):81-93.

von Rad, G. <u>Wisdom in Israel</u>. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

Reese, J. M. *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences*. AB 41. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971.

Reumann, J. *Righteousness in the New Testament*. New York/ Philadelphia: Paulist Press/Fortress Press, 1982.

Reynolds, J. & R. F. Tannenbaum. *Jews and Godfearers at Aphrodisias*. CPSSV. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1987.

Richardson, P. & P. Gooch. "Logia of Jesus in 1 Corinthians." In *Gospel Perspectives Volume 5: Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels*. Ed. D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 39-62.

Riches, J. K. "Apocalyptic - Strangely Relevant." In *Templum Amicitiae*. JSNTSup 48. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991, 237-263.

Riegel, S. K. "Jewish Christianity: Definitions and Terminology." *NTS* 24 (1977/78):410-415.

Riesenfeld, H. "Vom Schätzesammeln und Sorgen - Ein Thema Urchristlichen Paränese." In *Neotestamentica et Patristica*. NovTSup 6. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962, 47-58.

Riesner, R. *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. WUNT 2/7. 2nd Ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1984.

Riesner, R. "Jesus as Preacher and Teacher." In *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. JSNTSup 64. Ed. H. Wansbrough. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991, 185-210.

Robinson, J. A. T. *Jesus and His Coming*. London: SCM Press, 1957.

Robinson, J. A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. London: SCM Press, 1975.

Robinson, J. M. "On Bridging the Gulf from Q to the Gospel of Thomas (or Vice Versa)." In *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*. Eds. C. W. Hedrick & R. Hodgson. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986, 127-175.

Robinson, J. M. "Early Collections of Jesus' Sayings." In *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus - The Sayings of Jesus*. Ed. J. Delobel. Leuven University Press, 1982, 389-394.

Robinson, J. M. New Quest for the Historical Jesus and Other Essays. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.

Robinson, J. M. "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew via Jesus." In The Future of Early Christianity. Ed. B. A. Pearson. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991, 173-194.

Robinson, J. M. & H. Koester. Trajectories through Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Robinson, T. A. The Bauer Thesis Examined: The Geography of Heresy in the Early Church. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.

Roetzel, C. J. Judgement and the Community. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.

Rohrbaugh, R. L. "The Pre-industrial City in Luke-Acts: Urban Social Relations." In The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation. Ed. J. H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991, 125-149.

Rowland, C. The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity. London: SPCK, 1982.

Russell, D. S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Saldarini, A. J. "The Gospel of Matthew and Jewish-Christian Conflict in the Galilee." In The Galilee in Late Antiquity. Ed. L. I. Levine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1992, 23-38.

Sanders, E. P. "The Genre of Palestinian Jewish Apocalypses." In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World. Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 447-459.

Sanders, E. P. Jesus and Judaism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

Sanders, E. P. Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah. London/Philadelphia: SCM/TPI International, 1990.

Sanders, E. P. Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE-66 CE. London/Philadelphia: SCM/TPI International, 1992.

Sanders, E. P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

Sanders, J. A.   "Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul, and the Old Testament."   Rpr. in _Paul and the Scriptures of Israel_.   JSNTSup 83/SSEJC 1.   Eds. C. A. Evans & J. A. Sanders.   Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993, 98-117.

Sanders, J. A.   _Suffering as Divine Discipline in the Old Testament and Post-Biblical Judaism_.   Rochester: Colgate Rochester Divinity School, 1955.

Sanders, J. T.   _Ethics in the New Testament_.   London: SCM Press, 1986.

Sandmel, S.   "Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity: The Question of the Comfortable Theory."   _HUCA_ 50 (1979):137-148.

Sandmel, S.   _Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature_.   Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1956.

Sänger, D.   "Jüdische-hellenistische Missionsliteratur und die Weisheit."   _Kairos_ 23 (1981):231-243.

Sato, M.   _Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q_.   WUNT 2/29.   Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988.

Schaeffer, S. E.   "The Gospel of Peter, the Canonical Gospels, and Oral Tradition."   Ph. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1991.

