

one (two persons, even among the twelve Apostles, bearing it). On the other hand, there is earlier attestation than Origen's to the existence of the Epistle, if, as some scholars think, use is made of it in the *Shepherd* of Hermas (*circ.* 150 A.D.).

Features in the internal evidence, which have been held to fortify the objections just considered are (*a*) the meagre references to Christ's Person and work (1. 1; 2. 1-7; 5. 7-9), and especially the absence of any allusion to the Resurrection (this being the more remarkable in view of the statement in *I Cor.* 15. 7); and (*b*) the good quality of the Greek, together with the inclusion, in 1. 17, of an hexameter line (this being thought to be beyond the range of St. James' literary culture). Moreover, the allusions to wealthy persons as present in Christian congregations and to the function of "healing," as discharged by Church officials, have been held to point to a date much later than St. James' lifetime. Certain parallels between *Jas.* and *Rom.* (collected in the footnotes to the Translation) leave the issue unaffected, since it is difficult to determine on which side the priority lies. If the Epistle is really the work of a later writer than St. James, various dates between 75 and 150 have been suggested for its origin.

Nevertheless, as regards the resemblances to *Rom.* there is nothing impossible in the supposition that St. James came across a copy of that Epistle, and desiring to counteract an antinomian perversion of the teaching enforced by St. Paul, wrote this Letter about 60 A.D., for *Romans* was composed about 56. And the contents of it furnish one persuasive argument for its authenticity in the occurrence of the many similarities in substance, though not in form, between the ethical admonitions in the Epistle and those of our Lord, preserved in the Sermon on the Mount: the former look like reminiscences of the latter before these had been collected and put on record, or, at least, before the writer of the Epistle had read a collection of them. The large number of these resemblances (cited in the footnotes) are best accounted for by the supposition that the author drew upon his memory of what he had heard from Jesus; and the conditions of the case are well met by assuming that the author was St. James, who, after becoming a Believer, would naturally treasure in his mind all that he could recall of the Christ's teaching. If the Letter proceeds from St. James, the small amount of Christology contained in it is, in some measure, explicable by the hypothesis that, in spite of the passages which seem to have in view certain Pauline statements, he was not really familiar with St. Paul's Epistles, for it was that Apostle who was the principal formulator of Christological doctrine. That there is no allusion to the imposition upon Gentiles of certain ceremonial restrictions out of regard for Jewish scruples (*Acts* 15. 20; 21. 25) is scarcely surprising, if the Letter was not addressed to Gentiles; and several features in it point to this. The writer was a Christian Jew (see 2. 19, 21), and his Epistle appears to be directed to Jews by race, who were resident outside Palestine, and who had become Christians, for the