


ESCHATOLOGICAL APPROVAL IN THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

Daniel Kong Eng



This dissertation is submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
to the University of Cambridge

Wolfson College, Cambridge

August 2020

Abstract

Eschatological Approval in the Epistle of James

Daniel K. Eng

University of Cambridge

This study makes a case that *eschatological approval* is a unifying motif in the epistle of James. While themes like *friendship*, *wisdom*, *obedience*, and *perfection* have been demonstrated in the epistle of James, none of these occurs in every major portion of the epistle. *Eschatological approval*, or a favourable verdict from God in the end, runs like a thread through every major section addressed to the hearers.

This study is developed in several stages. First, it establishes that James 1:2–27 serves as the introductory prologue of the epistle. Also, James 1 introduces major concepts of James, such as *the use of speech*, *the rich and poor*, and *coming judgment*.

Next, this study contends for the structure of James. We examine two uses of a grand *inclusio* in James: 1:12/5:11 and 2:12–13/4:11–12. Next, using the principle of cohesiveness, we segment James into sections. We provide a tentative outline for the structure of James based on these principles.

In the third stage, we examine *eschatological approval* in the text of the epistle. First, we make a case that the main idea is developed in the introductory prologue. The repeated themes in the beginning (Jas 1:2–3), middle (1:12), and end (1:25) of the prologue reveal a double-*inclusio* that points to 1:12 as a key saying that sums up the main idea: the author is concerned for his hearers to have a favourable verdict in divine eschatological judgment. After that, we examine James 2–5 to see how this main idea recurs throughout each section as delineated earlier. We will make the case that the motif of *eschatological approval* is the recurring motif that holds the epistle together. Even 4:13–5:6, which addresses those outside the epistle’s hearers, addresses *eschatological approval* by presenting the other side of eschatological judgment.

The study concludes by arguing that James 1:12 is the thesis statement for the epistle, presenting both the main idea of the prologue and the thread that runs through the body of James. This main idea is reprised at Jas 5:11, with its repetition of the concepts of *blessedness* and *perseverance*. Ultimately, the author of James directs his hearers so that they will be approved by God at eschatological judgment.

Declaration

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration.

It is not substantially the same as any that I have submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for a degree or diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution. I further state that no substantial part of my dissertation has already been submitted, or, is being concurrently submitted for any such degree, diploma or other qualification at the University of Cambridge or any other University or similar institution.

This thesis (including footnotes, but excluding prefatory material and bibliography) does not exceed the prescribed word limit of 80,000 words set by the Degree Committee of the Faculty of Divinity at the University of Cambridge.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Declaration.....	ii
Introduction.....	1
Part One: Studying a Unifying Motif in James.....	5
Chapter 1: Literature Review.....	6
1.1 Literature Review: Themes in James	6
1.2 Literature Review: Eschatological Approval	22
1.3 A Way Forward Based on the Literature Review	25
Chapter 2: Method	28
2.1 Macrostructures: Cohesion, Inclusions, and Situation	28
2.2 Microstructures: Discourse Devices and Greek Parallels	34
Part Two: The Structure of James.....	40
Chapter 3: James as a Letter	41
Chapter 4: James 1:1–27 as the Introductory Prologue in James	44
4.1 James 1:1–27 as a Distinct Unit	44
4.2 The Introductory Nature of James 1	57
4.3 Outline of James 1	68
Chapter 5: The Structure of James 2–5.....	70
5.1 The Use of <i>Inclusio</i> in James 2–5	70
5.2 James 2:1–13	74
5.3 James 2:14–26	76
5.4 James 3:1–12	77
5.5 James 3:13–18	78
5.6 James 4:1–10	81

5.7	James 4:11–12	84
5.8	Apostrophe: James 4:13–17 and 5:1–6	87
5.9	James 5:7–20	91
5.10	Outline of James 2–5	94
Part Three: Eschatological Approval in the Content of James		96
Chapter 6: Eschatological Approval in James 1		97
6.1	Eschatological Approval in James 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25	97
6.2	Eschatological Approval in the Rest of James 1	117
6.3	Summary	135
Chapter 7: Eschatological Approval in James 2–5		137
7.1	James 2:1–13	137
7.2	James 2:14–26	148
7.3	James 3:1–12	155
7.4	James 3:13–18	161
7.5	James 4:1–10	165
7.6	James 4:11–12	169
7.7	Apostrophe: James 4:13–5:6	172
7.8	James 5:7–20	177
7.9	James 1:12 as the Thesis Statement of the Epistle	187
7.10	Summary	190
Chapter 8: Conclusion.....		191
8.1	Eschatological Approval as a Unifying Motif in James.....	191
8.2	The Secondary Contributions of this Study	193
Bibliography		196
Appendix: The Role of Semitic Catchwords in Interpreting the Epistle of James		215

Introduction

After centuries of relative neglect, the epistle of James has emerged as an area of renewed investigation in New Testament studies.¹ One aspect of this emergence has been the questioning of the notion that James is a haphazard collection of wisdom sayings and commands.² The latter view was held by Martin Luther and explained in detail by Martin Dibelius. Luther lamented that the author of James “throws things together so chaotically.”³ Dibelius likewise asserts that James is atomistic and largely has “no continuity of thought whatsoever.”⁴ However, in the past several decades, scholars have argued that the epistle reflects more continuity than Luther and Dibelius claimed.

The increased attention given to James as a coherent document includes the examination of various *motifs* in the epistle. These studies, which we will discuss in Chapter 1, are direct or indirect responses to the view of Luther and Dibelius. They contend that there are common concepts that connect the parts of James. These recurring concepts can serve as evidence that James is not a haphazardly assembled document.

This study will take the examination of recurring motifs in James a step further by arguing for a *unifying motif* that connects the major sections of James. As we will see, previous studies have compellingly argued for the presence of various themes in James. However, as we will discuss, an evaluation of the sum of these studies points to a lacuna: a motif that runs like a thread through each of the major sections.

The present study will accomplish two tasks. First, it will contend that *eschatological approval* is a recurring theme in the content of James. To date, there has been no sustained examination of the references to a *favourable divine judgment* as a recurring motif in the epistle. Second, this study will make a case that *eschatological approval* is a *unifying motif* that runs like a thread through *all the major content*. In other words, concern for *eschatological approval* is present in every major subunit of James and holds the epistle together. It is simultaneously broad enough to encompass the entire epistle and narrow enough to accommodate the particularities in James.

¹ The bibliography of Dale Allison’s recent commentary, which he does not claim to be exhaustive, runs to 43 pages. Many of these sources are dated from the last several decades. See Allison, *James*, xi–xlix.

² See Guthrie and Taylor, “Structure,” 681–82.

³ Luther, “Prefaces to the New Testament,” 397.

⁴ Dibelius contends that paraenesis lacks continuity, which influences his view of James’ structure. See Dibelius, *James*, 5–6.

For this study, *eschatological approval* refers to a favourable verdict from God in *eschatological judgment*. The author of James writes so that his hearers will receive *approval in the end*, not just in the present. In what follows, we will examine the rationale behind examining *eschatological approval* as the unifying motif of James.

The author of James exhorts the hearers with a series of admonitions applied to various realms, from living in the community to exhibiting a faith that saves. The author is thus concerned with the audience's *praxis*. In content, James is decidedly hortatory, containing many commands for its hearers either to perform specific actions (1:22–25; 2:14–26; 3:13–18) or to refrain from specific actions (1:13–15, 20; 2:1–12; 4:1–5, 11–12, 13–16; 5:12).⁵ James also contains aphorisms, or timeless sayings, (e.g., 1:12; 2:13, 26; 3:18; 4:17), a formula found in wisdom literature.⁶ Recurring concepts in many of these commands and aphorisms have led to the monograph-length studies of motifs examined below.

The epistle also displays a consistent concern about *judgment*. Scattered throughout James are references to a *judge*, *judgment*, and *judging* (2:4, 6, 12–13; 4:11–12; 5:9, 12). The frequency and distribution of these references to judgment suggest the possibility that the author is concerned about the source of judgment.

The author of James, as this study will argue, communicates his concern that the hearers display behaviour leading to a favourable verdict. The phrase *eschatological approval* encompasses this concept in three ways. First, it refers to a *judgment* or *evaluation* of the hearers conducted by God. Second, this judgment is *eschatological*, or in the last age. Third, the phrase communicates the author's hope that the hearers *find favour with God* in this evaluation. The phrase *eschatological approval* acts as a shortened version of a *favourable verdict after eschatological divine judgment*, which we will argue is repeated in James. This hope for a favourable verdict is epitomised by Jas 1:12, which describes one who is *tested* and *approved* by God. We will examine this saying in detail later. This study makes a case that the concept of a favourable verdict is a *unifying motif* in James.

In this dissertation, the *approval* we will examine as a unifying motif in James is specifically *eschatological*. After all, not all evaluation done by God is eschatological. One considers the *testing* of Abraham in Genesis 22, or the approved (δόκιμος) worker in 2

⁵ William C. Varner demonstrates that James contains a higher ratio of imperatival forms to total words than any other NT book. He also points out that James has a “balanced distribution” of imperatives, unlike other NT books which separate their indicative sections from their hortatory sections. See Varner, *James*, 21–22.

⁶ See Varner, 25–26; Allison, *James*, 74–76; McCartney, *James*, 43–44.

Timothy 2:15, neither of which involve end-time evaluation. As we will contend in this study, the recurring motif that unifies James is divine judgment that is *eschatological*. We will discuss this specification further in response to the review of literature of different themes studied in James.

To be sure, this study does not claim that all divine judgment in James is eschatological. Some divine evaluation discussed in James could indeed be non-eschatological. However, we will be presenting a case that James is unified by the particular motif of eschatological divine judgment.

As stated above, *eschatological approval* is an end-time verdict that is *favourable*. In other words, this unifying motif in James is not generally about judgment from God in the eschaton, but a result that is *favourable*. As we will see, the sections directly addressing the primary hearers of James relate to a repeated concern that the hearers are *approved*.

One might object that the term *approval* does not occur in James outside of δόκιμος in 1:12. However, it is the contention of this thesis that 1:12 is central to James. First, it is central to the introduction of the epistle (here understood as 1:1–27), which previews the major concepts of the document. Second, based on our study of eschatological approval, we will suggest that Jas 1:12 can be viewed as a thesis statement for the entire document. Third, we will attempt to demonstrate that the *concept* of a favourable eschatological verdict occurs repeatedly in James, even if the term δόκιμος is not repeated.

With the focus of this thesis being on a prominent concept in the content of James, we will not attempt to re-create the occasion of the epistle. To be sure, there are indications about the historical situation of James that inform our interpretation; we will occasionally refer to them.⁷ However, it is not the aim of this study to construct a *Sitz im Leben* for the epistle's hearers.

This thesis will proceed in three parts. In Part One, which is composed of two chapters, we will formulate a method for studying a unifying motif in James. Chapter 1 will present a survey of relevant literature. First, I argue that the previously studied themes do not qualify as a unifying motif because they are either *too narrow* or *too broad*. Second, we will examine previous scholarship that has discussed concepts that are relevant to the idea of *eschatological approval*. Based on the literature review, we will present some goals for building our argument, such as an examination of the prologue and structure of the epistle. In

⁷ These include the *assembly* (συναγωγή, 2:2), the *oppression by the rich* (2:6; 5:4), and the *fight and quarrels* (4:1).

Chapter 2, this thesis will describe the method used for research, which occurs in two phases. First, we describe methods of discourse analysis including the cohesiveness of sections, the situational features of the epistle, and the use of *inclusio* as a framing device. Second, we describe how we will examine James at the *microstructure* level of sentences and words. The study of microstructures includes discourse devices and the use of Greek parallels.

In Part Two, this thesis will examine the macrostructures of James. First, in Chapter 3, we will approach the situational feature of James as an ancient Greek letter. Next, in Chapter 4, we will make a case for James 1 functioning as the prologue of James, previewing the most significant content of the epistle. In Chapter 5, we will focus on the structure of the body of James, examining cohesive ties to segment James 2–5 into distinct sections.

Part Three, which is the bulk of this study, will examine the theme of *eschatological approval* in each section of James. Using our structure from Part Two, we will determine the salient portions of the text through the principles of discourse analysis. Chapter 6 will discuss how James 1 introduces the theme for the rest of the epistle. After that, Chapter 7 will discuss James 2–5, which builds on the introductory nature of James 1. We will determine the salient portions of the body and closing of James, showing their relation to the theme of *eschatological approval*. Finally, Chapter 8 will summarise this study and review its contributions.

Part One: Studying a Unifying Motif in James

In this first part of the thesis, we will formulate an approach for studying *eschatological approval* in James. Building on previous scholarship (Chapter 1), we will determine a method for building the argument (Chapter 2).

Chapter 1: Literature Review

Through a survey of relevant literature, we will highlight the lacuna that this study attempts to fill. First, we will examine studies of themes in James, concluding that they successfully identify major themes in the epistle, but they leave a void. This void is a motif that *unifies* all of James while being specific to the epistle's content. The void exists because some studies do not address a motif that is unifying, while others attempt to argue for a unifying motif, but are unsuccessful.

Second, we will survey works that discuss elements of *eschatological approval*, from an *eschatological perspective* to *divine judgment*. Finally, we will reflect on the literature review, forming goals for the study of *eschatological approval*.

1.1 Literature Review: Themes in James

In this section, we examine studies of major themes in James. The epistle contains repeated concepts, each of which likely has an essential role. Some scholars have proposed that one of these concepts stands out as the central theme of James.

To be sure, the authors presented below do not make identical claims about a concept in James. The terminology they use to describe the role of the latter varies, including *fundamental issue*, *main theme*, *a tying thread*, *main purpose* and *unifying ethic*. Some may aim to show that all the content of James fits under a specific category, but others merely propose that one concept is *more prominent* than the others. We will highlight the goal, and where possible, the terminology of each study. While the proposals are not identical, they contain overlap: each proposes (1) a theme, and (2) that this theme is most significant for the epistle.

In what follows, we will examine proposals for a central theme in James. This section, which is not exhaustive, updates the work done in 1997 by Manabu Tsuji.⁸ As we will see, these authors often recognise that the theme they propose interacts with other themes in James.

Ultimately, we will commend these studies for successfully showing a major motif, or significant theme in James. However, whatever their intention, these studies leave a lacuna of a motif that is *unifying*. As we will contend, some of these studies intend to argue for a unifying motif, but are unsuccessful.

⁸ Tsuji, *Glaube*, 51–58.

We will make a case that the previously studied themes are not unifying, since they are either *too narrow* or *too broad*. The lack of a good fit for a unifying motif that is sufficiently broad without becoming too general provides the occasion for this study of *eschatological approval* in James.

1.1.1 Themes: Too Narrow

In this first set of studies, each successfully highlights a major theme in James. However, none of these themes fits the task of this thesis: a motif that is *unifying*. These themes that we will survey are too *narrow* in scope, for they do not account for significant portions of James. These proposals fall into four general categories: friendship, wisdom, obedience, and single-mindedness/perfection.

1.1.1.1 Friendship

Some scholars have proposed that *friendship* is the dominant theme in James. Luke Timothy Johnson, in his 1995 commentary, affirms the centrality of a *polar opposition* between “friendship with the world” and “friendship with God.” He sees that the tension between these two friendships “undergirds” the material in James.⁹ The two friendships, according to Johnson, present the hearer with a choice to make. This work builds on his 1985 essay, in which he shows that the dichotomy is not just central to Jas 3:13–4:6, but also occurs repeatedly in James (1:17–18, 21–22; 2:1–7, 8, 14–19; 3:6–8; 4:6–10, 13–16; 5:1–8, 15–18).¹⁰ Johnson ties *friendship* with *perfection* through Aristotle’s ethics,¹¹ appeals to Abraham’s example in 2:23,¹² and connects the concept of wisdom from above with friendship with God.¹³ Ultimately, Johnson sees choosing friendship with God as a *call to conversion*.¹⁴

Arriving at a conclusion similar to Johnson’s, Sherri Brown¹⁵ proposes that a “foundational moral code” runs through James to its hearers. Arguing that the entirety of James is a *chiasm*, Brown points out that its centre, or climax, is Jas 3:13–4:10, which

⁹ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 14.

¹⁰ Johnson, “Discipleship in James,” 174–77.

¹¹ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 178.

¹² Johnson, 244.

¹³ Johnson, 265.

¹⁴ Johnson, 269.

¹⁵ Brown, “Prophetic Endurance.”

contains the crux of the author's exhortation: the opposition between *friendship with God* and *friendship with the world*.¹⁶ She contends that the ending of James (5:7–20) draws together the main concepts of the epistle under “steadfastness as a community in friendship with God in the face of temptations and trials,” expressed through prayer and accountability.¹⁷ Brown writes that the parousia motivates the epistle's hearers to live intentionally until the *telos*, where they will receive salvation.¹⁸

1.1.1.2 Wisdom

Others have proposed that *wisdom* is the dominant concept in James. Rudolph Hoppe (1977) sees *wisdom* as the *guiding principle* of James, arguing that the epistle depends on the Old Testament wisdom tradition. Examining James 1:2–12, Hoppe contends that *wisdom* is needed to gain the eschatological promise. Hoppe ties the wisdom of God to *faith* in James 2 and contends that Abraham's example demonstrates how pairing faith and works leads to wisdom and perfection.¹⁹ Wisdom is so crucial, according to Hoppe, that it is the main subject of a treatise in 3:13–18.²⁰ He connects all the admonitions of James to this goal of the Christian attaining wisdom and perfection.²¹ As support, Hoppe shows the parallels between James and the Jesus tradition: perfection through the fulfilment of the law, perfection through suffering, and having wisdom from above.²² Ultimately, Hoppe concludes that *doing the law* established by Jesus leads to perfection and wisdom.²³

Robert W. Wall²⁴ states that *wisdom* is the “orienting concern of this book by which all else is understood.” He equates wisdom with the divine “word of truth” provided to guide the hearers through their trials.²⁵ Situating James in the canonical discussion of Jesus, Wall argues that the epistle offers a *way of wisdom* through which the marginalised hearers can prove their devotion to God.²⁶ Recognising a double opening (1:1–11, 12–21) and closing (5:7–12, 13–20), he segments the central part of the epistle into three essays introduced by

¹⁶ Brown, 531–32.

¹⁷ Brown, 533.

¹⁸ Brown, 533–40.

¹⁹ Hoppe, *Hintergrund*, 107–18.

²⁰ Hoppe, 146.

²¹ Hoppe, 40–43.

²² Hoppe, 119–44.

²³ Hoppe, 146–47.

²⁴ Wall, *Community*.

²⁵ Wall, 19.

²⁶ Wall, 18, 34.

the three parts of the exhortation in 1:19. These are (1) the wisdom of “quick to hear” in 1:22–2:26, (2) the wisdom of “slow to speak” in 3:1–18, and the wisdom of “slow to anger” in 4:1–5:6.²⁷

William Varner, in his recent commentary,²⁸ contends that the theme that “permeates the entire writing” of James is to *follow heavenly wisdom (from above) rather than earthly wisdom (from below)*. Like the proposals mentioned above regarding the correct *friendship* in James (Johnson, Brown), Varner’s model makes prominent a binary choice between opposed options. Varner argues that the author marks certain parts of the text for emphasis and provides cohesive ties that aid in segmenting the discourse. Varner contends that the author of James, through a rhetorical question, makes 3:13–18 stand out as “thematic peak” of the epistle. He goes on to state that the meta-theme of *choosing heavenly wisdom* runs through “every other paragraph” through the “two ways” formula commonly found in Old Testament wisdom literature.²⁹ Varner adds that 4:1–10 is the “hortatory peak” of James, also standing out with its initial rhetorical question. This section, according to Varner, calls for repentance and purification from being double-minded; it challenges the reader to be perfect.³⁰

1.1.1.3 Obedience

Others consider a concept related to *obedience* or *adherence* as the most dominating in James. Rudolf Obermüller, in a 1972 article discussing the anthropology and latent Christology in James in view of its community dynamics, sees the epistle’s prominence of following God’s example of *love*.³¹ This includes love for *God* shown in obedience, and love for *others* shown in caring for the needy.

Sophie Laws, in a conference paper first presented in 1973, based on the repetition of the epistle’s complementary ideas, proposes that the *imitation of God* is the major theme of James.³² First, Laws observes that the epistle repeatedly appeals to the *oneness*, or *unity* of God: he is wholehearted (1:5), only gives good gifts (1:17), has singleness in the law (2:11), and is one lawgiver and judge (4:12). Second, Laws shows how the picture of humankind in

²⁷ Wall, 75–247.

²⁸ Varner, *James*.

²⁹ Varner, 37. He also argues this in “The Main Theme and Structure of James.”

³⁰ Varner, *James*, 37. Varner also discusses these two “peaks” in *Book of James*, 28–35.

³¹ Obermüller, “Hermeneutische Themen,” 239, 243.

³² Laws, “Doctrinal Basis.”