Schaeffer, S. E.   "The Guard at the Tomb (Gos. Pet. 8:28-11:49 and Matt. 27:62-66; 28:2-4, 11-16): A Case of Intertextuality?"   _SBLSP_ 30 (1991):499-507.

Schiffman, L. H.   _The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls_.   SBLMS 49.   Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Schimanowski, G.   _Weisheit und Messias: Die jüdischen Voraussetzungen der urchristlichen Präexistenzchristologie_.   WUNT 2/17.   Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.

Schmidt, K. L.   "_diaspora_."   _TDNT_.   Vol. 2, 98-104.

Schmidt, T. E.   _Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels_.   JSNTSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

Schmithals, W.   _Paul and James_.   SBT 46.   London: SCM, 1965.

Schnabel, E. J. <u>Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics</u>. WUNT 2/16. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.

Schoeps, H. J. <u>Jewish Christianity: Functional Disputes in the Early Church</u>. Trans. D. R. A. Hare. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1969.

Schoeps, H. J. <u>Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums</u>. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1949.

Schrage, W. <u>The Ethics of the New Testament</u>. Trans. D. E. Green. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Schürer, E. <u>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ</u>. 4 Vols. Rev. & Ed. G. Vermes et al. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973, 1979, 1986, 1987.

Schwartz, D. <u>Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity</u>. WUNT 2/60. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992.

Schweitzer, A. <u>The Quest for the Historical Jesus</u>. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., 1968 rpr.

Seeley, D. "Was Jesus like a Philosopher? The Evidence of Martyrological and Wisdom Motifs in Q, Pre-Pauline Traditions, and Mark." <u>SBLSP</u> 28 (1989):540-549.

Seitz, O. J. F. "Two Spirits in Man: An Essay in Biblical Exegesis." <u>NTS</u> 6 (1959):82-95.

Sevenster, J. N. <u>Do You Know Greek?</u>. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Sieber, J. "The Gospel of Thomas and the New Testament." In <u>Gospel Origins and Christian Beginnings</u>. Eds. J. E. Goehring et al. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1990, 64-73.

Siker, J. S. <u>Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy</u>. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.

Silberman, L. H. "The Human Deed in a Time of Despair: The Ethics of Apocalyptic." In <u>Essays in Old Testament Ethics</u>. Ed. J. L. Crenshaw & J. T. Willis. New York: KTAV, 1974, 193-200.

Simon, M. "Problémes du Judéo-Christianisme." In <u>Aspects Du Judéo-Christianisme</u>. Colloque de Strasbourg 23-25 Avril 1964. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, 1-17.

Simon, M. "Réflexions sur le Judéo-Christianisme." In
     Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults; Part
     II: Early Christianity. Ed. J. Neusner. Leiden: E. J.
     Brill, 1975, 53-76.

Simon, M. Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations Between
     Christianity and Jews in the Roman Empire (AD 135-425).
     Trans. H. McKeating. London: Oxford University Press,
     1986).

Smith, D. E. "Narrative Beginnings in Ancient Literature
     and Theory." Semeia 52 (1990)1-9.

Smith, J. Z. Drudgery Divine. Chicago: The University of
     Chicago Press, 1990.

Smith, J. Z. "What a Difference a Difference Makes." In
     "To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews,
     "Others" in Late Antiquity. Eds. J. Neusner & E. S.
     Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985, 3-48.

Smith, J.Z. "Wisdom and Apocalyptic." In Religious Syn-
     cretism in Antiquity. Ed. B. A. Pearson. Missoula:
     Scholars Press, 1975, 131-156.

Smith, M. "On the History of Apokalupto and Apokalupsis."
     In Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World. Pro-
     ceedings of the International Colloquium on Apoca-
     lypticism; Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979. Ed. D. Hell-
     holm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1983, 9-20.

Snodgrass, K. R. "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah
     40:1-5 and Their Adaption in the New Testament." JSNT
     8 (1980):24-45.

Stegner, W. R. Narrative Theology in Early Jewish Chris-
     tianity. Louisville: Westminster/John Know Press,
     1989.

Sterling, G. E. "Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography."
     SBLSP 28 (1989):326-342.

Stone, M. E. "Apocalyptic Literature." In Jewish Writings
     of the Second Temple Period. CRINT II/2. Ed. M. E.
     Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress Press,
     1984, 383-441.

Stone, M. E. "Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic
     Literature." In Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God.
     Eds. F. M. Cross et al. Garden City: Doubleday & Co.,
     1976, 414-452.

Stowers, S. K. Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity.
     Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1986.

Stowers, S. K. "Social Typification and the Classification
     of Ancient Letters." In The Social World of Formative
     Christianity and Judaism. Eds. J. Neusner et al.
     Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987, 78-90.

Strecker, G. "On the Problem of Jewish Christianity."
     Trans. G. Krodel. In Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest
     Christianity. Eds. R. Kraft & G. Krodel.
     Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971, 241-285.

Strobel, A. Untersuchungen zum Eschatologischen Verzöge-
     rungsproblem. NovTSup 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

Suggs, M. J. Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's
     Gospel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Tashjian, J. S. "The Social Setting of the Q Mission: Three
     Dissertations." SBLSP 27 (1988):636-644.

Taylor, N. H. "The Composition and Chronology of Second
     Corinthians." JSNT 44 (1991):67-87.

Theissen, G. The Gospels in Context: Social and Political
     History in the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. L. M.
     Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.

Theissen, G. Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity.
     Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Theissen, G. "We Have Left Everything...(Mark 10:28):
     Discipleship and Social Uprooting in the Jewish-
     Palestinian Society of the First Century." Rpr. in
     Social Reality and the Early Christians. Trans. M.
     Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992, 60-93.

Theron, S. M. "Motivation of Paraenesis in 'The Testaments
     of the Twelve Patriarchs'." Neotestamentica 12
     (1981):133-150.

Thompson, M. Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching
     of Jesus in Romans 12.1-15.13. JSNTSup 59. Sheffield:
     JSOT Press, 1991.

Thyen, H. Der Stil der judisch-hellenistischen Homile.
     Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935.

Tobin, T. H. "4Q185 and Jewish Wisdom Literature." In Of
     Scribes and Scrolls. Eds. H. W. Attridge et al.
     Lanham: University Press of America, 1990, 145-152.

Tomson, P. J. <u>Paul and the Jewish Law</u>. CRINT III.1.
    Assen/Minneapolis: Van Gorcum/Fortress Press, 1990.

Tournay, R. J. <u>Seeing and Hearing God with the Psalms</u>.
    JSOTSup 118. Trans. J. E. Crowley. Sheffield: JSOT
    Press, 1991.

Treat, J. C. "The Two Manuscript Witnesses to the Gospel of
    Peter." <u>SBLSP</u> 29 (1990):391-399.

Trilling, W. "Zur Entstehung des Zwölferkreises: Eine
    geschichtskritische Überlegung." In <u>Die Kirche des
    Anfangs</u>. Eds. R. Schnackenburg et al. Freiburg:
    Herder, 1978, 201-222.

Tuckett, C. M. "A Cynic Q?" <u>Biblica</u> 70 (1989):349-376.

Tuckett, C. M. "Q (Gospel Source)." <u>ABD</u>. Vol. 5, 567-572.

Turner, H. E. W. "The Gospel of Thomas: Its History, Trans-
    mission, and Sources." In <u>Thomas and the Evangelists</u>.
    SBT 35. Naperville: Alec R. Allenson, 1962.

Tuttle, G. A. "The Sermon on the Mount: Its Wisdom
    Affinities and Their Relation to its Structure." <u>JETS</u>
    20 (1977):213-230.

Vaage, L. E. "The Ethos and Ethics of an Itinerant Intel-
    ligence." Ph. D. diss., Claremont Graduate School,
    1987.

Vaage, L. E. "The Woes in Q (and Matthew and Luke):
    Deciphering the Rhetoric of Criticism." <u>SBLSP</u> 27
    (1988):582-607.

Vaage, L. E. & J. S. Kloppenborg. "Early Christianity, Q
    and Jesus: The Sayings Gospel and Method in the Study
    of Christian Origins." <u>Semeia</u> 55 (1991):1-14.