James stands in contrast to God: *disunity* and *duplicity*. Man doubts (1:6), is double-minded and adulterous (1:8, 4:4, 8), discriminates (2:1–9), does not carry faith through into works (2:14–16, 22), and has duplicitous use of the tongue (3:9).³³ She points out that the two ideas are juxtaposed in James to urge its hearers to imitate God in integrity, generosity, consistency, and perfection.³⁴

Franz Mußner (1987)³⁵ declares that the primary purpose of James is the *realisation of the implanted word*, which first occurs in Jas 1:21.³⁶ He writes that the author is concerned with the dangers that threaten the church: doctrinal disputes, the spirit of the world, and faith that does not bear fruit. He recognises that eschatology plays an essential role in motivating the ethics of the epistle; it is not merely a collection of wise advice.³⁷

Timothy B. Cargal, in his 1993 book, after applying Greimasian structural semiotics to James,³⁸ proposes that the primary purpose of the epistle is to *restore its hearers* to the convictions of the author.³⁹ Segmenting James into sections based on inverted parallels (1:2–21; 1:22–2:26; 3:1–4:12; 4:11–5:20), he argues that each section presents “positive and negative actions” as examples for the hearers.⁴⁰ Cargal outlines the series of binary oppositions in an appendix, such as: doing the word and hearing the word only (1:22), not showing partiality and having distinctions (2:1, 4), or recognising God’s will and presuming about one’s future (4:13, 15–16).⁴¹

Matthias Konradt (1998)⁴² makes a case that *the Word* unifies the ethics of James. Like Mußner’s, Konradt’s argument builds on his assessment of the pivotal nature of Jas 1:18, not only for 1:13–25 but also for the entire epistle. He sees the “new birth” described in 1:18 as conversion, and that the “word of truth” governs Christian existence.⁴³ Tracing the line of soteriology through the letter until the eschaton, Konradt contends that the hortatory sections of James describe different aspects of Christian existence. Seen together, they present a unified message that calls converts to *obey* the word inside them. This obedient life

³³ Laws, 299–301.

³⁴ Laws, 304.

³⁵ Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*.

³⁶ Mußner, 22–23.

³⁷ Mußner calls this unifying concept a clear *Physiognomie*. 210–11.

³⁸ Cargal, *Restoring*.

³⁹ Cargal, 46, 53.

⁴⁰ Cargal, 39, 64.

⁴¹ Cargal, 229–32.

⁴² Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*.

⁴³ Konradt, 41–99.

will culminate in eschatological salvation. Thus, according to Konradt, James is centred in the Word.⁴⁴

In his 2011 commentary, Scot McKnight describes the ethics of James as *Torah observance in a messianic key*.⁴⁵ Recognising that *perfection*, or *holiness-wholeness*, is a “fruitful” theme around which to organise the teachings of James, he affirms the work of Elliott and Moo.⁴⁶ While McKnight openly questions whether there even needs to be a “central category,”⁴⁷ he points out that the commands of James can be organised under the category of Torah observance as Jesus taught for a messianic community. McKnight supports this by appealing to Jesus’ use of the Shema, the priority of relationship with God in James, and the eschatological and communal elements of the epistle’s ethics. He prefers this description for James rather than *perfection*, contending that it is “simpler, more historical, and more in line with the fundamental structures of James’s thought.”⁴⁸

1.1.1.4 Single-mindedness/Perfection

Others, building on the dichotomies in James (such as choosing between God and the world), propose that James is a call to *single-mindedness*, *wholeness*, or *perfection*. In other words, it is not just obedience and adherence in view, but an *undivided* or *wholehearted* commitment to God.

Josef Zmijewski (1980) posits that *perfection* unifies the themes in James. He sees the frequency of the term τέλειος and its cognates (1:4, 17, 25; 2:8, 22; 3:2) along with the related words (like ὅλος) and the opposite, δίψυχος. Observing how the author of James uses them with key nouns, he suggests that the τέλ- terms unite faith and works.⁴⁹ Looking at the opening exhortation of James (1:2–4) in connection with the major sections of the body, Zmijewski contends that the epistle warns its hearers against a separation (*Diastase*) of Christian faith and Christian works.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ Konradt, 310. While his view of the *Word* is like Mußner’s, Konradt focuses more on soteriology than the church.

⁴⁵ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 47.

⁴⁶ McKnight, 41–42.

⁴⁷ McKnight, 41.

⁴⁸ McKnight, 44–47.

⁴⁹ Zmijewski, “Christliche ‘Vollkommenheit,’” 52–55.

⁵⁰ Zmijewski, 77–78.

In *A Spirituality of Perfection* (1999), Patrick J. Hartin contends that *perfection* is the unifying theme of James, giving meaning to its other themes.⁵¹ Hartin defines *perfection* as a “call to integrity,” or consistency in deeds and words.⁵² Examining τέλειος in the LXX and related ideas in the Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls, he renders τέλειος as the *wholeness* of one’s ethics, expressing wholehearted dedication to the Lord and adherence to the Torah.⁵³ Hartin indicates that the call to perfection is evident in the epistle’s appeals to morality, from taming the tongue to controlling one’s anger. He arranges his discussion of perfection in James into four categories: (1) call to perfection through enduring trials (Jas 1:2–4; 5:7–11), (2) wisdom as the horizon for attaining perfection (1:5–8, 17; 3:13–18; 4:4), (3) perfection and the law (1:25; 2:8), and (4) faith perfected through works (2:22).⁵⁴ In his treatment of these passages, Hartin emphasises the central role of *wholehearted loyalty to God* and *obedience to the law* in the epistle.

Douglas J. Moo (2000) suggests that *spiritual wholeness* is the “central concern” of James. Considering the varied material in James, Moo acknowledges that any theme that can encompass all of it would need to be “quite broad.” Eschewing the term “theme,” Moo appeals to Jas 4:4–10, which he considers the “emotional climax” of James, to identify the central concern. After pointing out that this passage challenges the epistle’s hearers to choose between God and the world, he shows how the oppositions expressed throughout James demonstrate the same concern. The hearers are to give themselves wholly to the Lord.⁵⁵

Luke L. Cheung, in his 2003 monograph,⁵⁶ contends that the “primary concern” of the author of James is the *fulfilment of the law of freedom*,⁵⁷ *bringing perfection*. He contrasts this perfection with *doubleness*, which is “loving God halfheartedly and failing to keep his commandments.”⁵⁸ Cheung argues that the epistle calls for speech and action showing obedience to the law and wisdom from above, the framework provided by Jas 1:19–25; 2:8–12; 3:13–18; 4:11–12.⁵⁹

⁵¹ Hartin, *Spirituality*, 10.

⁵² Hartin, 15.

⁵³ Hartin, 167.

⁵⁴ Hartin, 57–92.

⁵⁵ Moo, *Letter of James*, 46.

⁵⁶ Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*.

⁵⁷ Cheung, along with Andrew B. Spurgeon, briefly designate a similar concept as the purpose of James in their recent commentary. See Cheung and Spurgeon, *James*, 6–7.

⁵⁸ Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 273.

⁵⁹ Cheung, 86–161.

Blomberg and Kamell, in their 2008 commentary, propose that *single-mindedness* is a unifying motif in James. Citing how the author calls his hearers to imitate God's unwavering character, they argue that the different commands in James, from speech-ethics to eschewing favouritism, are all expressions of single-minded devotion to God. The hearers are to "shun all duplicity or vacillation in their allegiance and obedience to Christ and emulate God's trustworthy consistency." They propose that this charge is expressed clearly by Jesus in Matt 6:24 and Luke 16:13: one cannot ultimately serve two masters.⁶⁰

Dan G. McCartney (2009) proposes that the "overall theme" of James is that *genuine faith in God must be evident in life*. Like Johnson, McCartney recognises the prominence of friendship, but he considers it a subset of genuine faith.⁶¹ McCartney posits that *genuine faith* occurs not only at the beginning and end, but throughout James, and it "drives the deep concern" of the letter.⁶² Faith is indispensable (Jas 1:6–8), expressed through patience (5:7–11), and saves (5:15).⁶³ It manifests through the correct use of speech, wealth ethics, and perseverance.⁶⁴ McCartney ties the repeated warnings against self-deception to genuine faith.

Matt Jackson-McCabe, in a 2014 article, presents a case that *endurance* in James is the topic that is *unifying*. Combining the calls for obedience and choosing between two opposed options, he contends that James is a "coherent appeal to endure temptation in humble reliance on a provident deity." He proposes that the author expresses this endurance in three areas: good deeds, control of speech, and gentle disposition.⁶⁵ Like Wall, he sees 1:19 as programmatic for the rest of James: being *slow to speak* (Jas 3:1–12), *quick to hear* (Jas 2), and *slow to anger* (Jas 3:13–4:10).⁶⁶ Choosing to follow the *logos* and not one's evil desires manifests itself in endurance in these three areas.

1.1.1.5 Evaluation, and a Proposed Solution

The publications above highlight prominent themes in James. They each compellingly show that a motif recurs in the epistle in different places. Thus, these studies are largely

⁶⁰ Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 261–63.

⁶¹ McCartney, *James*, 63.

⁶² McCartney, 56–57, 267–71.

⁶³ McCartney, 57.

⁶⁴ McCartney, 74–75.

⁶⁵ Jackson-McCabe, "Enduring Temptation," 164.

⁶⁶ Jackson-McCabe, 165–71.

successful at highlighting a significant theme in James and arguing for its recurrence in the text of the epistle.

However, a void emerges from a consideration of the sum of these studies. This present study seeks to fill this void: providing a set of arguments for a motif in James that is *unifying*. The themes highlighted above each end up being *too narrow* to be unifying. Tsuji correctly points out that many proposals, including those that uphold *faith and works*, *wisdom*, or *perfection*, do not successfully identify a unifying motif because none of these aspects occurs in all the sections of James.⁶⁷ For example, the term *friendship* or the concept of loyalty to God occurs in James 2:23 and 4:4, and *wisdom* or a related concept only occurs in 1:5 and 3:13–18. While each of the themes highlighted above is important to the epistle, it would help to see, as Tsuji proposes, how each of these motifs are interrelated.⁶⁸ Scholars like Johnson, Hoppe, Wall, and Hartin attempt to choose one concept that encompasses the rest of the motifs. However, these attempts end up being unconvincing because scholars often struggle to incorporate content from the epistle under that concept. For example, it is difficult to see how *friendship* corresponds to the section on the tongue (3:1–12) or the call to be patient for the parousia (5:7–11). It is also not apparent that *love* is connected with perseverance (1:2, 12, 25), submitting to God (4:6, 10), or refraining from oaths (5:12). Likewise, Hartin does not even offer a treatment of Jas 2:1–13 or 3:1–12 to connect these passages to *perfection*, which he contends is the unifying concept. Also, it is not apparent that *wisdom*, which Wall contends is connected to everything in James, is connected to quarrels (4:1–4),⁶⁹ the condemnation of the merchants (4:13–17),⁷⁰ or the wicked rich (5:1–6).

The repetition of other elements in James provides a clue studying of a unifying motif. The studies examined above focus on present praxis, but *eschatological content* is also distributed throughout James (1:9–11; 2:5, 12; 3:1; 4:10; 5:2–3, 7–12, 20). While some

⁶⁷ Tsuji, *Glaube*, 51–57.

⁶⁸ Tsuji, 58.

⁶⁹ Wall attempts to tie the *asking* for selfish reasons in 4:2–3 to the *asking* for wisdom in 1:5–8, claiming that the petitioner will not receive because of their “real” lack, for wisdom. See Wall, *Community*, 198. But this connection is not made in the passage, and the author already explains why the petitioner does not receive.

⁷⁰ So Tsuji, *Glaube*, 56 n43. Wall, who categorises this section with the wisdom of “slow to anger,” admits that the merchant does not express visible anger in this passage. He attempts to explain this away by appealing to an “inevitable progression” that leaves to violence in 5:1–6. See Wall, *Community*, 215. However, there is no mention of anger in either 4:13–17 or 5:1–6. The condemnation of the oppressive rich based is their greed and defrauding of their workers. Their *enjoyment of luxury* (5:5) does not indicate any anger.

mention eschatology, they do not tie it to their proposed concept of the unity of the epistle. For example, Mußner realises that the ethics of James are connected to eschatology,⁷¹ but does not include this in his discussion of the main theme of realization of the law, as conceived by him. Brown limits her discussion of eschatology to the closing content of James, and hardly acknowledges its prominence and frequent appearance elsewhere.⁷² Obermüller states that the author of James is eschatologically motivated,⁷³ but does not connect this with his proposal of the prominence of *love* in James. Hoppe recognises the importance of eschatological reward in James 1 but focuses on the importance of doing the law and attaining wisdom without addressing its final implications. Varner focuses on what he calls the “thematic peak” and “hortatory peak” (3:13–18 and 4:1–10, respectively), but he does not do justice to the eschatological content that runs through the document. Ultimately, while James contains a great deal of content regarding behaviour in this present age, proposals of a central theme should be broadened to account for the goal of this behaviour. With all the eschatological content of James in mind, for which we will argue later, a central or unifying motif for James should include some aspect of eschatology.

Another clue to approaching the study of a unifying motif comes in the prominence of *divine judgment* in James. The opening exhortation assures its hearers that trials serve to be a *test* (δοκίμιον, 1:3) of their faith, and the connected saying about receiving the crown of life in 1:12 specifies that one must be *approved* (δόκιμος). The opening chapter of James ends with two statements about *piety* (θρησκεία) that is valuable before God, rendering him to be the evaluator. Divine judgment is discussed in the epistle’s most explicit content about the eschaton, with the *judge standing by the door* (5:9) and the reference to condemnation for those who do not keep their word (5:12). Furthermore, distributed throughout the body of James are references to divine judgment (2:12–13; 3:1; 4:12). Thus, including the concept of divine judgment can account for more of the epistle’s content than the studies highlighted above do. With the thematic studies surveyed above not covering major portions of the epistle, a proposal for a unifying motif is more likely if it accounts for *divine judgment*.

⁷¹ Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 209–10.

⁷² Brown, “Prophetic Endurance,” 533–40.

⁷³ Obermüller, “Hermeneutische Themen,” 235.

1.1.2 Themes: Too Broad

Some scholars, seeing the prominence of evaluation and judgment in James, consider *testing* or a related concept to be its central theme. However, as we will discuss later, these proposals end up being *too broad*; a motif can be narrowed to include *eschatological divine judgment* and still encompass the document. In what follows, we will first survey proposals that *testing* or a similar idea is the dominant concept in James. After that, we will evaluate them at the end of this section.

1.1.2.1 Testing

C. E. B. Cranfield, in a two-part 1965 article,⁷⁴ proposes that James finds unity under the recurring motif of putting “the professions of Christians to the test.”⁷⁵ The “tests,” according to Cranfield, go through the central sections of James: (1) of the right hearing of the word of God (1:19–27), (2) of respect to persons (2:1–13),⁷⁶ (3) of true faith (2:14–26), and (4) of right speaking (3:1–12).⁷⁷

F. O. Francis, in his seminal 1970 article,⁷⁸ proposes that *testing* is the “fundamental issue” that underlies the main sections of James. Arguing that the opening chapter of James reflects the “double opening” commonly found in Hellenistic epistles, Francis recommends that Jas 1 has an “abc/abc” structure in the introductory chapter, corresponding to the components of *testing/steadfastness* (1:2–4, 12–18), *wisdom-words/reproaching* (1:5–8, 19–21), and *rich-poor/doers* (1:9–11, 22–25). He goes on to state that topics “b” and “c” appear in the body in reverse order, with “a”—*testing*, underlying the whole. Francis sees *testing* underlying the two main sections of the epistle introduced by 1:26–27, namely “faith and action as regards to the rich and poor” (2:1–26) and “angry passion of wisdom, words and position” (3:1–5:6).⁷⁹ He sees testing of *works* in the former section (epitomised by the account of Abraham), and testing of *emotion* in the latter (epitomised by Job).⁸⁰

In a 1978 article, Euan Fry proposes that *testing* and *patient endurance* “together make up the main theme of the book.”⁸¹ Taking the themes of James, he determines if each is

⁷⁴ Cranfield, “Message of James.”

⁷⁵ Cranfield, 186.

⁷⁶ Cranfield, 186–93.

⁷⁷ Cranfield, 338–45.

⁷⁸ Francis, “Form and Function.”

⁷⁹ Francis, 118.

⁸⁰ Francis, 119–20.

⁸¹ Fry, “Testing of Faith,” 430.

a primary or secondary focus in each section of the epistle. Plotting the themes on a graph, Fry asserts that the themes reveal a structure to the book, divided into three major sections: 1:2–18, 1:19–4:12, and 4:13–5:18. He shows that the repeated themes in the first and third significant sections reveal an A-B-A arrangement, with *testing* and *endurance* being the “principal themes.”⁸² Then, like Cranfield, he sees the rest of James as a development of these central themes. Fry sees the various paragraphs in the body of James as *tests* through which the hearers are to endure.⁸³

Like Fry, D. Edmond Hiebert (1978) combines two concepts and upholds their combination as central to James. Seeing the centrality of both *testing* and *faith-deeds*, he designates *tests of a living faith* as the “unifying theme” of James.⁸⁴ He argues that the author introduces and discusses this theme in 1:2–18, with the “key... hanging at the front door” (1:3) unlocking the structure of the epistle.⁸⁵ Like Cranfield, Hiebert asserts that the rest of the epistle presents a series of tests for the hearers of James. These tests are: (1) response to the word (1:19–27), (2) reaction to partiality (2:1–13), (3) production of works (2:14–26), (4) production of self-control (3:14–18), (4) reactions to worldliness (4:1–5:12), and (5) resort to prayer (5:13–18).⁸⁶ Ultimately, according to Hiebert, James urges Christian practice consistent with Christian profession.

Peter H. Davids, in his 1982 commentary on James, states that *suffering/testing* “underlies much of the epistle” and it is a “thread which ties the epistle together.”⁸⁷ Davids builds his view on Francis’ proposal of the double-opening and *testing* underlying James. While Davids admits that one can forget about the presence of this theme, he argues that this theme is prominent in the opening verses, lies behind the two sections of James 2 and the “defection” of 4:1–10, and occurs in the closing content in 5:7, 19–20.⁸⁸ Because of the connection between James 1 and the “thematic reprise” of 5:7–11, Davids contends that the author’s desired response to suffering is to *endure patiently*, not giving in to the evil impulse

⁸² Fry, 428–30.

⁸³ Fry, 432–35.

⁸⁴ Hiebert, “Unifying Theme,” 224.

⁸⁵ Hiebert, 231.

⁸⁶ Hiebert, 224–30.

⁸⁷ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 35.

⁸⁸ Davids, 35. Notably, McCartney (2009) agrees with Davids that *suffering* is prominent in James, but states that it is only a concern at the epistle’s beginning and end. Also, he declares that the concern with suffering is indirect; the author is primarily concerned about suffering in *faith*. See McCartney, *James*, 57.

to blame God. He links ὑπομονή in Jas 1 with μακροθυμῶ in Jas 5. Davids considers the exhortation to *endurance* in the opening and closing of James to be the “call of the book.” He goes on to argue that the “what and how” is explained between the opening and closing.⁸⁹ He even incorporates *testing* in his titles of specific sections, including 1:2–11, 12–27; 4:13–5:6.⁹⁰

Like Fry and Hiebert, Tsuji’s (1997)⁹¹ combines the concepts of tests and their criteria into one theme, arguing for *temptations through desire and obedience to God* as the motif that characterises James. He argues for a thematic *inclusio* encompassing James, with *tests* and *patience* bracketing the body. Tsuji aligns with Francis and Davids in stating that Jas 1 is a two-part introduction. He concludes that the idea of Jas 1 is *temptations of desire and obedience to God*.⁹² Then, after dividing up the body of James (2:1–5:6), Tsuji’s exegesis leads to his conclusion that the body of James focuses on the *opposition between the world and God*. He connects the introduction and the body through the *requirement of doing the word of the law*. Tsuji states that obedience to God strengthens someone against the way of the world.⁹³ Finally, Tsuji examines the closing exhortations of James (5:7–20), showing how the concepts of *blessing*, *perseverance*, and *patience* from the introduction are reiterated, and that the dominant theme presented in Jas 1 runs through the final part of the epistle.

Nicholas Ellis, in a 2015 monograph, investigates the concept of divine testing in James, concluding that James aims at depicting a *perfect, tested man* who endures in faithfulness to God, who is also *perfect and tested*.⁹⁴ Studying a breadth of texts including *Jubilees*, Ben Sira, Philo, Sirach, the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*, and the rabbinic tradition, Ellis determines that the tradition of rewritten Bible has the most affinity with the content regarding probation in James, centred on the blending of the Abraham and Job narratives.⁹⁵ With this hermeneutic in mind, Ellis concludes that God serves as the tested judge who

⁸⁹ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 38.

⁹⁰ This also occurs in some of the subsections of these passages. He calls 1:2–4 “Testing produces joy,” 1:12–18 “Testing produces blessedness,” 4:13–17 “The test of wealth,” and 5:1–6 “The test of the wealthy.” See Davids, 65, 79, 171, 174.

⁹¹ Tsuji, *Glaube*.

⁹² Tsuji, 59–72.

⁹³ Tsuji, 73–92.

⁹⁴ Ellis, *Hermeneutics*, 237.

⁹⁵ Ellis, 230–36.

examines the epistle’s readers for loyalty. The perfect man is unswervingly faithful despite “demonically inspired” indictments against God.⁹⁶

1.1.2.2 Evaluation

Previously, we noted that the motifs of *friendship*, *wisdom*, *obedience*, and *perfection* are each *too narrow* to be a theme in James that is unifying. The themes outlined in Section 1.1.2.1, which uphold *testing* or a similar concept as central, are *too broad*. In what follows, we will discuss how they can be specified to fit better as a unifying motif in James.

The concept of *testing*, as proposed by Francis and Davids, is by itself too broad; the general concept of *testing* can be more specific. As noted above, we will be examining the eschatological content of James as we look at the motif of *eschatological approval*. The eschatological view makes the *testing* in James more *particular*. Neither Francis nor Davids places significant emphasis on the *particular* testing that the author of James has in view. After all, *testing* in general is not necessarily eschatological, as we see in Abraham’s testing (Gen 22) and the temptation of Jesus. Also, the proposal of *testing* can be narrowed if one can show that it is *God* who consistently is the evaluator. As I will contend, the *goal* of the testing as presented in James is *specifically* from God in the end. As discussed above, the opening of James introduces the concept of eschatological divine judgment and re-iterates it in the closing content. Also, the epistle has references to eschatological judgment distributed through the text (2:12–13; 3:1; 4:12), specifying the type of testing that is in view. Francis does not link testing with divine *judgment*, leading him to admit that *testing* does not occur after the opening chapter.⁹⁷ Davids understates the prominence of eschatology in his discussion of the broad themes of the epistle. While he discusses the explicit eschatological content found in 5:7–11,⁹⁸ he fails to mention the other places in which eschatology plays a role: the inheritance for the poor in 2:5 and the judgment that plays a crucial role in the exhortatory sections of James at 2:12–13; 3:1; 4:11–12; 5:12. Perhaps not coincidentally, Davids fails to note how his proposed theme of *testing* plays a role in these sections of the epistle. In fact, Davids does not even discuss how his proposal of *testing* runs through larger units of James like 2:1–13 or all of Jas 3. While Davids does recognise James 5:7–11 as a

⁹⁶ Ellis, 237–39.

⁹⁷ Francis points out using other Greek letters that *a unifying motif* can exist in James without the repetition of the thematic word itself. See Francis, “Form and Function,” 118. We will discuss this phenomenon more below.

⁹⁸ See Davids’ section addressing eschatology in *Epistle of James*, 38–39.

thematic reprise, he does not address the fact that the terms for *testing* (πειρασμός, δοκίμιον, δόκιμος) found in 1:2–3 and 1:12, or even related concepts, are not found in 5:7–11. The content of 5:7–11, as we will see, focuses on hope in *eschatological* reckoning and judgment, not on any tests.⁹⁹

Those who link *testing* with a *criterion* to form the central theme of James, like Fry, Hiebert, and Tsuji, do some narrowing of this broad concept, but their proposals are still unconvincing. On the one hand, they attempt to fit all the admonitions under one criterion for judgment, the problem of which we have discussed above. For example, it is not clear how *patient endurance* encompasses all the commands; nor is it clear how *faith-deeds* is a broader category than friendship with God. Thus, their attempts at narrowing the broad concept of *testing* for a better fit in James ironically end up going too far: they end up being too narrow.

On the other hand, even the proposals which recognise a criterion for judgment are still *too broad*. After all, the acknowledgement of the concept of *testing* still raises the question, “to what end is testing conducted?” Again, the repeated concepts of eschatology and divine judgment provide clues that can help us determine a better fit for a unifying motif. While these authors are correct that *testing* is prominent in James, the concern can become more particular and still fit with the epistle’s content.

1.1.3 How the Literature Review on Themes Points to a Solution

All the themes proposed by the scholars above are undoubtedly important in the epistle of James. However, each does not qualify as the right fit as a unifying motif. They are either *too narrow* or *too broad*:

Too Narrow	Correct Fit	Too Broad
Friendship, wisdom, obedience, perfection	Includes more of the epistle than the themes that are too narrow. Recognises the prominence of testing and judgment, but narrows it to the specific concept of a favourable divine judgment in the eschaton	Testing

⁹⁹ As we will see, the strong connection between Jas 5:7–11 and the opening content of James is not found in *testing*, but in the association between *blessing* (μακάριος/μακαρίζω) and *perseverance* (ὑπομένω/ὑπομονή). Davids does not mention this connection found between 1:12 and 5:11, which can serve as evidence of a unifying motif tied to a favourable judgment.

Included in the epistle are references to all the concepts treated above: *friendship*, *wisdom*, *obedience*, and *perfection*. However, each one of these is too narrow to be unifying because it does not account for large portions of the epistle. By expanding the proposed theme, we can account for each major unit within James.

As hinted above, the repeated references to the eschaton provide a clue into finding a unifying motif that fits with all of James. By focusing on the end times and the consequences of the praxis of friendship, wisdom, obedience, and perfection, we can widen the scope of a proposed theme and attempt to avoid the pitfall of omitting large portions of the epistle.

The argument for a unifying motif in James to include eschatological divine judgment is supported by the notion that the themes surveyed end up being *criteria* for God's judgment. The scholars surveyed above often assert that the epistle teaches about an *evaluation according to the criterion or criteria* highlighted by the dominant theme. For example, Johnson states that those who choose friendship with the world will face judgment,¹⁰⁰ and Wall writes that those who refuse the advice of the trifold wisdom face God's judgment.¹⁰¹ Mußner indicates that the fulfilment of the law will set the standard in judgment.¹⁰² Therefore, the inclusion of divine judgment broadens the central theme to acknowledge (1) the repeated and prominent references to divine judgment and (2) that the themes highlighted above end up being criteria for divine judgment.

Furthermore, the recognition of divine judgment may solve the problem posed by Tsuji: it is difficult to see all the admonitions in James fitting under any of the concepts discussed above, whether these be *wisdom*, *friendship*, or *perfection*. It is often a stretch to squeeze concepts together under one of the terms, as we have discussed above. Ultimately, considering divine judgment as an umbrella under which its criteria of *wisdom*, *friendship*, and *perfection* (which are intertwined in James) fit, can solve this issue.

Also, recognising that *testing* as a main theme is too broad provides an occasion to narrow this concern to fit the particularities in James. The proposals that promote *testing* as the unifying motif do not give much attention to the specific concern that the epistle's hearers would receive a *favourable judgment*. While they recognise the content in the opening, the body, and the closing of James, they do not acknowledge that the author is *specifically* concerned that his hearers would have a *favourable judgment* based on these criteria. For

¹⁰⁰ Johnson, "Discipleship in James," 176.

¹⁰¹ Wall, *Community*, 249.

¹⁰² Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 126.

example, Tsuji's proposal of *temptations of desire through obedience* is broad enough to encompass the other criteria like perfection and wisdom. However, he does not account for its motivation and goal: a *favourable decision* (i.e. δόκιμος, 1:12) at eschatological judgment, along with *blessing* (1:12, 25; 5:11) and favourable status (2:5, 23; 3:18; 4:6–10).

Some scholars, who do not aim to present a unifying motif, recognise that a favourable decision is the motivation and goal of the admonitions in James. For example, Allison rightly acknowledges that *love of God* and the *imitatio dei* are motives for the exhortations in James and a key to the command is “the threat of eschatological punishment and the promise of eschatological reward.”¹⁰³ McKnight also recognises that “the themes of James are not simply advice,” but the author intends to “draw his readers into the world that leads to life and away from the world that leads to death.”¹⁰⁴ With these affirmations in view, a unifying motif can be sufficiently narrowed by acknowledging that the author desires the hearers to have *approval* in the eschatological judgment. In other words, I will contend that the author's goal is that the hearers receive a favourable eschatological verdict from God.

1.2 Literature Review: Eschatological Approval

The survey of literature discussing a unifying motif or central theme in James leaves a lacuna for a study of *eschatological approval*. As I will contend, this theme fits best as a unifying motif of the epistle.

As stated above, *eschatological approval* conveys a *favourable verdict as a result of divine judgment*. While some scholars acknowledge that elements of this theme appear in different places of the epistle, a sustained study of *eschatological approval* as the unifying motif in James does not exist. In what follows, we will offer a brief review of literature as it pertains to elements of *eschatological approval*.

An essential aspect of the unifying motif in this study is that it is *eschatological*. Scholars generally recognise the influence of eschatology on the entire epistle. This consensus speaks against the minority view epitomised by Wiard Popkes. He argues that there is very little eschatological content in James; it only appears in the frame of the epistle (1:3–12; 5:7–12).¹⁰⁵ Responding to Popkes, Burchard recognises the eschatological

¹⁰³ Allison, *James*, 94.

¹⁰⁴ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 41.

¹⁰⁵ Popkes, *Adressaten, Situation und Form des Jakobusbriefes*, 45.

perspective found in 2:5 and 2:13.¹⁰⁶ As we will argue below, eschatology, especially divine judgment in the end, plays a major role in the body of the epistle.

Some assert that the author of James is not teaching *about* the eschaton but giving exhortation with an *eschatological perspective*. These scholars come closer to recognising the centrality of an eschatological view in James, but they still miss the central role of eschatology. Davids states that the epistle's content is influenced by eschatology without it giving detailed instruction about the eschaton: "eschatology is not the burden of the book; it is the context of the book." He asserts that one can only understand the *joy* conveyed in 1:2 and 1:12 by viewing it in light of the end times.¹⁰⁷ Similarly, Hartin asserts that the author of James is not focused on revealing the future, but rather on exhorting his hearers about their behaviour in light of "the heavenly world."¹⁰⁸ Wesley Hiram Wachob argues that the "general worldview" of James is that actions in this present life have significance because of the eschatological future.¹⁰⁹ Both Johnson and Penner argue that the eschatological content in the opening and closing sections of James provides a grid on which to place the content of the main body.¹¹⁰ Likewise, Hartin and Cheung contend that eschatology motivates the behaviour prescribed by the author.¹¹¹ Allison points out that the author repeats the expectation of eschatological reward and punishment to motivate behaviour: "eschatology is wholly in the service of ethics."¹¹² However, Hartin, Cheung, and Allison only briefly discuss divine judgment and hope for a favourable verdict. Thus, these scholars relegate eschatology to the background of James, that is, they are insufficiently emphatic about its central role in the epistle. To these scholars, eschatology is there, but it is not a guiding theme.

As stated above, *divine judgment* is an essential aspect of eschatological approval. Scholars have acknowledged the role of judgment, but to varying degrees. Wachob places judgment alongside other eschatological themes: *parousia, justice, trials, rich and poor, and the kingdom of God*, but misses that *judgment* is present throughout the entire epistle.¹¹³

¹⁰⁶ Burchard, "Zu Jakobus 2, 14-26," 28.

¹⁰⁷ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 39.

¹⁰⁸ Hartin, "Wise and Understanding," 994.

¹⁰⁹ Wachob, "Apocalyptic Intertexture," 165–85.

¹¹⁰ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 83; Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 212.

¹¹¹ Hartin, "Wise and Understanding," 973-974. 981; Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 249–54.

¹¹² Allison, *James*, 93–94.

¹¹³ Wachob, "Apocalyptic Intertexture," 165–85.

Burchard sees that a significant aspect of James 1:26–3:11 is how one stands in judgment.¹¹⁴ Laws recognises the frequency of eschatological reward and judgment in James, but considers the indictment of disunity and inconsistency in behaviour to be “much more pervasive.”¹¹⁵

Moo asserts that “one of the key purposes” of the author of James is to encourage the epistle’s hearers to remain pious, knowing that God’s judgment is coming. He states that “some scholars” find the key to the letter in this point,¹¹⁶ but does not specify any names. One such scholar is Baasland, who sees James as the New Testament wisdom writing. However, he recognises that the author intends for everything to be seen in the light of God’s judgment, which makes it distinct from OT wisdom literature.¹¹⁷ Christopher Morgan also sees eschatological judgment being the motivation for faithfulness to God. He points out that the calls to obedience receive meaning in light of eschatological testing.¹¹⁸ Similarly, Jackson-McCabe states that the author of James instructs in light of the *parousia* of the Lord, which is characterised by (a) divine judgment and (b) a reversal of the present world’s corruption.¹¹⁹ Penner writes that the body of James explains the act of being faithful so that one can be *judged as righteous*.¹²⁰ Lockett, viewing James alongside 4QInstruction, points out the high frequency of references to eschatology and divine judgment in James.¹²¹ While these scholars recognise the crucial nature of divine judgment, they do not offer a sustained discussion of the role of a *favourable verdict* as a unifying concept.

A close attempt at discussing the centrality of *eschatological approval* in James comes in the nineteenth-century commentary by J. P. Lange and J. J. von Oosterzee.¹²² They assert that the theme of James is contained in 1:12, “blessed is the man that endureth temptation.” They support this view with two observations: (1) the same thought is

¹¹⁴ Burchard, “Zu Jakobus 2, 14-26,” 30–31; Burchard, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 12, 82, 136, 146.

¹¹⁵ Laws, *Epistle of James*, 28–29. Contra Laws, the appeals to *unity* and *singleness* in light of the eschaton suggest that these virtues are criteria for judgment.

¹¹⁶ Moo, *Letter of James*, 24.

¹¹⁷ Baasland, “Jakobusbrief,” 124.

¹¹⁸ Morgan, *Theology of James*, 184.

¹¹⁹ Jackson-McCabe, “Wisdom and ‘Apocalyptic’ Eschatology in James,” 508.

¹²⁰ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 212.

¹²¹ Lockett, “James and 4QInstruction.”

¹²² Lange and van Oosterzee, *The Epistle General of James*.

introduced in 1:2, and (2) it is repeated in 5:7.¹²³ They view *endurance* as the theme that runs through James, counting seven admonitions between 1:13 and 5:7 by which the hearers are to endure.¹²⁴ However, Lange and von Oosterzee miss the emphasis on a *favourable judgment* in the term δόκιμος and corroborated by the term μακάριος. They focus on the seven admonitions without pursuing discussions on divine judgment and the resultant status. Thus, their view of the dominant motif in James ends up being too broad, much like the proponents of the theme being *testing*.

Matthias Konradt offers another study that comes close to a sustained examination of eschatological approval as a unifying motif in James. Konradt focuses on the discussion of *eschatological salvation* and its relation to obedience to God's word of truth in James 1:18. He argues that a life of obedience leads to God giving the gift of salvation.¹²⁵ He shows how each section of James points to eschatological salvation.¹²⁶ Konradt recognises the essential nature that *judgment* has in the epistle, making a connection between the behaviour of Christians and the outcome of eschatological judgment. However, he does not consider divine judgment to be as far-reaching in James as salvation, stating that there is often a dearth of references to the *requirements* for judgment.¹²⁷

1.3 A Way Forward Based on the Literature Review

This thesis aims to fill the void left by the other studies: a unifying motif in James. As we will discuss below, eschatological approval links the subunits of James together. We will suggest that *eschatological approval* does justice to the introductory content of James, as well as the prominence of divine judgment that repeats through the document. Besides, the author's admonitions in the body of James give examples of the criteria of this divine judgment, and what will result in a favourable verdict. The closing content of James has the most explicit eschatological content, and it reiterates that the hearers must adhere to the way that will result in approval.

The literature discussed above offers insight into building parameters for this study. First, the literature review shows that a motif can exist in James without the repetition of the

¹²³ Notably, they miss the lexemic connections that 1:12 has with 1:25 and 5:11. We will discuss these connections below.

¹²⁴ Lange and van Oosterzee, *The Epistle General of James*, 31–33, 47–48.

¹²⁵ Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 310.

¹²⁶ Konradt, 287–96.

¹²⁷ Konradt, 296–98.

thematic word itself. For example, Konradt's proposal that *obedience to the word* unifies James, shows that the *concept of the word* recurs in the epistle without the repetition of the term λόγος. Hartin makes a case that *perfection* is the result of keeping the law in 2:8, despite the absence of τέλειος.

Francis points out that the early introduction of a thematic word can preview a concept in an epistle without the word explicitly occurring again. For example, Demetrius' letter in 1 Macc 10:25–45 twice mentions the major theme *keeping faith* in the introduction (10:26, 27–28) but Demetrius does not use ἐμμένω after that opening portion.¹²⁸ Hartin's study, while unconvincingly arguing for perfection as a motif that is unifying, still shows how *perfection* can relate as a concept to the portions that he treats. While words for *testing* (πειρασμός, πειράζω) only occur in James 1, scholars like Cranfield and Hiebert make a case for how the *concept* of testing recurs throughout James. With these examples in view, the absence of the term δόκιμος after James 1 is not an obstacle to examining *eschatological approval* as a unifying motif. Our task will be to make a case for the *concept* occurring in each major section of James.

Second, we will consider the *structure* of James. To make a strong case for one motif to be unifying, we must examine *each section* of the epistle to see how its content connects with the theme in question. We will especially consider the repeated themes at the opening and closing of the epistle. The discussion of a central theme in the epistle must include the way the author presents his material. Many of the scholars surveyed above focus on uniting the commands of James but do not give enough attention to the way the repeated themes in the opening and closing of the document frame these commands. For example, Fry correctly recognises some of these opening and closing themes, but his method of charting themes in a matrix does not consider discourse markers that reveal the structure. Furthermore, in his treatment of themes, he misses that a favourable eschatological judgment is prominent in both the opening and closing.

Third, an examination of the *structure* of James requires a *clear method* for delineation. Each of the resources examined in this survey includes some discussion of the structure of the epistle, which impacts the interpretation of the prominent elements. However, their proposals of the structure differ, and they often omit a description of a method for determining sections of James. Hartin, for example, maintains that the eschatological content

¹²⁸ Francis, "Form and Function," 118; Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 405.

frames the reception of the wisdom instruction, but does not explain how he views the structure of the document in relation to his contention.¹²⁹ Wall states that the structure of James is like other New Testament letters and gives an outline, but does not explain his method of segmentation beforehand.¹³⁰ Tsuji describes some criteria for dividing up the epistle but does not clarify when he uses them. While he claims that Jas 2:1–5:6 is distinct from the opening and closing because it addresses the hearer’s behaviour,¹³¹ he does not account for the fact that the author indeed addresses their behaviour in 1:19–27; 5:7–9, 12–20. Considering the lack of clarity about how the structure of James is determined, this thesis will present a method for delineating James into sections and subsections.

Fourth, an examination of the *opening section of James* informs the interpretation of the text. Hartin, Francis, Wall, Mußner, Konradt, Jackson-McCabe, Davids, and Hiebert are among the many who assert that the opening section influences the reception of the rest of epistle. While they hold differing views on the extent of the opening section, they agree that it functions to introduce the major concepts of the letter. Thus, their work clarifies the need to consider the opening content of James to discuss a unifying motif in the epistle. This present study will attempt (a) to decipher the boundaries of the opening content and (b) to examine how it serves as a prologue for the document.

Furthermore, this thesis will make a case that divine judgment is indeed an essential element in the content of James. Just as Penner, Baasland, and Jackson-McCabe have discussed, we will contend that the content in James exists in light of divine judgment. Finally, as Konradt has pointed out, if divine judgment is indeed an encompassing concept in James, one should expect the epistle to have references to the *requirements* for judgment. We will present an argument that James indeed has references to the requirements for judgment.

In the next chapter, we will discuss the method for this study. We will make a case for the structure of James, which will influence its interpretation. We will also account for both the boundaries and function of the opening section of James.

¹²⁹ Hartin, *Spirituality*, 51.

¹³⁰ Wall, *Community*, 58.

¹³¹ Tsuji, *Glaube*, 60.

Chapter 2: Method

In building a case for *eschatological approval* as the unifying motif in James, this thesis will examine the epistle in two stages, as described in this chapter. First, we will study the *macrostructures* that form the epistle, in pursuit of discerning the epistle's overall structure. Given that the relationships between units of phrases and sentences contribute to meaning,¹³² we will form a case for a structure to James. After that, we will examine each section of James and how it relates to the proposed theme. Within this study of each section, we will sometimes examine *microstructures*, which are sentences or lexemes.

2.1 Macrostructures: Cohesion, Inclusions, and Situation

A burgeoning discipline within New Testament studies is *discourse analysis*, which is also called *text-linguistics*.¹³³ The use of discourse analysis recognises that language consists of larger units than words, phrases, and sentences. While traditional grammars have focused on the latter, discourse analysis considers the paragraph to be the unit that carries meaning. Thus, discourse analysis facilitates the study of *macrostructures* of paragraphs rather than just the *microstructures* of sentences and words.¹³⁴

2.1.1 Cohesion

One of the primary principles of discourse analysis is *cohesion*, which refers to the relationships between elements in a text that hold it together. These relationships define a cluster of sentences as a unit of text. As a result, the interpretation of one element in the discourse presupposes or is dependent on another.¹³⁵ By observing the elements that bind a

¹³² Snyrnan, "Discourse," 89.

¹³³ Some use these two terms interchangeably, but others distinguish between *text* as written communication and *discourse* as interpretation of the text. See Porter, "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey," 17.