Vanderkam, J. C. "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of
    Apocalyptic Thought." In <u>A Word in Season</u>. JSOTSup
    42. Eds. J. D. Martin & P. R. Davies. Sheffield: JSOT
    Press, 1986, 263-283.

Verner, D. C. <u>The Household of God: The Social World of the
    Pastoral Epistles</u>. SBLDS 71. Chico: Scholars Press,
    1983.

Vöglte, A. "Der 'eschatologische' Bezug der Wir-Bitten des
    Vaterunser." In <u>Jesus und Paulus</u>. Eds. E. E. Ellis &
    Erich Gräßer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975,
    344-362.

Volz, P. _Jüdische Eschatologie_. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1903.

van Voorst, R.E. _The Ascents of James: History and Theology of a Jewish-Christian Community_. SBLDS 112. Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1989.

Wall, R. B. "Community." _ABD_. Vol. 1, 1103-1110.

Webb, R. L. "'Apocalyptic': Observations on a Slippery Term." _JNES_ 49 (1990):115-126.

Webb, R. L. _John the Baptizer and Prophet_. JSNTSup 62. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Webber, M. I. "'Iakobos ho Dikaios: Origins, Literary Expression and Development of Traditions about the Brother of the Lord in Early Christianity." Ph. D. diss., Fuller Theological Seminary, School of Theology, 1985.

Weinfeld, M. _Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School_. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992 rpr.

Welch, J. W. _Chiasmus in Antiquity_. Hildesheim: Gerstenberg Verlag, 1981.

Wengst, K. _Humility: Solidarity of the Humiliated_. Trans. J. Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Wenham, D. "Paul's Use of the Jesus Tradition: Three Samples." In _Gospel Perspectives Volume 5: Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels_. Ed. D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985, 7-37.

Westermann, C. _Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech_. Trans. H. C. White. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991 rpr.

Westermann, C. _Prophetic Oracles of Salvation in the Old Testament_. Trans. K. Crim. Louisville: Westminster/ John Knox Press, 1991 rpr.

Whedbee, J. W. _Isaiah and Wisdom_. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.

White, J. L. _The Body of the Greek Letter_. SBLDS 2. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972.

White, J. L. _The Form and Structure of the Official Petition_. SBLDS 5. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1972.

White, J. L. Light from Ancient Letters. Philadelphia:
    Fortress Press, 1986.

White, J. L. "New Testament Epistolary Literature in the
    Framework of Ancient Epistolography." ANRW 2.25/2,
    1730-1756.

Wilson, R. Mcl. Studies in the Gospel of Thomas. London:
    A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1969.

Wilson, R. R. "From Prophecy to Apocalyptic: Reflections on
    the Shape of Israelite Religion." Semeia 21 (1981):79-
    95.

Wilson, R. R. "Problems of Describing and Defining Apoca-
    lyptic Discourse." Semeia 21 (1981):133-136.

Winton, A. P. The Proverbs of Jesus: Issues of History and
    Rhetoric. JSNTSup 35. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Wischinitzer, R. The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of
    the Dura Synagogue. Chicago: The University of Chicago
    Press, 1948.

Wise, M. O. "The Eschatological Vision of the Temple
    Scroll." JNES 49 (1990):155-172.

Witherington, B. Jesus, Paul and the End of the World.
    Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1992.

Wolverton, W. I. "The Double-Minded Man in the light of
    Essene Psychology." ATR 38 (1956):166-175.

Worrell, J.E. "Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls."
    Ph. D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968.

Wright, N. T. The New Testament and the People of God.
    Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

York, J. O. The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of
    Reversal in Luke. JSNTSup 46. Sheffield: JSOT Press,
    1991.

Zeller, D. Die weisheitliche Mahnsprüche bei den Synop-
    tikern. FzB 17. 2nd. Ed. Würzburg: Katholische
    Bibelwerk, 1983.

Zimmermann, A. F. Die urchristlichen Lehrer. WUNT 2/12.
    2nd. Ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988.

Zuntz, G. The Text of the Pauline Epistles. London: Oxford
    University Press, 1953.