¹³⁴ Other scholars have used discourse analysis on James. For example, Cheung indicates that he examines lexical and semantic cohesion and changes in manner of expression to inform his segmentation of James. However, he does not explain when he utilises this approach. See Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 57, 60–84. Varner also indicates that he uses discourse analysis, but he focuses on the address "brothers" as an indicator of segmentation without considering other ways the author could indicate cohesion. See Varner, *James*, 35–38.

¹³⁵ Halliday and Hasan, *Cohesion in English*, 4.

unit of text together, one can analyse discourse from the top-down, showing how individual parts of a biblical book relate to the whole.¹³⁶ Numerous factors can unite a text, and a unit often contains more than one element of cohesion. Building on the work that Halliday and Hasan applied to English, Jeffrey Reed helpfully divides cohesive ties into two categories: (1) *organic ties* and (2) *componential ties*.¹³⁷

Organic ties are the conjunctive systems of language, signalled by particles serving as transition markers (e.g. γάρ, ἀλλά, δέ, καί), prepositions, grammatical structures (such as genitive absolute constructions) and conventionalised lexical items (like λοιπόν). Each of these markers plays a specific role, indicating a particular semantic constraint to the context. Regarding connectives, Steven E. Runge writes, “The objective is not to know how to translate the connective, but to understand how each one uniquely differs from another based on the function that it accomplishes.”¹³⁸ Connectives like the ones mentioned above occur throughout James, like δέ (e.g. 1:4, 5, 6, 9, 10), ἀλλά (e.g. 2:18), and διό (e.g. 1:21; 4:6). We will examine how connectives function in prominent places.

Not only do organic ties link together a discourse, but they also set *boundaries* to sections. Organic ties organise the discourse so the hearer can place limits on where cohesive relationships exist in the text.¹³⁹ Thus, the identification of organic ties assists in segmenting James into distinct sections for analysis. In addition to Runge, the work of scholars like Murray J. Harris,¹⁴⁰ Stephen H. Levinsohn,¹⁴¹ and Daniel B. Wallace¹⁴² will be instrumental in guiding the identification of organic ties and their function in James.

Reed also describes *componential ties*, the meaningful relationships between individual linguistic components in the discourse. Componential ties include ties of co-reference, co-classification, and co-extension. These componential ties create what Halliday and Hasan call *semantic chains*, as a set of discourse lexemes relate to the others through the three types of relationships. The speaker or author uses chain interactions to speak about similar kinds of things, grouping sentences together.¹⁴³

¹³⁶ Black, *Linguistics*, 171.

¹³⁷ Reed, “Cohesiveness of Discourse,” 32–45.

¹³⁸ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 19.

¹³⁹ Reed, “Cohesiveness of Discourse,” 36.

¹⁴⁰ Harris, *Prepositions*.

¹⁴¹ Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*.

¹⁴² Wallace, *Greek Grammar*.

¹⁴³ Reed, “Cohesiveness of Discourse,” 36–45.

Semantic chains link sections of text so that they become larger sections. In other words, repetition and similarity connect units of text; units become subsections of a lengthier section connected by transitional devices. H. Van Dyke Parunak's article¹⁴⁴ on transitional tools helps categorise different ways a unit of text can hold together. Helpful to this thesis is Parunak's five types of linguistic similarity: (1) *phonological*, (2) *morphological*, (3) *lexical*, (4) *syntactic*, and (5) *logical or rhetorical* similarity.¹⁴⁵ Kathleen Callow also categorises cohesion, discussing grammatical cohesion, lexical cohesion, and cohesion of participants and events.¹⁴⁶

Reed describes a method for determining textual cohesiveness when identifying semantic chains. He borrows the language of *peripheral*, *relevant*, and *central tokens* from Halliday and Hasan. While *peripheral tokens* are linguistic items that are not part of chains and *relevant tokens* form part of one or more chains, it is *central tokens* that primarily determine textual cohesiveness. Central tokens are chains that interact with other chains. Reed further specifies that if central tokens interact in more than one context, it is likely that the author is forming a thread through the discourse, using language cohesively.¹⁴⁷ Examples of semantic chains in James include *θηρσκόζ/θηρσκειά* in 1:26–27, *πίστιζ* and *ἔργα* in 2:14–26, *γλωσσα* in 3:5–8, and *μακροθυμέω/μακροθυμία* in 5:7–10.

2.1.2 Use of *Inclusio*

Another way to mark discourse boundaries is through the identification of inclusions. The device of *inclusio* was a commonly used method in ancient literature to mark the beginning and end of a block of text through lexical or thematic parallels. Guthrie defines *inclusio* as a “form of distant parallelism” where the same components occur at the beginning and end of a pericope. Variations on strict *inclusio* include the appearance of synonymous terms or complementary elements rather than identical elements, or the elements occurring *near* the beginning or end rather than precisely at the beginning or end.¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁴ Parunak, “Transitional Techniques.”

¹⁴⁵ Parunak, 528.

¹⁴⁶ Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 29–48.

¹⁴⁷ Reed, “Cohesive Ties.”

¹⁴⁸ Guthrie, *The Structure of Hebrews*, 15. See pp. 76–89 for uses of *inclusio* in Hebrews.

An *inclusio* creates a “semantic sandwich” that binds sayings together as a unit.¹⁴⁹ Ernst Wendland proposes the usage of terms *anaphora* and *epiphora* to refer to the “points of significant lexical-thematic correspondence” found at the opening and closing portions of an *inclusio*, respectively.¹⁵⁰ Through an *inclusio*, the author uses the *epiphora* to return to the topic or point made in the *anaphora*, tying together the entire section.¹⁵¹

In addition to framing or bracketing a unit, inclusions with corresponding elements at the beginning and end of a unit can also indicate a possible chiasmic structure. For example, elements labelled A and A' can indicate a possible ABA' or ABCB'A' structure.¹⁵²

Possible examples of *inclusio* in James include (a) 2:1 and 2:9 with the cognates *προσωπολημψίας* and *προσωπολημπτεῖτε*, (b) 2:14–17 and 2:26 with cognates of the terms *πίστις*, *ἔργα*, *σῶμα*, and *νεκρά*, and (c) 4:6–7 and 4:10 with the terms *ταπεινοῖς* and *ταπεινώθητε*. We will examine the use of *inclusio* in James as we seek to determine units of text, especially instances of a grand *inclusio* that frame large portions of the epistle.

2.1.3 Situational Features

Another tenet of discourse analysis is the recognition of *situational features* that impact the text, including genre, author, provenance, the occasion of writing, and the readers' circumstances. Examining such text-pragmatic features allows the exegete to determine the relative importance of each unit within the whole.¹⁵³ While not all these factors are explicit in the text or known through related disciplines, some are evident in the text itself.¹⁵⁴

In Chapter 3, we will discuss the identification of James as an *epistle*, which influences its interpretation. While some apply methods related to ancient speeches or Jewish wisdom literature to James, the document identifies itself as a letter from a certain *James* to the *twelve tribes* (1:1). We will make a case that the study of ancient Greek epistles can reasonably apply to James. As we will see below, F. O. Francis' seminal article¹⁵⁵ examines James in light of Greek letter convention, arguing for a distinctively epistolary content and function for its opening and closing content. With influence from Francis as well as other

¹⁴⁹ Callow and Callow, “Text,” 27.

¹⁵⁰ Wendland, “Let No One Disregard You,” 339 n12.

¹⁵¹ Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral*, 54.

¹⁵² Egger, *How to Read*, 75.

¹⁵³ Black, *Linguistics*, 171–72.

¹⁵⁴ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 39.

¹⁵⁵ Francis, “Form and Function.”

studies of Greek letters,¹⁵⁶ we will study elements of James for affinity with the form and function of other Greek letters.

Second, this thesis will proceed with the supposition that the primary hearers of James are Jewish recipients outside of their ancestral land. The text indicates that the recipients of the letter: ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ (1:1). While διασπορά may refer to the Church as is possible in 1 Pet 1:1, nothing in the document contradicts the notion that these are ethnic Jews.¹⁵⁷ The assumption of the hearers' familiarity with Jewish tradition and literature points to a primarily Jewish audience. The repeated references to Old Testament figures and sayings, as well as the reference to a synagogue (Jas 2:2) corroborate this view.¹⁵⁸ Besides, the address is to the *twelve tribes*, a designation not found in 1 Peter. Notably, the call to care for orphans and widows in Jas 1:27 echoes a repeated Old Testament command that usually includes the *alien* or *stranger* as well (e.g., Exod 22:21–22; Deut 10:18; 14:29; 16:11; 24:19–21; Ps 145:9; Jer 7:6; 22:3; Ezek 22:7; Zech 7:10). The omission of the *alien* or *stranger* from this familiar combination may indicate that the epistles' hearers themselves are aliens outside their ancestral land. Thus, as we take Jas 1:1 at face value, the *situational feature* of the recipients being diaspora Jews will impact the interpretation of the epistle.

Third, this thesis will proceed with the view that eschatological concerns prominent in Jewish and early Christian writings reflect the atmosphere in which James emerges. Eschatological expectation was widespread in Jewish and Christian thought, evidenced by a variety of sources. While many in ancient Israel believed that death was the end,¹⁵⁹ the expectation of deliverance from Sheol emerged after the exile.¹⁶⁰ With the Jewish people under foreign rule, circumstances called for explanations of present suffering, divine promises, and the role of Israel in history. Eschatological teachings addressed these issues, and they impacted early Christian doctrine.¹⁶¹ Ernst Käsemann, considering the expressed

¹⁵⁶ Such as Exler, "Form of the Ancient Greek Letter"; Stowers, *Letter Writing*; Weima, *Paul*.

¹⁵⁷ So Allison, *James*, 127–32; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 28.

¹⁵⁸ So Hartin, *James*, 52; Moo, *Letter of James*, 23–25; Allison, *James*, 32–50.

¹⁵⁹ "Ancient Israel shared the conviction of the Mesopotamian peoples that 'he who goes down to Sheol [the underworld] does not come up' (Job 7:9; cf. 10:21; 16:22; 2 Sam 12:23)." Bauckham, *Fate*, 16.

¹⁶⁰ The portrayal of Martha's statement to Jesus in John 11:24 reflects the belief of an eschatological resurrection after physical death. However, there were still some, like the Sadducees (Matt 22:23), who rejected the resurrection.

¹⁶¹ For a discussion on how apocalyptic and eschatological content developed within the period between 300 BCE and 300 CE, see Rowland, *The Open Heaven*, 9–22, 443–48.

eschatological motivation behind much of the ethics of Jesus, declared that “apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology.”¹⁶² The Gospels indicate in Jesus’ teaching a belief that the dead will be raised in the end (e.g., Matt 22:23–32; Luke 14:14; John 11:24). The New Testament epistles, including Paul’s letters, teach of an eschatological resurrection of the dead, with Jesus being the first (e.g., Rom 6:5; Phil 3:11; 1 Cor 15:20–24; 2 Tim 2:18). Also, the New Testament reveals a belief in a conscious afterlife.¹⁶³ This belief is epitomised by Jesus’ teaching about the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 16:23), which speaks of an afterlife punishment (also see *1 En.* 22:11; Josephus, *Ant.* 18.14).¹⁶⁴ The concept of an eschatological court where the dead are judged is described in Revelation 20:12 (cf. Dan 7:10). This day of judgment (2 Pet 3:7) will include condemnation of the wicked and vindication of the righteous (Rom 2:5–9; 1 Thess 1:10; Jude 14–15). Also, the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (especially 4QInstruction) affirmed the development of beliefs about life after death in Judaism, along with the blending of sapiential texts with an eschatological worldview.¹⁶⁵

Eschatological expectation in Jewish and early Christian thought included more than judgment and a conscious afterlife; many expected an imminent *cataclysmic event* that marked the end of the present world. Exilic, post-exilic and early Christian apocalypses like Daniel 7–12, *1 Enoch*, *2 Baruch*, and the *Apocalypse of Zephaniah* describe the end times as a revelation from a heavenly being. The Synoptic Gospels portray Jesus teaching of wars, affliction, and terror during a time of upheaval unmatched since the beginning (Matt 24:1–35; Mark 13:1–30). This final stage would include God’s victory over those hostile to him.

While James is not an apocalypse, its content is grounded in eschatological expectation, with 5:7–11 having the most explicit material about the eschaton. The salutation, which designates the *twelve tribes* of the *diaspora* as recipients, evokes hope that Israel will be restored.¹⁶⁶ Many texts call upon the Lord to destroy the enemies of the people and gather the tribes back to the land (e.g., Sir 36:13–17; Tob 13:5–11; Ps. Sol. 8:28; 17:44; 4 Ezra 13:39–49).¹⁶⁷ Also, the epistle contains elements that occur elsewhere in the New Testament in eschatological contexts, including the *crown of life*, warnings against teaching, and joy

¹⁶² Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today*, 92–102.

¹⁶³ For a discussion of this development, see Thiselton, *Life after Death*, 3–5.

¹⁶⁴ Joachim Jeremias, “Αἰδης,” *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*.

¹⁶⁵ Raymond E. Brown, *New Testament Essays*, 251; Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom*, 1.

¹⁶⁶ E. P. Sanders notes that the diaspora “generally figures large in the hopes for the end-time restoration” and that this expectation was so widespread that the mention of *twelve* “would necessarily mean restoration.” See Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 98.

¹⁶⁷ For more discussion, see deSilva, “Diaspora.”

amidst suffering. Thus, the prominence of *eschatological approval* makes sense against the background of widespread eschatological expectation.

2.2 Microstructures: Discourse Devices and Greek Parallels

In addition to examining macrostructures for cohesion and situational features, this thesis will investigate places in James at the *microstructure* level: sentences and words. While many sayings in James prove to be uncontroversial, there are places where some focused examination is necessary.

2.2.1 Discourse Devices

At the sentence level, the examination of *discourse devices* can shed light on what the author intends to be the most vital part of an utterance. These discourse devices occur at the sentence level, the *microstructure*, but they have an impact on the macrostructure. Forward-pointing devices, information structuring devices, and thematic highlighting devices have pragmatic effects that point to meaning communicated by the author.¹⁶⁸ Foundational to this approach is the principle that *choice implies meaning*. Koine Greek sentences typically follow a convention of word order and word choice; discourse devices often “break” these grammatical rules for pragmatic effect. Since the author chose particular words and their order for an utterance, one must expect that there is *meaning* associated with that choice.¹⁶⁹ The goal of examining discourse devices is to decipher the meaning embedded in a form that differs from convention. This departure from the default option, which Runge calls “markedness,”¹⁷⁰ often impacts the interpretation of a macrostructure. For example, Levinsohn argues that Χριστόν in Phil 3:8 and καθ’ ὑστέρησιν in Phil 4:11, each occurring at the beginning of its clause, are marked for saliency. This saliency, or prominence, is higher than the “natural saliency” occurring if the word or phrase occurs in its default place at the end of the clause.¹⁷¹

An example of the use of word choice and word order in James occurs in the opening exhortation in 1:2. The text indicates a deliberate choice to place the accusative phrase πᾶσαν

¹⁶⁸ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 385.

¹⁶⁹ Runge, 4–6.

¹⁷⁰ Runge, 11.

¹⁷¹ Levinsohn, “A Discourse Study of Constituent Order and the Article in Philippians,” 66.

χαράν first in the sentence rather than in its default place at the end of the clause or sentence.¹⁷² After all, the author could have ordered the sentence with the subordinate clause first and the object of the imperative last: Ὅταν περιπέσητε πειρασμοῖς ποικίλοις, ἠγήσασθε πᾶσαν χαράν.

Natural saliency would still have applied to πᾶσαν χαράν if it occupied its conventional place at the end of the sentence. However, its placement at the very beginning gives it *markedness* and even greater saliency. Runge points out that the scope of the emphasis on πᾶσαν χαράν extends over the entire sentence, representing the main point of the clause. Furthermore, he indicates that the author's choice to interrupt the sentence with the vocative ἀδελφοί μου, while not adding semantic information to the sentence, delays the information of *what* the hearers are to consider all joy, giving it greater attention.¹⁷³

2.2.2 Examination of Words

After an examination of macrostructure and discourse devices at the sentence level, examination at the word-level will be done when necessary. Such situations arise with the ambiguity of a certain lexeme that is pivotal for interpretation. In such cases, this study will proceed as follows. First, we will examine the *range of possibilities* for the lexeme based on widely-used Greek lexica. This will give us proper boundaries for our study of each term.


Second, after consulting the lexica, we will attempt to *narrow* the range of meaning based on the context of the passage in James. The text of the epistle will guide the favouring or elimination of certain possibilities for each term. Thus, the context of the term, both in the subunit and the whole epistle, will aid our interpretation.

Third, we after consulting the lexica and a term's context, we will examine documents outside of James in cases where they can *confirm* a particular gloss. To confirm this sense, we will prioritise documents that are (1) in Koine Greek, (2) are likely to pre-date or be roughly contemporary to James, and (3) contain a Judeo-Christian worldview. While we will primarily draw upon these documents, other documents outside these criteria have value, including Greco-Roman documents, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Hebrew Bible. We will consult these at times, especially if a secondary author appeals to them.

¹⁷² We will discuss the “default place” of each element as they become relevant.

¹⁷³ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 275.

The three criteria narrow the corpora of documents to the LXX,¹⁷⁴ Greek intertestamental literature, and the New Testament. The diagram below illustrates our focus on documents that qualify for all three criteria, while acknowledging the value of other documents. These criteria will guide our use of relevant parallels.



On the occasions that we turn to the parallels to assist our interpretation of James, there are several reasons for focusing on the three corpora for confirming the use of lexemes in James. First, regarding the LXX, the epistle demonstrates strong parallels to OT themes (such as the tongue, humility, and wealth)¹⁷⁵ and the usage of OT exemplars (Abraham, Rahab, the prophets, Job, Elijah).¹⁷⁶ Also, terms in James suggest a close literary relationship with the LXX. While there are 67 New Testament *hapax legomena* in James,¹⁷⁷ only thirteen of these are not found in the LXX.¹⁷⁸ Furthermore, all the OT quotations in James are from the LXX.¹⁷⁹ As we study terms in James in conversation with the LXX, we will give

¹⁷⁴ For the purposes of this study, we will define ‘LXX’ as the texts included in Rahlfs’ 1935 edition.

¹⁷⁵ Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 39–54, 84–87.

¹⁷⁶ Varner, *Book of James*, 24; Williams, “Of Rags and Riches,” 275; Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 57.

¹⁷⁷ Allison, *James*, 85.

¹⁷⁸ Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 388.

¹⁷⁹ Carson, “James,” 997. This does not include the saying in James 4:5, which is not clearly from the Old Testament.

prominence to wisdom literature.¹⁸⁰ Of the 67 NT *hapax legomena* in James, 34 occur in the OT wisdom literature. Individual themes in James, which occur only sporadically in the NT, are also central in the wisdom literature: care of widows, use of the tongue, concern for tomorrow, perfection, and prayer.¹⁸¹

Second, *intertestamental literature* allows us to examine lexemes within a Judeo-Christian milieu. While their varied dating precludes conclusions that the author of James had knowledge of them or was dependent on them, they shed light on the ideological atmosphere in which James was written. Scholars observe some striking affinities with the content in James. For example, some identify common concepts between James and Pseudo-Phocylides,¹⁸² and others propose connections with the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.¹⁸³ Other documents associated with James are *Jubilees* (especially in Abraham's offering of Isaac),¹⁸⁴ the *Testament of Abraham*,¹⁸⁵ and the *Sibylline Oracles*.¹⁸⁶

Third, James exhibits parallels with much of the rest of the New Testament. Especially prominent parallels are found in the *sayings of Jesus* in the Synoptic Gospels. The epistle of James shows more connections with the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels than any other NT writing.¹⁸⁷ There is a particularly high affinity between James and the

¹⁸⁰ Notably, Bauckham states that James most resembles wisdom paraenesis, with the “paradigm works” being Proverbs and Sirach. He likens James to Sirach, arguing that the author comments on Jesus' sayings in a similar way that ben Sira comments on his father's sayings. See Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 30.

¹⁸¹ So Baasland, “Jakobusbrief,” 124.

¹⁸² Dan G. McCartney offers a list of similarities between the two documents. See McCartney, *James*, 47–48. Also, see the discussion of James having similarities with Pseudo-Phocylides in Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 73.

¹⁸³ Allison lists the parallels between James and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. See *James*, 55. Notably, Arnold Meyer proposes that James itself is structured on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and that the author “Jacobus” is the patriarch Jacob. See Meyer, *Rätsel*, 179–95. Johnson recognises the similarities but doubts dependence between these documents. See *Brother of Jesus*, 46–52.

¹⁸⁴ Allison, *James*, 238, 697; Meyer, *Rätsel*, 135; Foster, *Exemplars*, 64–68; Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 122–24.

¹⁸⁵ Moo, *Letter of James*, 139; Allison, *James*, 273, 421, 483, 785; McKnight, *Letter of James*, 66 n32, 251 n111, 408 n177.

¹⁸⁶ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 66n32, 285, 290; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 143, 145; Allison, *James*, 422, 448, 547.

¹⁸⁷ Hartin, *James and Q*, 2.

Sermon on the Mount.¹⁸⁸ Some have even proposed connections with a hypothetical source Q.¹⁸⁹

We can also bring other portions of the NT into conversation with James. James has parallels with NT epistles in their form and content. James especially displays an affinity with the other Catholic (or General) Epistles, with a focus on affirmed praxis in connection with correct teaching.¹⁹⁰ In other words, these letters, like James, urge their hearers to “trust God and live as though they are kingdom saints...to live what they believe.”¹⁹¹

To be sure, the dating and redaction history of some documents makes their usage a complex issue, especially for ones that post-date James like the *Testament of Abraham*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and Theodotion’s translation of Daniel. However, our examination does not assume that James has a literary dependence on them. Instead, we examine parallel terms with the view that they elucidate the milieu out of which James emerges.

The principle of *clustering* will be used as we examine the parallels. A text will weigh more heavily on our interpretation of James if it contains clustering of two or more terms also associated in the epistle of James. For example, Theodotion Dan 12:12 contains both ὑπομένω and μακάριος, just like Jas 1:12, and is thus considered a more probable parallel than other texts that do not contain clustering.


We must reiterate that the *context in James* will hold priority over the Greek parallels as we examine terms in James. The context includes macrostructures, discourse devices, and syntax in the epistle. Only after we examine the context and the lexicographical data will we turn to the Greek parallels to corroborate the usage of a term. The graphic below sums up the hierarchy that we will use in examining James, with macrostructures maintaining the highest priority and the parallels having the lowest priority.

¹⁸⁸ Gerhard Kittel presents twenty-six *Anklänge* of the words of Jesus in James, all from the Synoptic Gospels. See Kittel, “Der geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes,” 84–90.

¹⁸⁹ Hartin has committed a monograph to this connection. See Hartin, *James and Q*.

¹⁹⁰ So Lockett, *Introduction*, 1.

¹⁹¹ Bateman, *General Letters*, 117.



This thesis will have two more parts. In Part Two, we will argue for the *structure* of James. After that, Part Three will discuss *eschatological approval* in the rest of James.

Part Two: The Structure of James

In Part Two, we will examine the *macrostructures* in James as we build the argument for *eschatological approval* as a unifying motif. While Allison rightly points out that the unity of the text is not in its literary scheme but in the author's goals,¹⁹² these goals are expressed through a *structure* that shapes our interpretation. We will first make a case for the genre of James, then examine James 1, and then turn to James 2–5.

In Chapter 3, we will establish that James is indeed an epistle, giving special attention to its opening and closing. These sections often introduce and reiterate the important content of an epistle.¹⁹³ The closing content supports the study of James as an ancient Greek letter.

In Chapter 4, we will contend that James 1:1–27 functions as the introductory prologue. We will first argue for the cohesiveness of 1:1–27, and then examine its introductory nature. A prominent aspect of the opening content of James is the use of *inclusio* marked by 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25. After a discussion of the epistle's introduction, we will present a tentative outline.

In Chapter 5, we will examine the macrostructures of James 2–5. We will make a case for the use of *inclusio* marking large portions of James. Then, examining the text for cohesiveness, we will delineate the units in James. Finally, we will present a tentative outline for James 2–5.

These three chapters will be instrumental in our examination of *eschatological approval* in Part Three. First, they provide guidelines for the study of James. We will present a case that James is an epistle in Chapter 3 and argue for the introductory function of James 1 in Chapter 4. Second, the segmentation of James in Chapter 5 provides a foundation for determining the salient portions of each subunit. In the process of doing this, I highlight the two instances of a grand *inclusio* that frame the intervening content of the epistle in Chapter 5, which will be especially important for this thesis.

¹⁹² Allison, *James*, 81.

¹⁹³ See the work of Francis, "Form and Function"; Weima, *Paul*, 11–50, 165–204.

Chapter 3: James as a Letter

As discussed above, discourse analysis involves the examination of *situational features* that shape the text. In what follows, we will discuss the issue of whether James can indeed be studied as an epistle, which will inform our interpretation of its content.

While James has been traditionally grouped with the ‘catholic’ epistles, scholars have debated whether one can regard it as a letter. Dibelius influentially rejected the view that James is a letter, claiming that the only epistolary feature of James is its salutation (1:1). Based on the document’s contents, he categorised James as paraenesis, which “strings together admonitions of general ethical content.”¹⁹⁴ More recently, S. R. Llewelyn, agreeing with Dibelius that James does not have unity, proposes that 1:1 is a later addition. He contends that once one removes the prescript, James is simply a loose compilation of sayings like the Gospel of Thomas or the sayings source Q.¹⁹⁵

However, some have more recently proposed that James can be a letter while having a paraenetic *nature*. Bauckham contends that the opening of James indeed categorises it as a letter since it is the only formal feature essential to an ancient epistle. He is undeterred by what he deems to be a lack of a letter-closing, stating that some letters “just end” without a closing.¹⁹⁶ In determining whether it is a letter, other scholars have appealed to the general content of James rather than its opening and closing. Hartin calls it a “hybrid, which brings many different traditions together” akin to ‘Q’ and 1 Enoch (92–105), reflecting traditions of wisdom, eschatological, and prophetic material.¹⁹⁷ Ernst Baasland contends that James is a lengthy wisdom speech written in letter form, because its arguments are longer than that of paraenesis.¹⁹⁸ Studying a variety of documents, Leo Perdue disagrees with Dibelius’ particular understanding of paraenesis and asserts that one can use paraenetic style to address specific situations.¹⁹⁹ Luke T. Johnson points out that the exhortatory rhetoric of direct address and the “vivid dialogical style” is appropriate for a letter.²⁰⁰ Stanley K. Stowers shows that ancient letters can have a paraenetic nature, involving a favourable relationship

¹⁹⁴ Dibelius, *James*, 1–3.

¹⁹⁵ Llewelyn, “The Prescript of James.”

¹⁹⁶ Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 12. Similarly, Francis states that many Hellenistic letters “of all types have no closing formulas whatsoever; they just stop.” See “Form and Function,” 125. We will discuss the ending of James below.

¹⁹⁷ Hartin, “Wise and Understanding,” 996.

¹⁹⁸ Baasland, “Literarische Form,” 3654.

¹⁹⁹ Perdue, “Paraenesis.”

²⁰⁰ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 24.

between writer and recipient, gnomic content, and recommendations for hearers toward particular actions. Citing examples from papyri, Stowers categorises James as a paraenetic letter.²⁰¹

The work of F. O. Francis strengthens the argument that James is a letter. Francis argues that James resembles Hellenistic *secondary letters*, or letters that lack situational immediacy.²⁰² Citing Josephus' *Antiquities* 8.50–54, Phlm 4–7, Eusebius' *Praep. Ev.* 9.33–34, 1 Macc 10:25–45, as well as various papyrological letters, Francis shows that letters often contained a *doubled opening formula* with blessing, thanksgiving, and keywords repeated later. He argues that these elements are all displayed in James 1. In its opening, James repeats the concepts of *πειρασμός*, *δοκίμιον*, and *ὑπομονή* in 1:2–3 and 1:12, supporting a *double-opening* as observed by Francis. Also, the concept of *blessing* highlighted by Francis occurs in 1:12 and 1:25. Furthermore, the opening verses provide key terms that repeat later, such as *faith* (1:3), *work* (1:3), *perfect* (1:4), *boast* (1:9), *save* (1:21) and *law* (1:25). Besides, terms that are rare in the New Testament, like *ἀκατάστατος* (1:8), *δίψυχος* (1:8), *ποιητής* (1:22), and *χαλιναγωγέω* (1:26), occur in the opening chapter and re-occur (the same form or a cognate) later in the document. The recurrence of these terms bolsters the view that the beginning portion of James is what Tsuji calls a *supplier of key words*²⁰³ for the rest of the document, akin to other Greek letters.²⁰⁴ We will examine the opening content in more detail below.

Also, contra Bauckham, the end of James indeed displays elements of a letter-closing found in other Greek letters. These elements include eschatological content, a thematic reprise, content about oaths, health, and prayer, and the phrase *πρὸ πάντων*.²⁰⁵ Francis X. J. Exler shows these epistolary elements in papyrological letters.²⁰⁶ Since the work of Exler, more papyri dated earlier than 200 CE have emerged that confirm that such features are common in Greek letter endings. The following chart lists papyrus letters with these elements, including the ones cited by Exler:

²⁰¹ Along with the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Thessalonians, and 1 Peter. See Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 94–106.

²⁰² As pointed out by Francis, “Form and Function,” 111.

²⁰³ Tsuji, *Glaube*, 60–63.

²⁰⁴ Tsuji, 111–18.

²⁰⁵ Francis, “Form and Function,” 110–24.

²⁰⁶ Exler cites P.Oxy. VIII 1154 as an example of how *πρὸ πάντων* is a “final phrase” in Greek letters. See Exler, “Form of the Ancient Greek Letter,” 113–14.

Element of Greek Letter Ending	Papyrological Evidence ²⁰⁷
πρὸ πάντων	BGU XIII 2350; BGU XVI 2659; O.Krok. I 96; VBP II 35; P.Brem. 57; P.Col. VIII 216; P.Giss. I 22; P.Mil. Vogl. I 24; P.Oslo II 49; P.Oxy. VIII 1154
Oaths, featuring the verbs ὀμνύω and ὀμνυμι or the noun ὄρκος	P.Cair. Zen. III 59462; P.Col. III 18; P. Col. Zen. II 68; P.Haun. I 10; P.Hib. I 65.
Health and prayer	P.Oxy. VIII 1154; BGU XIII 2350; BGU XVI 2659; P.Bodl. I 157; P.Col. VIII 216; P. Oxy XII 1581; P. Yale I 78.

Such elements also appear in New Testament epistles; πρὸ πάντων is found in 1 Peter 4:8, a prayer and a health wish in 3 John 2, and a prayer or request for prayer is a common element in the closing of other NT epistles (2 Cor 13:7; Eph 6:18–19; 1 Thess 5:25; Heb 13:18).²⁰⁸ Hartin agrees with Francis and Exler that the ending of James contains elements of letter-closings,²⁰⁹ as does Davids, who states that it is “dictated by the epistolary form.”²¹⁰

Ultimately, evidence from Greek letters, including recent papyrological evidence supports the view that James is a letter. Contra Llewelyn, removing the prescript still leaves ample evidence of epistolary elements. While James does contain paraenesis, along with text that falls into other genres, these occur within the “framing genre” of an ancient letter.²¹¹

Furthermore, the categorisation of James as a *paraenetic letter*, as Stowers advocates, does justice to both its epistolary elements and exhortatory content. With gnomic content and exhortations for certain behaviour, James displays the elements of ancient paraenetic letters. Thus, the *situational feature* (as discussed in the previous chapter) of the epistolary and paraenetic nature of James guides our analysis. We can proceed using the methods of discourse analysis that apply to paraenetic sections in other New Testament epistles.²¹²

²⁰⁷ Accessed via The Papyrological Navigator, <http://papyri.info>.

²⁰⁸ For more on this convention, see Francis, “Form and Function,” 125.

²⁰⁹ Hartin, *James*, 257–58.

²¹⁰ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 181.

²¹¹ Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 58–59.

²¹² Runge offers a number of examples applied to the New Testament for each discourse device in *Discourse Grammar*.

Chapter 4: James 1:1–27 as the Introductory Prologue in James

In what follows, we will make a case that James 1:1–27 serves as the *introductory prologue* of the epistle. First, we will argue for 1:1–27 as a distinct literary unit. Second, we will argue that this unit has a distinct introductory nature for the epistle. Third, we will present an outline of James based on our conclusions.

4.1 James 1:1–27 as a Distinct Unit

In this section, we will contend that James 1:1–27 is a distinct literary unit. We will make this case by examining (1) the use of *inclusio*, (2) the *cohesive ties* that identify it as a unit, and (3) the literary character of James 1 vis-à-vis the content following it in the epistle.

4.1.1 Use of *Inclusio* in 1:2–25

First, the occurrence of *inclusio* in James 1:2–25 supports its cohesion as a single unit. In what follows, we will examine a case for a double-*inclusio* that links together 1:2–25. This view of the structure of James 1 builds on the work of Francis and Davids, who propose a “double opening statement.” The statement of thematic material twice in the opening content is consistent with other ancient Greek letters.²¹³

Mark E. Taylor argues for an *inclusio* at 1:2–4 and 1:12 and another at 1:12 and 1:25. For the first *inclusio*, both statements focus on the steadfastness of the believer, paralleling the blessing, trial, perseverance, testing, and the result of testing.²¹⁴

1:2–4	1:12
πᾶσαν χαράν	μακάριος
πειρασμοῖς	πειρασμόν
ὑπομονήν / ὑπομονή	ὑπομένει
δοκίμιον	δόκιμος
ἵνα ᾗτε τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι	τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς

²¹³ Letters with a double-opening include a one between Solomon and Hiram treated by Josephus and Eupolemus, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, Philippians, 2 Corinthians, 3 John, and Demetrius’ letter in 1 Macc 10:25–45. See Francis, “Form and Function,” 111–18; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 25.

²¹⁴ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 60–61. As discussed above, Lange and van Oosterzee recognise the parallel between 1:2 and 1:12. See Lange and van Oosterzee, *The Epistle General of James*, 47. Penner views 1:2–12 as a distinct section, seeing a chiasmic structure, but along with von Lips argues that this passage is the extent of the introductory prologue. See *James and Eschatology*, 144–213.

The second *inclusio*, according to Taylor, occurs at Jas 1:12 and 1:25. Along with the obvious parallel of μακάριος in both places, he argues that both sayings, which employ the future tense, are eschatological. He pairs ὑπομένω with παραμένω, as the one enduring through trial is “roughly parallel” to the one continuing in the law. Taylor proposes that obeying the law in 1:25 is parallel to loving God in 1:12. He presents this second *inclusio* in this manner:²¹⁵

1:12	1:25
μακάριος	μακάριος
ὑπομένει	παραμείνας
ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν	ποιητῆς ἔργου... ἐν τῇ ποιήσει

Taylor and George H. Guthrie present a balanced structure for Jas 1 with a double *inclusio*, adding the parallel of the emphasis on “having become” (γενόμενος):²¹⁶

1:2–4	1:12	1:25
πᾶσαν χαράν	μακάριος	μακάριος
πειρασμοῖς	πειρασμόν	
ὑπομονήν / ὑπομονή	ὑπομένει	παραμείνας
δοκίμιον	δόκιμος	
	γενόμενος	γενόμενος
τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι	τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς	
ἔργον τέλειον		τέλειον... ἔργου
	αὐτόν	αὐτοῦ

Based on the lexical parallels in these three passages, Taylor and Guthrie argue for “thematic solidarity” in the opening chapter of James. They state that these three passages all communicate the idea of *blessing* on those who *endure* the test. One displays *endurance* through obedience built on love for God. They also maintain that all three passages are eschatological.²¹⁷

Several of the reasons used to support a double-*inclusio* from Taylor and Guthrie are weak. First, it is not apparent that *having joy* is parallel with *being blessed*. The former is based on knowing the result of testing, while the latter is a state of being. We will examine the nature of μακάριος below. Secondly, the antecedent of the pronoun αὐτόν (probably God) in 1:12 is different from the one for αὐτοῦ in 1:25 (the one who perseveres).

²¹⁵ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 61–62.

²¹⁶ Guthrie and Taylor, “Structure,” 683–84.

²¹⁷ Guthrie and Taylor, 684.

Even if one sets aside their weaker points of support, the terms in the text highlighted by Taylor and Guthrie support a double-*inclusio* that forms the structure of Jas 1. They correctly point out that the statements at 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25 point to a future hope. The hope of being *mature and complete* (1:4) motivates the hearers to persevere through trial. Also, for those who persevere, love God, and obey the law, the hope lies in being *approved* (1:12), being *blessed* (1:12, 1:25) and receiving the *crown of life* (1:12). Thus, 1:12 serves as the *hinge* to this passage in of James, ending one *inclusio* and starting the next. The saying unifies the prologue in both structure and theme.

Furthermore, the connections between James 1:2–4 and 1:25 further support the argument that 1:2–25 function as a unit. The repetition of ἔργον and τέλειον in 1:4 and 1:25 serves to bracket the passage together. Also, a parallel exists between the call to consider it *all joy* (πᾶσαν χαράν) concerning *endurance* (ὑπομονήν/ὑπομονή) in 1:2–4 and the statement of *blessing* (μακάριος) on the one who *endures* (παραμείνας). We will discuss the content of Jas 1 considering the double-*inclusio* in Chapter 6.

4.1.2 Cohesion in 1:1–27

In this section, we will contend that James 1:1–27 has elements that bind the text together. Reed provides two broad categories for cohesive ties: (1) *organic ties*, which include conjunctive systems of language like particles, prepositions, and grammatical structures, and (2) *componential ties*, or connections of meaning that include *semantic chains*.²¹⁸

James 1:1 is a conventional Greek epistolary salutation, identifying the sender (Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος) and the recipient (ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ) and greeting (χαίρειν).²¹⁹ As discussed above, this opening supports the view that we can treat James as an epistle.

The end of the salutation connects to the next words, with χαίρειν and χαράν creating a cohesive tie. Dibelius states that James, which he categorises as paraenesis, is bound at times by *Stichwort-Verbindung*, or catchword connection, with the same words or cognates occurring in adjacent units.²²⁰ I have argued elsewhere that cohesion by catchword is not

²¹⁸ Reed, “Cohesiveness of Discourse,” 32–45.

²¹⁹ For a treatment of how each of these epistolary formulas impact the interpretation of Paul’s letters, see Weima, *Paul*, 11–50.

²²⁰ Dibelius, *Jakobus*, 21.

limited to paraenetic literature, but occurs across different genres in the Hebrew Bible, LXX, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Building on the work of scholars like Umberto Cassuto and H. Van Dyke Parunak, I show a consistent literary device of catchword connection that also occurs in James.²²¹ For example, the doubling of the root *לגמ* ties Numbers 5 together, and consecutive proverbs in Sirach 3 are connected by the catchword association of *honouring of one's father*.²²² James shows evidence of this literary device providing cohesion between 1:1 and 1:2, and we will examine other instances below.

The command in 1:2 concludes its thought at the end of 1:4. James 1:2–4 is a chain-saying that links one clause to the next using different cohesive ties. The command finds its basis in 1:3 with the connection of *γινώσκοντες ὅτι*. This phrase points forwards to the content in the rest of the sentence. The noun *ὑπομονήν* in 1:3 repeats in 1:4, along with the cohesive tie of *τέλειον-τέλειοι* in 1:4. The chain-saying concludes with *λειπόμενοι*.

The next subunit begins at James 1:5 and connects to the previous unit via the catchword *λείπω*. The unit starting at 1:5 continues until 1:8, as the componential tie of *asking God* runs through it. Besides, 1:5–8 is held together by *δέ* and *γάρ*, conjunctions that connect sentences and clauses. The conjunction *δέ* signals development of previous content,²²³ and *γάρ*, which introduces explanatory or inferential content,²²⁴ connects 1:6b and 1:7. The *man* (*ἄνθρωπος*) described in 1:7 connects to the *man* (*ἄνθρωπος*) in 1:8, while the descriptor *ἀκατάστατος* (1:8) is consistent with the imagery of the waves (1:6).²²⁵

James 1:2–4 and 1:5–8 are not only connected by catchword; they are also thematically connected through a componential tie of a theme common to these adjacent texts. The *wisdom* in 1:5–8 is a prerequisite of being *perfect and complete* (1:4), as indicated by the description of *lacking nothing*. Davids correctly identifies a connection between *perfection* and *wisdom*, which reflects Jewish tradition.²²⁶ Citing Wis 9:6, Hartin asserts that “an essential aspect of perfection is the possession of wisdom as the wisdom tradition has emphasized.”

²²¹ Eng, “Catchwords.”

²²² Eng, 253–54.

²²³ So Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 112–14.

²²⁴ Porter, *Idioms*, 207.

²²⁵ So Allison, *James*, 190.

²²⁶ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 54–56.

James 1:9–11 connects to the previous content through the organic tie δέ. As discussed above, δέ signals some development of previous content.²²⁷ The usage of δέ as a contrastive particle fits here, for the author denounces the behaviour of the double-minded in 1:8 but describes a future reward for the lowly in 1:9.²²⁸ Others see the δέ connecting 1:9–11 with 1:2–4. For example, Ropes asserts that the author “returns to the πειρασμοί of v. 2,” with the trials becoming an “elevation” for the lowly man in 1:9.²²⁹ Notably, Hort comments that 1:9 both returns to the original theme in 1:2 and contrasts with the “waverer” of 1:8 with δέ.²³⁰ In any case, one must account for δέ, as it signals a connection with previous content.

Placing James 1:12 within its chapter is a difficult task. Some connect it to the preceding content: either (1) completing an *inclusio* with 1:2–3,²³¹ (2) completing the thoughts from 1:9–11,²³² or (3) offering a summary of 1:2–11.²³³ Others connect it with what follows, with the term πειρασμός linked to its cognate πειράζω in 1:13–14.²³⁴ Still others designate 1:12 as isolated, with no connection to what precedes or what follows.²³⁵ However, it has an undeniable connection with 1:2–3, with the repetition of ὑπομένω, πειρασμός, and δόκιμος. While it does share a link with the πειρασμός-related language that follows, it has an echo in 1:25 with the blessed person (μακάριος) who perseveres (παραμένω). Thus, 1:12 most likely functions as an “overlapping” transition.²³⁶

James 1:2–12 has componential ties that hold it together. The strongest argument for componential ties linking together 1:2–12 is *syntactic similarity*,²³⁷ as each subsection (1:2–4, 5–8, 9–11) begins with an imperative which receives support through development. This pattern of *imperative/development* is not characteristic of the second half of James 1,

²²⁷ Bauer, “Δέ.”

²²⁸ Accordingly, Allison renders δέ as ‘but.’ See *James*, 200.

²²⁹ Ropes, *St. James*, 144.

²³⁰ Hort, *St. James*, 14.

²³¹ McCartney, *James*, 100.

²³² Johnson, *Letter of James*, 189–90.

²³³ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 106.

²³⁴ Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 84–86; Allison, *James*, 225. Francis and Davids consider 1:12 to be the opening of the second movement of the introduction, in the *joy-blessedness* paradigm. See Francis, “Form and Function,” 118; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 25–27.

²³⁵ Dibelius, *James*, 88; Moo, *Letter of James*, 69; Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 21. Notably, Codex Alexandrinus (A), with its *ekthesis* paragraph markers, has 1:12 stand alone as its own unit.

²³⁶ This has been argued by Guthrie and Taylor. See Guthrie, “James,” 204; Guthrie and Taylor, “Structure,” 684.

²³⁷ Parunak, “Transitional Techniques,” 528.

bolstering this view. Also, other componential ties link together 1:2–12. This text is linked together by the positive relationship between *affirmed behaviour* and *future reward*, found in 1:2–4, 5–8, 9–11, and 1:12. The pattern fits Parunak’s category of *logical* or *rhetorical similarity*, having similar relationships.²³⁸ Another componential tie, while not particular to 1:2–12, is a consistent thread of *eschatological context* runs through this section: the ultimate completeness (1:2–4), the way of reaching that goal (1:5–8), the reversals in 1:9–11,²³⁹ and the crown of life in 1:12.²⁴⁰

The connections between 1:2–4 and 1:12 lead Penner to propose a chiasmic arrangement in 1:2–12, with the *testing of the believer* (A, 1:2–4, 12) bracketing two units (1:5–8, 9–11).²⁴¹ However, Penner’s proposal derives from his view that 1:2–12 is a unit, not tied to what follows. Next, will continue examining 1:2–25 and the ties that hold it together as a unit.

Three factors support the plausibility of tying together 1:2–25 rather than the section ending at 1:12. First, an *inclusio* occurs at 1:12 and 1:25, with the repeated terms μακάριος and γενόμενος, and an expressed reward for *endurance* (ὑπομένω in 1:12 and παραμένω in 1:25). In view of the first *inclusio* (1:2–3, 12), Jas 1:12 serves as an overlap between 1:2–12 and 1:12–25. Second, as discussed above, (1) the repeated terms between 1:2–4 and 1:25, ἔργον and τέλειον, (2) the repeated concepts of *endurance* (ὑπομονή and παραμείνας) and (3) a favourable future all point to a large *inclusio*. Third, as we will see, the saying in 1:12 connects with the content after it.

James 1:12 connects to the following content through the catchword πειρασμός. I have argued that this is the clearest example of catchword association in James because of the different usages of this term. The repetition between 1:2–4 and 1:12 support the view that πειρασμός functions the same way in both, describing difficulty from an external source, or a *trial*. The use of the verb πειράζω in 1:13–14a, however, conveys a *temptation* from within, which is confirmed by 1:14b–15.²⁴² Nonetheless, the two usages have overlap, as both

²³⁸ Parunak, 528.

²³⁹ Allison comments, “it is only the eschatological future that makes real the difference between rich and poor.” See *James*, 213.

²⁴⁰ Taylor also detects the threads of the imperative and the eschatological content in 1:2–12. He especially notes that the third person imperative is repeated. See Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 103.

²⁴¹ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 144–45.

²⁴² Eng, “Catchwords,” 261–62.

connote a *test*. In both usages, a person is “put to the test.”²⁴³ Despite the semantic difference, one cannot overlook the connection between 1:12 and 1:13–14.²⁴⁴

As a result of the discussion above, it is best to see James 1:12 as a standalone saying that serves as a transition. James 1:12, as we have seen, has connections with the material immediately before and immediately after it. However, its connections reach farther in both directions, and its strong links with the beginning (1:2–4) and end (1:25) of James 1 suggest that it stands alone. Notably, Codex Alexandrinus, with its *ekthesis* paragraph markers, starts a new paragraph at both 1:12 and 1:13,²⁴⁵ indicating that at least one scribe considered 1:12 to stand alone.

James 1:13–18 has cohesiveness with both organic ties and componential ties. It has two parts, with 1:16 as a pause in between them. First, 1:13–15 is held together by a series of organic ties, including ὅτι, γάρ, δέ, καί, and εἶτα. These internal ties are remarkable given the frequency of asyndeton in James.²⁴⁶ Its componential ties include the repetition of the terms related to testing (πειραζόμενος, ἀπείραστος, πειράζει, πειράζεται). Also, it is held together by the life-cycle of sin, which starts with desire (ἐπιθυμία, 1:14) through a chain of events that ends in death (1:15).

Some assert that a section begins at James 1:16, based on the vocative ἀδελφοί μου, which signals new sections later in James (2:1, 3:1, 5:7).²⁴⁷ However, Jackson-McCabe rightly points out that this address alone cannot signal a new section, for it also occurs with units to “signal transitions or points of emphasis (2:5, 14; 3:10).”²⁴⁸ Furthermore, Runge explains that neither the exhortation μὴ πλανᾶσθε nor a “redundant vocative” like ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί adds any new information; they point forward to the more focal information

²⁴³ Bauer, “Πειράζω.”

²⁴⁴ Penner, who considers 1:13 to start the body of James, still recognises its catchword connection with 1:12. See Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 148 n1.

²⁴⁵ These paragraph markers are reflected in the Christian Standard Bible translation and the 2011 New International Version.

²⁴⁶ While asyndeton does not necessarily signal dissociation, the lack of an explicit connector makes any connection weaker than texts that have connectors. See Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 20–23. Varner demonstrates the common use of asyndeton in James by pointing out that 140 sentences in the epistle do not contain a single finite subordinate verb. See *James*, 19.

²⁴⁷ For example, see Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 71; Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 64. Varner applies this rule strictly and thus designates new units starting at 1:16 and 1:18. See Varner, *James*, 37–39.

²⁴⁸ Jackson-McCabe, “Enduring Temptation,” 165–66.

coming afterwards. Regarding James 1:16 in particular, Runge writes that it “does not introduce a new unit but highlights the principle that concludes the unit of vv. 13–18.”²⁴⁹

Runge correctly determines that the content after 1:16 continues the thought of 1:13–15. After the author strikes down the notion that God is the source of temptation (1:14), he affirms that God is instead the source of *good and perfect gifts* (1:17). With this development in view, the section probably begins at 1:13, which would be consistent with other segments in James 1 with an opening imperative (1:2, 5, 9, 13). However, some consider the command *not to be deceived* to be a conclusion to 1:13–15.²⁵⁰ Allison proposes a mediating view that the imperative in 1:16a should mark a transition. He rightly sees the connection between the two sections, paraphrasing the transition as “Do not go astray by supposing that God is the author of temptation but know rather this ...”²⁵¹ Ultimately, 1:13–15 and 1:17–18 have thematic ties, with *God* as the *source*, and the contrast between *no one* (1:13, μηδείς, οὐδένα) and *every* (1:17). It also shows cohesion, with a parallel between the lifecycle of sin in 1:15b and birthing imagery in 1:18. The verb ἀποκυέω in 1:18 is repeated from 1:15, setting up a contrast between human desire (ἐπιθυμία, 1:15) and the will of God (βουληθεῖς, 1:18).²⁵²

The affirmation that God gives good gifts in 1:17 has thematic solidarity with God birthing “us” in 1:18. Whether the birthing refers to (1) the NT concept of rebirth of Christians, (2) creation of humankind, or (3) the birth of Israel with the law,²⁵³ it affirms that God provides good things, connecting it to 1:17. Johnson calls 1:18 “the great demonstration of the conviction that he is the source of all good gifts.”²⁵⁴ Also, the depiction of God as a birthing *mother* in 1:18 is thematically tied to him as the *father* of lights in 1:17. The particularity of birthing imagery and mother/father language to these texts (themes which do not pervade the rest of the epistle) bolsters the case that these subsections are linked together.

Furthermore, James 1:13–18 contains thematic ties with previous content. A thematic connection exists between God giving gifts in 1:17 and God’s generosity in 1:5. Davids suggests that 1:17 refers to *wisdom from God* in 1:5 as the best possible gift to withstand the

²⁴⁹ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 101–7, 111–12, 118.

²⁵⁰ See, for example, Friedrich Spitta, who sees 1:16 as a warning against the “frevelhafter Behauptung” that God is the originator of temptation: Spitta, *Zur Geschichte*, 39. Cf. Cargal, *Restoring*, 81.

²⁵¹ Allison, *James*, 264–65.

²⁵² So McKnight, *Letter of James*, 130.

²⁵³ For an explanation of the three views, see Allison, *James*, 280–85; Laws, *Epistle of James*, 75–78.

²⁵⁴ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 197.

tests in 1:13–15.²⁵⁵ Whether or not Davids is correct, the theme of God as a giver of good things occurs in both texts. Also, the description of God as unchanging in 1:17 is consistent with the declaration that he “tempts no one” in 1:13.²⁵⁶ His unchanging nature also contrasts the unstable man in 1:8 and the fading rich man in 1:11.

The connection between 1:13–18 and 1:19 is controversial. Some see 1:2–18 as a unit, distinct from the following content. For example, Edgar ties 1:2–18 together based on the same root (πειρασμός, πειράζω, ἀπείραστος) as the dominant thread.²⁵⁷ Moo also unites 1:2–18 by the motif of trials, and the following section starting at 1:19 and ending at 2:26 based on “concern for obedience to his word.”²⁵⁸ Jackson-McCabe, while conceding some connection with preceding material, sees 1:19–27 as a distinct unit.²⁵⁹

Several cohesive ties support the view that the section continues beyond James 1:18. First, lexical ties²⁶⁰ exist between 1:13–18 and the content starting at 1:19. Both open with a third-person imperative, with the organic tie γάρ introducing an explanation that supports the command. Both discuss the contrast between God and man: God is not the source of man’s temptation (1:13–15), and man’s anger does not bring the righteousness of God (1:20). Furthermore, Taylor points out that κακῶν and κακίας associate the two sections.²⁶¹ He rightly identifies the similar language in both texts, with *every man* (πᾶς ἄνθρωπος) in 1:19 mirroring *every good giving and every perfect gift* (πᾶσα ... πᾶν) in 1:17. The term πᾶς will

²⁵⁵ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 88.

²⁵⁶ So Jackson-McCabe, “Enduring Temptation,” 166.

²⁵⁷ Edgar, *Chosen the Poor*, 158–60.

²⁵⁸ However, Moo concedes that the sections he delineates “are often mixed together with other themes.” See Moo, *Letter of James*, 45. Edgar likewise sees 1:2–18 as a unity, rejecting a differentiation in meaning between *trials* and *temptation* in 1:12 and 1:13. He also connects 1:9–11 to 1:2–4 and 1:12, as they begin with positive evaluations of negative human circumstances. However, this view appears forced because 1:9–11 devotes much more space to the negative rather than the positive, highlighting the ephemeral nature of riches.

²⁵⁹ Jackson-McCabe, “Enduring Temptation,” 169–70. He defends his view that 1:19–27 is distinct from 1:1–18 based on “practical consequences.” However, practical consequences are littered throughout 1:2–18, including 1:4, 5, 9–11, and 12. Also, he does not account for the other connections between 1:19–27 and previous content, including birth imagery, deception, and perseverance. He selectively uses the evidence from James 1, recognising that the “echoes” of testing and endurance between 1:2–4 and 1:12 indicate an *inclusio*, but does not consider what he calls the “fundamental” relationship between deeds and *blessedness* present in 1:2–4, 1:12 and 1:25 to indicate *inclusio(s)*. See Jackson-McCabe, 166.

²⁶⁰ See Parunak’s discussion on lexical similarity tying subunits together in “Transitional Techniques,” 528.

²⁶¹ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 106.

be used again in 1:21 (παῖσαν).²⁶² These are likely what Reed calls *relevant tokens*, repeated items that are not central to the text but give cohesiveness.²⁶³ The two texts also connect through the term λόγος, which appears in 1:18 and repeatedly in 1:21–23.²⁶⁴ Besides, Jas 1:16, 1:22, and 1:25, while not using the same verb, are linked by the concept of *deception*.

Also, 1:19 contains the organic tie δέ, which connects the present content to the previous.²⁶⁵ Neither Edgar, Moo, nor Jackson-McCabe mention this conjunction, but one must account for it.²⁶⁶ As discussed above, δέ either expresses *contrast* or *simple continuation*,²⁶⁷ and either possibility necessitates a connection between two texts.

Christopher Fresch shows from papyri that δέ signals a discourse transitioning to the next small unit while maintaining an “explicit continuative connection with what preceded.”²⁶⁸ Frank Scheppers notes that δέ often transitions to a “new step in a sequence...e.g. a Topic-Chain.”²⁶⁹

With the aforementioned work on δέ in view, it is most likely that this particle connects 1:19 to previous material. While the first part of 1:19 (Ἴστε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί) comes before δέ, the phrase is most likely anaphoric or cataphoric, not introducing material but pointing to other content. Either way, δέ cannot be referring to this address in the first part of 1:19, but likely relates to content further back, connecting 1:19 to previous material.

James 1:19 possibly develops 1:16–18 by calling for a response to God’s birthing.²⁷⁰ This would accord with Levisohn’s and Fresch’s work, and especially with Scheppers’ assertion that δέ signals the next link in a “topic-chain.” After the author corrects the notion that God is the source of temptation that leads to sin, he urges his hearers to know that God is

²⁶² Taylor, 105.

²⁶³ Reed, “Cohesive Ties,” 139.

²⁶⁴ I have identified λόγος as a catchword-connection in “Catchwords,” 262.

²⁶⁵ Also pointed out by Tsuji, *Glaube*, 62.

²⁶⁶ Cheung recognises the continuative sense of δέ, but curiously still makes a distinction between 1:2–18 and 1:19–27. See Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 65–66.

²⁶⁷ Runge shows NT examples of both. For example, in 1 Cor 12:3–7, δέ signals development, but not necessarily contrast. See *Discourse Grammar*, 28, 35. Also see Levinsohn, who shows the development signalled by δέ in 1 Tim 4:8, 2 Tim 1:5, 2 Tim 2:20, and 1 Tim 3:5. See *Discourse Features*, 54.

²⁶⁸ Fresch, “Discourse Markers,” 32–33. He confirms this same usage of δέ in the LXX Book of the Twelve.

²⁶⁹ Scheppers, *The Colon Hypothesis*, 413.

²⁷⁰ Ursula Kaiser proposes that 1:15–18 and 1:19–21 are connected by *the word of God*, and the *birthing metaphor* continuing from 1:15 and 1:18, rendering ἔμφυτος as *implanted*. See Kaiser, “Innate Word,” 464.

the source of good things (1:13–18). In 1:19, the author provides the *alternative* to sin: a threefold command to act righteously. Indeed, Hort and Jackson-McCabe see the conjunction δέ signalling a connection to previous material: the doctrine of the generous and birthing God now appears, to which the hearers are to respond with right praxis.

To be sure, the presence of development does not by itself necessitate that the material starting in 1:19 as part of the same unit. However, the expressed connection through δέ in non-narrative text constrains the content, signalling a new step or development based on the preceding material.²⁷¹ This usage of the conjunction, along with the proximity of the developing content, supports the notion that the content beginning in 1:19 belongs to the same unit as 1:13–18, and ultimately 1:2–18. The development signalled by δέ, the logical progression of the practical implications of the word, and the lexical ties discussed above support a cohesive unit.

The content beginning at James 1:19 has cohesive ties that extend this unit to 1:26. The author gives a threefold practical response to the birthing by the word in 1:19: *quick to hear, slow to speak, and slow to become angry*. These three parts are each developed in the following content. The third element, *slow to anger*, is developed with the warning that anger does not produce the righteousness of God (1:20). Rather than having anger (ὀργή), the hearers of James are to display *gentleness* (πραΰτης, 1:21) which LSJ fittingly specifies as the opposite of ὀργή.²⁷² The contrast between πραΰτης and anger appears in Add Esth 5:1, which describes the king’s face turn from *rage* (θυμός) to πραΰτης. Also, *Jos. Asen.* 23:8–10 depicts a contrast between the ὀργή of Simeon and the *gentle* (πραῦς) face of Levi.

The first part of the threefold command, *quick to hear*, receives development in James 1:22–25 indicated by the organic tie δέ. The nouns ἀκροατής (*hearer*) and ποιητής (*doer*) each appear three times in 1:22–25, giving the passage cohesion. The author urges his hearers to go beyond hearing, becoming doers (ποιηταί). The concept of *hearing* linking 1:22–25 back to 1:19, and λόγος (1:22, 23) creates cohesion with the occurrences in 1:18 and 1:21.

James 1:22–25 also contains elements connected to its surrounding content. The call to obedience contrasts the cycle of sin in 1:13–15. Also, a warning against being *deceived* (1:22) also occurs at 1:16 and 1:26, giving cohesion to this passage. As discussed above,

²⁷¹ So Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 118.


²⁷² *πραΰτης* is an alternate spelling of *πραΰτης*. See Liddell and Scott, “Πραΰτης.” Donald D. Walker further elucidates *πραΰτης* vis-à-vis ὀργή in Hellenistic literature. See *Paul’s Offer*, 54–55, 336.

λόγος unites these units through a semantic chain. Also, Taylor points out that ἄνδρoς appears in 1:20 and 1:23, connecting the two sections.²⁷³

As discussed above, James 1:25 completes the double-*inclusio* that includes 1:2–4 and 1:12. The repetition of μακάριος links this saying back to 1:12, as well as the concept of *endurance* (ὑπομένει and παραμείνας) and the term γενόμενος. Also, 1:25 connects to 1:2–4, with the repetition of *endurance* (ὑπομονή, 1:3–4), τέλειος (twice in 1:4) and ἔργον (1:4, cf. κατεργάζομαι in 1:3), and the favourable state for the one who endures.

James 1:26–27 concludes the opening chapter, with connections to previous content. They connect by a chain of three instances of θρησκός/θρησκεία. Jas 1:26 contains development of the second element of 1:19: *slow to speak*, linking being *pious* (θρησκός) with *bridling one’s tongue*. Again, the theme of warning against *deception* (1:16, 22) is repeated here, creating a *semantic chain* that is a *relevant token*, as the theme occurs in different contexts.²⁷⁴ The thematic tie of a *warning against deception* is especially notable because it is not pervasive in the rest of the epistle. Also, the designation of God as the *father* (πατήρ) associates 1:27 with *father of lights* in 1:17. This designation may point to his status as creator of all things: not just of the heavenly lights, but also of the fatherless and the widows.²⁷⁵

From the cohesive ties we have delineated above, we have made a case that James 1 is a unit of subsections that display cascading and overlapping connections. The connections we have discussed can be diagrammed in this manner:



²⁷³ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 106.

²⁷⁴ Reed, “Cohesive Ties,” 138. Allison also sees the connections between 1:26–27 and the previous material, highlighting the importance of *doing* in 1:22–25 and the *purity language* and content about *speech* in 1:19–21. See *James*, 351.

²⁷⁵ So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 103; Ng, “Father-God,” 53. Ng makes a thorough case that the designation *father* is not simply used because of convention, but as a deliberate choice by the author of James to emphasise God’s role as creator, carer, and judge.

As we have discussed above, James 1:1–27 contains cohesive ties that hold this passage together as a unit. Each subunit has connections with the content immediately preceding it and the content following it. There are *organic ties*, like prepositions and conjunctions, that link the sayings together. There are *componential ties*, such as chains of words and concepts that add cohesiveness. Also, numerous ties connect non-adjacent sections, strengthening the cohesion of 1:1–27.

Furthermore, there are no organic ties that link 1:26–27 with 2:1, supporting a clearer and stronger break between 1:27 and 2:1 than between the subunits of James 1. James 2:1 begins a section that discusses *favouritism*, *faith*, and the *rich and poor*. These themes are introduced in James 1, but not at its latter end. Also, as Taylor has correctly pointed out, the subject, verbal mood, person, and number all shift between 1:27 and 2:1.²⁷⁶ In the next section, we will present more reasons for seeing 1:1–27 as a section that stands alone in James.

4.1.3 The Literary Character of James 1

This section argues for the distinct literary character of the opening chapter of James. In addition to the ties that hold the text together, Jas 1:1–27 displays discernible attributes vis-à-vis the rest of the content of James that allows it to stand as a section.

First, the exhortative sections in Jas 1:1–27 are discernibly *shorter* than the rest of the document. In other words, the content of James 1 displays a *staccato* nature, with short sayings that make this section distinct from the rest of the epistle. Earlier, I argued that James 1 consists of nine subsections, including the epistolary greeting (1:1).

Second, there is a detectible *shift in literary character* at Jas 2:1. As discussed above, the sections are markedly different from this point. The epistle displays a “change of pace” beginning at James 2, with more extended cohesive parts, and the sentences within them having more development.²⁷⁷ Also, the content starting at 2:1 resembles treatises with significant development. James 2:14–26, for example, includes a hypothetical example and two Old Testament examples showing the connection between faith and deeds, all set within a diatribe-style exchange (see 2:18). Furthermore, the sections after James 1 generally have a

²⁷⁶ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 51.

²⁷⁷ Longacre indicates that variation in the length of clauses and paragraphs signals a shift in narrative literature. See Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse*, 32. Varner appeals to this principle to set apart Romans 12:9–21 as a distinct unit. See Varner, *Book of James*, 23.

narrower scope than the content in the opening chapter of James, such as favouritism (2:1–13), faith and deeds (2:14–26), or speech-ethics (3:1–12).

4.1.4 Reflection on the Unity of James 1

We have built a case that James 1:1–27 is a distinct literary unit. First, we examined the connections between 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25, which support a double-*inclusio*. Jas 1:12 serves as a “hinge” that concludes the first half and transitions to the second half of the literary unit. Also, the connections between 1:2–4 and 1:25, some of which are distinct from 1:12, support a grand *inclusio* for the entire passage. Second, we examined the cohesive ties that hold 1:1–27 together. Each subunit connects to the adjacent one and other subunits within the epistle’s opening chapter. Also, some subunits sum up previous content or preview the following content. I have argued that both organic ties and componential ties hold 1:1–27 together. Third, we examined the literary character of James 1 in comparison with the rest of the epistle. The subunits are short; together they form a unique section in the epistle. Also, there is a discernible shift at Jas 2:1. In the next section, I will contend that 1:1–27 has an introductory function for James.

4.2 The Introductory Nature of James 1

Building on the argument that James 1:1–27 is a distinct unit, we will now contend that it serves as the introductory prologue of James. First, similar elements in other documents point to the plausibility that James contains an introduction. Second, there are concepts in Jas 1 that also appear later in the epistle. Third, with the major themes of Jas 2–5 as a starting point, I will show how these occur in the opening content of Jas 1. Fourth, and most importantly, I will respond to views that the introduction to James ends in a place other than 1:27.

4.2.1 Support from Other Documents for an Introduction

Similar documents demonstrate the plausibility that James contains an introductory prologue. For this study, an *introductory prologue* is a distinct section with words and concepts that are repeated and developed later in the text. Since James is categorised with

Greek letters,²⁷⁸ speeches,²⁷⁹ and paraenetic wisdom literature,²⁸⁰ we will examine support for introductory prologues in these genres.

Since James has epistolary elements, one can look at the place and role of introductory sections in ancient Greek letters. After the epistolary opening, the body-opening of Greek letters sets a foundation for the remaining content, typically introduces the letter's occasion.²⁸¹ Pauline epistles typically contain a section after the salutation that previews the main topics of the epistle. Often included in a formulaic section of thanksgiving,²⁸² it either introduces new concepts or reminds the audience of previous communication.²⁸³ Examples of this include Rom 1:13; Gal 1:6–14; and 1 Cor 1:10–16.

Francis demonstrates that both occasional and secondary²⁸⁴ Hellenistic letters often contain introductory content stating the thematic material twice, under the “rubrics” of blessing and rejoicing. He demonstrates this two-fold introduction in Josephus *Ant.* 8:50–54, Eusebius *Praep. Ev.* 9:33–34 (both Josephus and Eusebius record letters between Solomon and Hiram), 1 Macc 10:25–45 (a letter from Demetrius to the Jews), Phlm 4–7, as well as 1 John. Francis identifies this double-introduction pattern in James, with *joy* (χαρά, 1:2) and *blessing* (μακάριος, 1:12).²⁸⁵

Furthermore, the Greek letter body-opening often begins with a “disclosure formula” highlighting a form of the word “to know.” Disclosure formulas can also be seen elsewhere in the NT (Phil 1:12; Jude 5; 1 Thess 1:4) and papyri.²⁸⁶ James fits this criterion since the first command in James is grounded in knowledge (γινώσκοντες, 1:3).

James also shows evidence that it was intended to be read aloud, which would point to an association with ancient speeches and homilies. It displays alliteration (such as πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις, 1:2), repetition (Ἄγε νῦν in both 4:13 and 5:1), assonance (εἰρηνική,

²⁷⁸ So Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 13; Wachob, *Voice of Jesus*, 3–7; McCartney, *James*, 40.

²⁷⁹ So Moo, *Letter of James*, 8; Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 386.

²⁸⁰ So Dibelius, *James*, 3; Perdue, “Paraenesis”; Johnson, *Letter of James*, 18–19.

²⁸¹ White, *Form and Function*, 33.

²⁸² O’Brien, *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*, 15; Weima, *Paul*, 59, 64. Weima demonstrates how 1 Thess 1:2–10 functions as a “preview of coming attractions.”

²⁸³ White, *Form and Function*, 156. Todd C. Penner also cites Phlm 7–14 and Phil 1:12–18. See *James and Eschatology*, 139.

²⁸⁴ That is, letters which lack situational immediacy.

²⁸⁵ Francis, “Form and Function,” 110–26.

²⁸⁶ White shows a disclosure formula in papyri, including P.Mich. I 6 l. 1, P.Tebt. 764 l.15ff, and BGU 846 l.5f. White, *Ancient Letters*, 207; White, *Form and Function*, 11–15.

ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, 3:17), and rhyme (ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος, 3:17),²⁸⁷ all of which are more prominent in speech than the written word. Rhetorical devices of speeches include the *exordium*, which serves to “set forth the order of the points which have to be treated (Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.8.11).”²⁸⁸ Even if the James does not fit with speeches, virtually all fields of Greco-Roman learning contain an *epitome*, or a systematic summary.²⁸⁹

Dibelius influentially categorised James as *paraenesis*, maintaining that documents of this genre have no purposeful structure.²⁹⁰ However, subsequent studies have demonstrated that paraenetic material often contains more structure than Dibelius claims. For example, 1 Pet 2:13–17 and Rom 12:3–16 serve as sections that preview subsequent paraenetic content. Ecclesiastes and Sirach each contain opening content that provides a scheme for the rest of the material.²⁹¹ Thus, paraenesis can include an introductory prologue.

Each of the genres in which one could likely categorise James displays examples of introductory sections. These studies suggest the possibility that the opening of James functions to preview the rest of the document. Next, we will examine the content of James 1 that occur later in the epistle.

²⁸⁷ Cf. Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 389; Allison, *James*, 83–84. Allison also highlights the “more oral” environment of the NT (78 n419.) He appeals to how sounds inform interpretive possibilities, discussed by Dean, “Grammar of Sound,” 53–70.

²⁸⁸ Butler, *Quintilian: Institutio Oratoria: Books I - III*, 484–85. Witherington identifies Jas 1:2–18 as the *exordium*. See Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 419. For similar views, see Frankemölle, “Semantische Netz,” 183–84; Baasland, “Literarische Form,” 3654, 3659.

²⁸⁹ Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 85. Johnson thus views the epistle’s opening as the *epitome*, categorising James as protreptic discourse in the form of a letter. See *Letter of James*, 15, 24.

²⁹⁰ Dibelius maintained that James, like the sayings of Jesus, contains sayings loosely joined together. See *James*, 3.

²⁹¹ Hermann von Lips cites Rom 12:3–16, 1 Pet 2:13–17, and Isocrates *Demon.* 13–16. While all three passages contain seemingly disconnected admonitions, von Lips demonstrates that each displays an *inclusio* and introduces the major concepts of the paraenetic material that follows. He also cites Ps.-Phoc. 3–8 and Did. 1:1–2 as other paraenetic texts that function as an introduction. He concludes that James likewise displays an introductory *inclusio* of Jas 1:2–12 framed by ὑπομονή, πειρασμός, and δόκιμος. See *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 412–14. Cheung furthers the work of von Lips, showing that the opening of Sirach, Pseudo-Phocylides, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, 4Q184 and 4QInstruction often outlines the rest of the content, and the closing recapitulates the opening. See Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 34–36.

4.2.2 Concepts in James 1 that Occur Later in the Epistle

This section will discuss the content of James 1, connecting it with concepts that occur later. Our examination will support the view that 1:2–27 serves as an introductory prologue for James.

4.2.2.1 James 1:2–4

James 1:2–4 introduces motifs which will recur later in the document. The first of these is *testing*, which will occur in 1:12–14 and the traditions alluded to in 2:21.²⁹² Second, this section introduces the concept of *faith*, an essential element in James 2. Third, *perseverance* (1:3, 4) appears later in 1:12, 1:25, and 5:11. Fourth, the concept of *completeness* (1:4) repeats later (1:15, 17, 25; 2:8, 22; 3:2; 5:11). In addition to *πειρασμός*, *δοκίμιον*, *πίστις*, *ὑπομονή*, and *τέλειος*, 1:2–4 introduces the term *ἔργον*, cognates of which recur in the rest of James (2:9, 14–26; 3:13; 5:16).

Rather than an opening thanksgiving found in many NT epistles, the author issues a command (Jas 1:2–3). The hearers are to rejoice when they face *πειρασμός*. The author then gives the foundation of this joy, that the *δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως* produces *perseverance* (*ὑπομονή*).

The opening exhortation introduces the concept that one's response to present circumstances will be the basis of future judgment. The appeal to have joy in the face of testing is consistent with Sir 2:1–5 and 1 Pet 1:6–7, which also link rejoicing with testing. Including Jas 1:2–4, all three passages contain the concept of a favoured future state. Also, the contrast between persevering and succumbing to temptation (see 1:14–15) is one of a string of contrasts that runs through James. We will discuss these contrasts more as we discuss *eschatological approval* in the epistle.

4.2.2.2 James 1:5–8

Several motifs are introduced in James 1:5–8. The *generosity* of God, which occurs again in James 1:16–18, is the exemplary virtue for the hearer in 2:14–15. *Faith* appears again in this section, as one who asks God in faith will receive wisdom. The concept of *prayer* is revisited in 4:2–3 (*αἰτέω*) and 5:13–18 (*προσεύχομαι*). In this passage, the *contrast*

²⁹² Scholars like Davids and Francis (see Chapter 1) have shown that the concept *testing* is repeated without the repetition of the word itself.

to faith is the activity described by διακρίνω, a term which will be used again in 2:4. The antithesis of the one asking God in faith is the man who is δίψυχος (*double-minded* or *double-souled*), an adjective used later (4:8) to refer to those who need purification.

4.2.2.3 James 1:9–11

In James 1:9–11, the author introduces the major motif of an *eschatological reversal*. This section, which echoes Jer 9:23–24, calls to mind the faithfulness of God and hope for a future reckoning.²⁹³ Future judgment, as we will discuss later, occurs multiple times in James. As they contrast the *rich* in this section, the *humble* or *lowly* (ταπεινός) are often associated with the *poor*,²⁹⁴ who are the chosen heirs of the kingdom (Jas 2:5). Those caring for the poor are in God's favour (1:27) while those not caring for them are condemned (2:1–6, 14–17; 5:1–6). The rich will be brought low in the end. This reversal appears again in the quotation of Prov 3:34 in Jas 4:6 and the description of the coming misery on the rich in 5:1–6. The ephemeral nature of wealth occurs again in 5:2–6 and is connected to 4:15–16. Also, the term καυχάομαι (*boast*) and related words repeat in James (2:13; 3:5, 14; 4:16).

4.2.2.4 James 1:12

Several motifs are reinforced in James 1:12. *Perseverance through testing*, introduced in 1:2–4, is repeated in 1:12, as well as a *future state* for the one who perseveres. *Perseverance* occurs again in 5:11 with the OT example of Job. God's promise of an *eschatological reward* for those who love him appears again in 2:5. We will examine this reward later.

Notably, three keywords mentioned above—ὑπομένω, πειρασμός, and δόκιμος—are repeated from 1:2–3, now connected with a description of the *reward* for the one who perseveres: a *crown*. The description of blessing (μακάριος) for the one persevering also occurs at 1:25 and 5:11.

²⁹³ Drake Williams argues for the connection with Jer 9:23–24 (LXX 9:22–23), contending that the *rich* are God's people as well. See Williams, "Of Rags and Riches," 273–82.

²⁹⁴ Lockett presents the dynamics in view of the debate concerning the identity of the *rich* and *poor* in James. See Lockett, *Introduction*, 28–31.

4.2.2.5 James 1:13–18

James 1:13–18 introduces new content that will appear later in the epistle. The concept of the root of sin as *inner desire* recurs in the treatise on partiality (Jas 2:1–6), the warning against earthly wisdom (3:14–16), and the addressing of fights and quarrels (4:1–4). The imagery of giving birth to sin and death is contrasted later with the imagery of God begetting his people (1:18).

The term ἁμαρτία and its cognates also repeat through James, often in connection with loyalty to God and his commands (Jas 2:9; 4:8, 17; 5:15, 16, 20). The motif of death also recurs in James, describing faith without deeds (2:26), the effect of evil usage of the tongue (3:8) and the destiny of one who strays from the truth (5:20).

As stated above, James 1:17 returns to the topic of God as the source of good things, first mentioned in 1:5. God generously gives the *crown of life* to the persevering one (1:12), *brings his people into being* by the word of truth (1:18), implants the *word* in them (1:19), gives the *kingdom* as an inheritance (2:5), and gives grace to the humble (4:6). The unchanging character of God in 1:17 stands in contrast with the instability (ἀκατάστατος) of the double-minded man (1:8) and evil use of the tongue (3:8).

The author again uses the imagery of birthing in James 1:18, referring to God, who brought forth the hearers through the *word of truth*. In the context of the life cycle imagery of human desire giving birth to sin and death (1:15), this birthing could either refer (1) to *initial creation* or (2) to the *rebirth* into Christianity.²⁹⁵ Thus, this section introduces the foundational nature of the word (λόγος) of God for his hearers. This term will be used several more times in the introductory content (1:21, 22, 23). The truth (ἀλήθεια) of God's word appears again in 3:14 and 5:19.

4.2.2.6 James 1:19–25

James 1:19–25 introduces the motif of *speech-ethics*, which will be frequently revisited in the document: one must be careful in speech, as the various examples show (1:13; 2:3, 11, 16; 3:1–12; 4:13). Also, one will be judged according to how one speaks (2:12; 4:11; 5:12).

Other motifs are introduced in James 1:19–25. The *anger of man* appears in James 1:20, which will occur in 4:1–3 and possibly at 5:8. Furthermore, this section introduces the

²⁹⁵ The outcome of the birthing is *firstfruits*, which is often used in a soteriological sense in Christian literature. We will discuss this connotation later.

concepts of *righteousness* and *justification*, which play a crucial role in 2:21–25, and are mentioned in other places as well (3:18; 5:6, 16). The call to put away *filth* (ῥυπαρία) previews the religion that is pure and *undefiled* (Jas 1:27) and the condition of being near to God (4:8). Again, the λόγος of God is in view here (Jas 1:21), which can save one’s soul. The concept of *saving* or *rescuing* in the verb σώζω is introduced here and used through the document (2:14; 4:12; 5:15, 20).

The exhortation to be *slow to speak* stands in contrast with God’s word (λόγος) and the law (νόμος). The repeated connections of James with Lev 19 show that the author has the Jewish law in mind.²⁹⁶ Furthermore, the many echoes of the sayings of Jesus in James,²⁹⁷ especially with the Sermon on the Mount/Plain, reaffirm Jesus’ teaching of adherence to the law (Matt 22:37–40) in keeping the two greatest commandments: love for God (Jas 1:12; 2:5) and love for one’s neighbour (Lev 19:18b; Jas 2:8).²⁹⁸ Thus, the word is to be received (1:21) and obeyed (1:22–23), for these actions will lead to blessing.

Finally, the author introduces the concept that one is to be a doer of the word, not just a hearer. Being a doer of the word occurs again in Jas 2:14–26, as obedience to the commands leads to future blessing.

4.2.2.7 James 1:26–27

The two transition statements in James 1:26 *preview* the longer sections to come. They can be seen as a reversed table of contents for the content immediately following, since the major concepts (bridling the tongue, caring for the poor) in 1:26–27 appear in reverse order later in the epistle (2:1–26; 3:1–12).²⁹⁹

Also, the bridling of the tongue in James 1:26 will appear frequently in other places (1:13, 19; 2:3, 13, 16; 4:11–12). The appeal to the heart (καρδία) reprises the inner self in 1:8 and 1:14, which receives elaboration in 3:11–12, 3:14, and 4:1. James 1:27 also contains the

²⁹⁶ Johnson points out seven connections between James and Lev 19:12–18. See Johnson, “Leviticus 19 in James,” 399.

²⁹⁷ Bauckham maintains that James is a teacher in Jewish wisdom tradition guided by the teachings of Jesus. See *Wisdom of James*, 30. Hartin emphasises that James has “more connections with the sayings of Jesus than with any other New Testament writing.” See *Spirituality*, 2.

²⁹⁸ Foster argues that νόμος in James refers to the “new Torah” as taught by Jesus, expressed in the double love command. See *Exemplars*, 55–56.

²⁹⁹ So Francis, “Form and Function,” 118.

language of purity and cleanliness, which appears to recur in the context of the improper use of the tongue (3:6) as well as the call to repent (4:8).

4.2.2.8 Summary

In the content above, we observe that the major words and concepts introduced in James 1 recur in the rest of the text of James. These observations support the claim that the opening chapter serves as an introductory prologue of James, which previews the rest of its content. Next, with the major themes of Jas 2–5 as a starting point, we will examine how these occur in James 1.

4.2.3 The Major Concepts of James 2–5 Appear in 1:2–27

This section gives further support to the view that James 1 is the introductory prologue by taking key concepts from Jas 2–5 and demonstrating that all of them occur in Jas 1. After all, one might object to the view that James 1 is the prologue, stating that it may only contain a *minority* of the concepts in the body. If Jas 1 omits major topics in Jas 2–5, it would undermine the argument that Jas 1 functions to introduce the fundamental concepts of the epistle. Thus, a delineation of the major topics of Jas 2–5 is to determine if all or most of them occur in Jas 1. While the previous two sections used Jas 1 as a starting point, I will take the inverse approach in this section, using James 2–5 as a point of departure, showing that the main ideas from each section are indeed introduced in 1:2–27.

The approach of the chart below is based on the inductive study taken by Hubert Frankemölle, who produced a detailed matrix of the key terms in James. Beginning with keywords like *Gott*, *geben*, and *Werk* found in the body of James, he shows how each term is introduced in the prologue.³⁰⁰ The method used for compiling the chart below, which starts from the body of the epistle, focuses on *general concepts* rather than *words*. While terms and their cognates do not always appear in other parts of the epistle, this chart supports the notion that the *concept* described in James first occurs in 1:2–27. For example, *impartiality* is a major idea of 2:1–9, and this concept appears in 1:5 with the affirmation that God gives to all without reproach.

³⁰⁰ The matrix is printed as a wide fold-out sheet inserted at the end of the journal issue. Frankemölle determines that the *exordium* of 1:2–18 announces major concepts of the letter. See Frankemölle, “semantische Netz,” 184.

The observations from this examination will allow us to affirm the *boundaries* of the introductory content on the initial chapter as it prepares the hearer for the material in the rest of the letter. It will also show the *encompassing nature* of 1:2–27 in introducing every major concept of James 2–5.

Major Concept in James 2–5	Introduced in Jas 1:2–27
Impartiality (2:1–9)	God gives to all without reproaching (1:5)
Caring for the needy (2:3–7, 2:15)	Visiting orphans and widows (1:27)
Adherence to the law (2:8–13)	Being a doer of the word, persevering in the law (1:22–25)
Testing and completing of faith by deeds (2:14–26)	Testing of faith, completing of work (1:2–4) Being a doer of the word (1:22–25)
Bridling of the tongue (3:1–12)	Being slow to speak (1:19) Bridling the tongue (1:26)
Wisdom from above (3:13–18)	Asking God for wisdom (1:5)
Anger, strife, desire (4:1–5)	Temptation from desire (1:13–15) Slow to anger (1:19)
God raises the lowly (4:6, 10)	The lowly will be exalted (1:9)
Cleansing and purifying (4:8)	Religion that is pure and undefiled (1:27)
There is one lawgiver and judge (4:11–12)	The word of truth/the law comes from God (1:18, 1:21)
Warnings against the rich boasting (4:13–5:6)	The rich must boast in their humiliation (1:9–11)
Coming judgment, a blessing for the steadfast (5:7–11)	Reversal between rich and lowly (1:9–11) Blessing for the steadfast (1:12)
Usage of speech (5:12)	Slow to speak (1:19) Bridling the tongue (1:26)
The power of prayer (5:13–18)	Asking the generous God (1:5)
Adherence to the truth (5:19–20)	Word of truth is from God (1:18, 21)

The chart above supports a case that the major concepts that occur in the body of James are introduced in varying degrees in 1:2–27. These observations further support the demarcation of 1:2–27 as the introductory prologue.

4.2.4 Responding to the Views that the Introduction Ends at 1:12 or 1:18

Earlier, we discussed how James 1:1–27 contains cohesive ties that unite its subsections together. In this section, I will respond to the views that the *introductory nature* of the opening portion of James ends at a place other than Jas 1:27. In responding to these views, we will present the strongest arguments for the introductory nature of all of James 1. Even if we set aside the detectable literary shift that occurs at 2:1 and the connective particle

δέ in 1:19, there are multiple reasons to hold the view that the prologue of James extends to 1:27 rather than ending at 1:12 or 1:18.

Some scholars view James 1:2–12 as the introduction to the epistle. This view has merit because, as we observe above, 1:2–12 previews many of the major concepts of the epistle. Proponents of this view tend to pair the opening content of James with its closing content, arguing for a *grand inclusio* in the entire document. For example, Elliott proposes that the introduction of 1:2–12 pairs with 5:13–20 as the conclusion, since the latter echoes material from the former.³⁰¹ Penner limits the introduction to 1:2–12 as well but contends that the body-conclusion of James is 4:6–5:12.³⁰² Penner’s argument derives from the work of von Lips, who provides a full list of parallels between 1:2–12 and the rest of the epistle.³⁰³ Drawing from these observations, von Lips designates 1:2–12 as a summary-like exposition.³⁰⁴

While James 1:2–12 is introductory in nature, the view that the introduction is limited to 1:2–12 does not account for the content following it also functioning in the same manner. Significant concepts and keywords in James do not appear until 1:13–27. As discussed above, the motif of *desire leading to sin* first appears in 1:13–15 and recurs in 4:1–5. The keyword *πλανάω* in 1:16 recurs in 5:19–20, which ironically fits the criteria used by Elliott and Penner to indicate introductory content. The term *λόγος* occurs in 1:18 and continues in 1:21–23, and appears again in 3:2. Thus, we observe evidence that the introduction extends past 1:12.

Proponents of James 1:2–18 as the introduction to the epistle base their view on the unity of the passage based on *trials* or *temptation*. For example, Edgar contends that 1:2–18 serves as the introductory unit of James, pointing out that the same root (*πειρασμός, πειράζω, ἀπείραστος*) appears in both 1:12 and 1:13–15.³⁰⁵ Later, while admitting that 1:19–27 includes several major concepts that recur later in James, he considers it distinct from 1:2–18. He applies Aristotelian guidelines for speeches to James, contending that 1:2–18 is the *exordium*, preparing the hearers for what follows and “rendering the hearers well disposed.” He views 1:19–27 as a *prothesis* of sorts, introducing the concepts of 2:1–3:12.³⁰⁶ Moo

³⁰¹ Elliott, “James in Rhetorical and Social Scientific Perspective,” 71.

³⁰² Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 143–49.

³⁰³ von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 415.

³⁰⁴ “Summarische Exposition.” (von Lips, 422.)

³⁰⁵ Edgar, *Chosen the Poor*, 139.

³⁰⁶ Edgar, 158–60. Edgar does recommend caution in taking rhetorical guidelines meant for speeches and applying them to written documents.

considers 1:2–18 to be the opening section, also arguing that the motif of trials unifies the section. He holds that 1:19–27 is part of a section extending to 2:26, united by “concern for obedience to his word.”³⁰⁷ As cited above, Frankemölle argued based on his chart that the prologue of James is 1:2–18. He contends that the *exordium* of James is 1:2–18, which announces major concepts of the letter. In similar fashion to Penner and Elliott, he pairs the introduction (*exordium*) with 5:7–20, which he calls the *peroratio*, providing a scheme for reading the letter.³⁰⁸

While James 1:2–18 displays the attributes observed by Edgar, Moo, and Frankemölle, this view does not account for the content in 1:19–27 functioning in the same manner. Many of the significant concepts of the body of James do not occur in Jas 1 until 1:19 or later,³⁰⁹ including *the use of speech, the law, and purity*. While Frankemölle’s approach to James is straightforward, the evidence he presents does not support his assertion that the introductory content ends at Jas 1:18. His matrix of James’ key terms associates each of them with content in 1:2–18.³¹⁰ However, it also reveals eight repeated concepts and keywords in James that are absent from 1:2–18. Of these eight, six of them appear in 1:19–27. Thus, it follows that expanding the bounds of the prologue would cover most of the thematic terms that Frankemölle identifies.³¹¹ For example, controlling the tongue (3:1–12; 4:11; 5:12) is introduced in 1:19 and reiterated at 1:26.

Edgar’s conclusion that the prologue ends at James 1:18 derives from his view that the opening content establishes favour with the hearers like an Aristotelian *exordium* does. However, 1:25, which falls outside Edgar’s designated *exordium*, communicates a positive outcome for the one who perseveres in the law; it fits his criterion. Also, the ominous and

³⁰⁷ However, Moo concedes that the thematic sections he delineates “are often mixed together with other themes.” See Moo, *Letter of James*, 45. Edgar likewise sees 1:2–18 as a unit, rejecting a semantic difference between terms having the same root-word (*trials* and *temptation*) in 1:12 and 1:13–15. He also connects 1:9–11 to 1:2–4 and 1:12 through positive evaluations of seemingly negative human circumstances. However, this view appears forced because 1:9–11 addresses the negative much more than the positive, highlighting the ephemeral nature of riches.

³⁰⁸ Frankemölle, “semantische Netz,” 174–78.

³⁰⁹ Contra Frankemölle, who limits the *exordium* to 1:2–18.

³¹⁰ Frankemölle, “semantische Netz,” 184.

³¹¹ It can be argued that the two remaining terms are still introduced in 1:2–27. Frankemölle shows that *seht ein, Herz, Seele, retten, Gebot/Gesetz, and Zunge* first appear in 1:19–27. One remaining term is *Jesus Christus*, which does occur in 1:1 and 2:1. The other key term is *arm* (poor), which can be associated with *demütig* (lowly) in 1:9 and the *orphan and widow* in 1:27. See his foldout matrix in Frankemölle, “semantische Netz.”

condemnatory nature of 1:6–8 and 1:13–15 do not fit Edgar’s assessment that 1:2–18 inclines the hearers towards the author. Furthermore, his view that 1:19–27 introduces 2:1–3:12 does not account for impartiality (2:1–9) introduced as an attribute of God in 1:5 and the testing of faith (2:14–26) introduced in 1:2–4. Jas 1:19–27 also introduces concepts and keywords found in 3:13 and following, including anger (1:19, 4:1–15), purifying (1:27; 4:8), and righteousness (δικαιοσύνη, δίκαιος—1:20; 3:18; 5:6, 16). Also, 1:2–18 excludes the significant Jacobean emphasis of speech-ethics (3:1–12), first occurring in 1:19 and 1:26. The related keywords λόγος and νόμος and their cognates occur in Jas 2–5 and appear first at 1:18 and 1:25, respectively. Thus, the distinction between 1:2–18 and 1:19–27 is not as evident as Edgar claims. It follows that all of James 1 functions in the same way. As discussed above, the literary character of 1:2–27 is easily distinguishable from the text beginning in 2:1, which calls into question Moo’s designation of 1:19–27 as part of a passage that continues to the end of James 2.

Consequently, the introductory prologue to James cannot be limited to 1:2–12 or 1:2–18. The content in the latter half of James 1 functions much like the first half; arguments that end the introduction before 1:27 fall short of convincing.

4.2.5 Summary

In this chapter, I have presented a case that James 1:2–27 serves as the introductory prologue to James, previewing the major concepts occurring later. First, we justified that James 1:1–27 is a distinct unit, pointing to its use of *inclusio* and cohesion. We also discussed the distinct literary character of James 1, with shorter sections covering general issues. Second, I argued that 1:1–27 has an introductory nature, presenting concepts that occur later. Finally, I responded to the views that the introductory nature of the opening content of James ends at 1:12 or 1:18.

4.3 Outline of James 1

With our discussion of the segmentation of James 1 through the epistolary form, grammatical links, and its use of cohesive ties, we can put forth a tentative outline of James 1. We have argued above for its distinctiveness as the introductory prologue of James:

1:1	Salutation
1:2–4	Rejoicing in endurance for the ultimate profit of trials
1:5–8	God gives wisdom
1:12	Pivotal Statement: Blessed is the one who endures trial
1:13–18	God is not the source of what leads to death, but life.
1:19–25	Listening and doing, blessed is the one who endures with the law
1:26–27	Transition Statements about acceptable piety

As argued above, the beginning (1:2–4) and end (1:25) of the prologue have connections with the ‘hinge’ statement found in 1:12. The saying in 1:12 will prove to be crucial as we move forward. In the next chapter, we will examine how James 2–5 can be segmented into sections and present an outline for James 2–5. After that, we will discuss how *eschatological approval* is introduced in Jas 1 and runs like a thread through the sections of Jas 2–5.

Chapter 5: The Structure of James 2–5

In this chapter, we examine the macrostructures in the content of James occurring after the prologue. We will focus on decisions for segmentation that are controversial, like the place of 3:13–18 and the connection of the section beginning at 5:7 with previous material.

This chapter will accomplish two principal tasks. First, examining the use of *inclusio* in James 2–5, we will argue that the author frames the content of his epistle in a particular way. The precise details of this framing will be relevant for our study of *eschatological approval* in Chapter 7. There, we will be looking at how the intervening content discusses eschatological approval.

Second, we will examine James 2–5, using the principle of cohesiveness to divide it into sections. The segmentation of James will be significant as we aim to determine the salient portions of each section in Chapter 7. There, we will discuss how each section as delineated here relates to eschatological approval. At the end of this chapter, we will present a tentative outline of James based on our findings.

5.1 The Use of *Inclusio* in James 2–5

As we examine the material in James appearing after the prologue, we will make a case for two large instances of *inclusio*: (a) one marked by 1:12 and 5:11 and (b) another marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12.³¹²

5.1.1 *Inclusio*: James 1:12 and 5:11

Recent studies about the structure of James have argued for a ‘grand *inclusio*’ with its boundaries in the letter’s opening and closing, framing the content of the entire epistle.³¹³ Both Francis and Davids argue for a “thematic reprise” of the concept of blessing for those who persevere, starting at James 5:7.³¹⁴ Wilhelm Wuellner marks the key terms in 1:1–12 and

³¹² In addition to these two instances of *inclusio*, Taylor also argues for a large *inclusio* marked by the term ἀντιτάσσεται in 4:6 and 5:6, building on the work of Alonso Schökel. See Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 67–68. Penner also aligns with Schökel, drawing a parallel between 4:6 and 5:6. See Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 155–58. However, the contention for a connection between 4:6 and 5:6 is weaker than the contention for connections at (a) 1:12/5:11, and (b) 2:12–13/4:11–12, since the latter two pairs *cluster* more than one repeated term.

³¹³ For a more detailed survey of the literature, see Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 69–71.

³¹⁴ Francis, “Form and Function,” 121; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 26, 38.

5:7–20 as framing the *argumentatio* in 1:13–5:6.³¹⁵ Frankemölle, who ends the prologue at 1:18, sees the parallels of perseverance, description of the end, judgment, salvation, and life/death between 1:2–18 and 5:7–20.³¹⁶ Penner argues for an *inclusio* between the introduction at 1:2–12 and the *conclusion to the main body* at 4:6–5:12.³¹⁷ Allison detects that 5:7–11 resembles the beginning, creating a “sort of *inclusio*, which might signal to the reader that the conclusion is near.”³¹⁸

In what follows, we will argue for a grand *inclusio* marked by James 1:12 and 5:11. An *inclusio* is an intentional literary device created by the author using the same or related terms to mark off a section.³¹⁹ Thus, the argument for an *inclusio* is stronger when there are repeated *words* or *cognates* rather than just common concepts. In other words, the repetition of a term like ὑπομένω is stronger evidence for an *inclusio* than an ‘eschatological outlook.’ Furthermore, the *clustering* of multiple terms being repeated provides an even stronger case for an *inclusio*.

As argued above, James 1:12 serves as a ‘hinge saying’ for the introductory prologue of James. It has connections with the content immediately preceding it (1:8, 1:11) and immediately following it (1:13–18). We have also made a case that 1:12 is the fulcrum of a double-*inclusio*, with repeated terms shared with the beginning of the prologue (1:2–3) as well as the end (1:25). Thus, with the connections that 1:12 has with much of the rest of the prologue, it follows that the material in James 1 either points forward or back to the statement in 1:12. We will discuss the content of James 1, especially the centrality of 1:12, when we examine *eschatological approval* later.

James 5:11 contains a *cluster* of key terms appearing in the tripartite introduction of James. Using words that remind the hearers of the introductory prologue in 5:11, the epistle displays a grand *inclusio* framed by James 1 and 5:11.

1:2–3	1:12	1:25	5:11
πᾶσαν χαρὰν	μακάριος	μακάριος	μακαρίζομεν
πειρασμοῖς	πειρασμόν		
ὑπομονήν / ὑπομονή	ὑπομένει	παραμείνας	ὑπομείναντας / ὑπομονήν

³¹⁵ Wuellner, “Der Jakobusbrief,” 36.

³¹⁶ Frankemölle, “semantische Netz,” 193.


³¹⁷ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 143–58.

³¹⁸ Allison, *James*, 695.

³¹⁹ So Guthrie and Taylor, “Structure.”

Scholars who have argued for a grand *inclusio* in James have included other portions of the introductory and closing content as parallels. For example, Penner ties the *patience* in 5:7–10 with the *endurance* introduced in James 1.³²⁰ Also, Timothy Cargal links the *restoration* in 5:19–20 with the *diaspora* in 1:1.³²¹ Similarly, Taylor associates the *sin* and *death* in 5:19–20 with the content in 1:15–16.³²² While there is a case for each of these, the most persuasive evidence for a grand *inclusio* in James comes in the terms in 5:11 that also appear in the three places of the introductory prologue.

With James 1:12 as the ‘hinge statement’ of the prologue and 5:11 its key terms, the entirety of James can be likened to a fish skeleton. The tripartite introduction forms the head of the fish, and the statement in 5:11 forms its tail. We will continue to discuss this structure as we examine the rest of the epistle’s content:



While scholars have disagreed on its boundaries, the evidence supports a grand *inclusio* for the entirety of James. We have made a case that the repeated terms in 1:2–4, 1:12, 1:25, and 5:11 mark the *inclusio*, with other recapitulated concepts in the opening and closing content adding support.

³²⁰ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 177–79.

³²¹ Cargal, *Restoring*, 45–47.

³²² Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 69–70.

5.1.2 *Inclusio*: James 2:12–13 and 4:11–12

An often-overlooked instance of *inclusio* in James occurs at James 2:12–13 and 4:11–12. Repeated terms are clustered in these two places that stand at transition points in the content of the epistle. We will examine the function of these verses later as we discuss the epistle’s sections and their relation to the theme of *eschatological approval*. In this section, which will build on the work of Taylor and Guthrie,³²³ we will make a case for an *inclusio*.

The usage and distribution of νόμος in James 2:12 and 4:11 suggest the author’s intentionality. Taylor points out that νόμος repeatedly occurs in 2:8–12 (five times) and in 4:11 (four times), without any intervening instances.³²⁴ Also, God is called νομοθέτης in 4:12. The clustering of these instances offers support for an *inclusio*.

The usage of *doing* in association with νόμος also appears in both places, a concept that first appears in the prologue in 1:22–25. James 2:12 contains the imperative ποιείτε, within the context of νόμος, under which they will receive judgment. Likewise, James 4:11 urges its hearers not to judge the law but to be a doer (ποιητής) of it.

Both texts address the praxis of *speaking*. They contain the plural imperative forms λαλεῖτε (2:12) and καταλαλεῖτε (4:11), while 4:11 also includes the forms καταλαλῶν and καταλαλεῖ. To be sure, the concept of the use of speech is prominent in other places in James (e.g., 1:26; 3:1–12), but these lexemes do not occur between 2:12 and 4:11.³²⁵

The concept of *judgment* is arguably the most prominent parallel between these two texts. James 2:12–13 contains κρίνεσθαι, κρίσις, and κρίσεως while 4:11–12 includes κρίνων (twice), κρίνει, κρίνεις and κριτής (twice).³²⁶ While the related word κρίμα occurs in 3:1, there are no intervening instances of these lexemes. Also, both texts affirm that there is one who is *judge* over the hearers of the epistle; they are not to usurp God’s role by acting as judges (4:11, cf. 2:4).

Finally, Allison points out that πλησίον occurs in James 4:12, which likely recalls the command to love one’s *neighbour* in Leviticus 19:18.³²⁷ This love command is repeated in the teachings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 5:43; 19:19; 22:39; Mark 12:31, 33;

³²³ Taylor points out that this use of *inclusio* at 2:12–13 and 4:11–12 “has yet to be explored fully.” See Taylor, 71. Cf. Guthrie and Taylor, “Structure,” 684–85.

³²⁴ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 64.

³²⁵ As pointed out by Taylor, 64.

³²⁶ Notably, Vlachos considers κριτής to be a “link word” connecting 4:11 and 4:12. See Vlachos, *James*, 148.

³²⁷ Allison, *James*, 633–34.

Luke 10:27). While Jas 4:12 likely contains an allusion to Lev 19:18, the command explicitly occurs in James 2:8. If Taylor and Johnson are correct that 2:11 serves as a summary of 2:1–11,³²⁸ the exhortation in 2:11 has a strong connection to 2:8.

The use of πλησίον in James 4:12 is remarkable. The designation ἀδελφός, to which πλησίον stands in parallel, is repeated in 4:11. The choice to use πλησίον as a replacement for ἀδελφός suggests that the author is intentionally appealing to Lev 19:18.³²⁹

The repeated terms in 2:12–13 and 4:11–12, some of which do not occur in the intervening content, suggests intentionality. The evidence points to the author clustering these terms to create an *inclusio* between these texts, framing the material between them. The chart below is based on Taylor’s depiction of the lexical parallels.³³⁰

2:12–13	4:11–12
λαλεῖτε	καταλαλεῖτε, καταλαλῶν, καταλαλεῖ
ποιεῖτε ... νόμου	ποιητῆς νόμου
κρίνεσθαι, κρίσις, κρίσεως	κρίνων (twice), κρίνει, κρίνεις and κρίσις (twice)
πλησίον (in 2:8, see above)	πλησίον (= ἀδελφός, see above)

5.2 James 2:1–13

The content of James 2:1–13 moves from specific to general. The author begins with a command, warning his hearers against showing *favouritism* to the rich (2:1). This command is delivered for the hearers to observe while *having faith in the Lord Jesus Christ*.³³¹ The opening command is followed by a scenario involving two men entering the συναγωγή. The author condemns favouritism shown to the man wearing a gold ring and bright clothes while brushing aside the man in soiled clothing. We will discuss the content and message of this hypothetical scenario when we examine *eschatological approval* later.

After the command and hypothetical scenario condemning favouritism (James 2:2–7), the author widens his discussion to include general adherence to the law. Jas 2:8–9 is tied to the previous material through the link of προσωπολημπεῖτε in 2:9 to προσωπολημψίας in

³²⁸ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 65; Johnson, “Leviticus 19 in James,” 399–400.

³²⁹ So Moo, *Letter of James*, 199–200; Allison, *James*, 639.

³³⁰ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 65.

³³¹ While τοῦ κυρίου can be a subjective genitive, Adam correctly infers that it is most likely an objective genitive, as the author of James uses God as the object of belief elsewhere (2:19, 23). See Adam, *James*, 34–35.

2:1. The particle μέντοι in 2:8, a form of μέν, is used emphatically to connect the previous material to the next.³³² While μέντοι relates to the earlier content, the pairing of μέντοι with εἰ also points forward to a contrasting sentence beginning with εἰ δέ (2:9).³³³ Together, the sentences indicate the contrast between condemnation of favouritism and the affirmation of fulfilling the whole law.

While the theme of condemnation of *favouritism* ties together the first half of 2:1–13, the more general concept of *obedience to the law* ties together the second half. As stated above, the five instances of νόμος (2:8–12) form a semantic chain that ties the passage together. The author illustrates the move from the specific to the general through the overlapping strings of *favouritism* and the *law*. Thus, the two first-class conditional statements in 2:8–9 serve as a transition tying together the two movements of this section.

James 2:12–13, which opens the *inclusio* discussed above, serves as both a *summary* and *transition* for 2:1–13. The commands λαλεῖτε and ποιεῖτε summarise the hypothetical scenario (2:2–7) which includes *speaking* and *acting* towards the two men entering the gathering. The two imperatives also preview the content within the boundaries of the *inclusio*. As we will see, ποιέω and the theme of *obedience* plays a significant role in 2:14–4:10. Also, *speech-ethics* will receive considerable attention, especially in 3:1–12 and 4:11. Jas 2:12 is tied to the previous content through the term νόμος, which is qualified by the genitive ἐλευθερίας. This phrase νόμος ἐλευθερίας repeats content in the prologue in 1:25.

Also, James 2:13 both concludes the section of 2:1–13 and transitions to the content that follows. The appeal to *judgment* (κρίσις twice) ties 2:13 to κρίνεσθαι in 2:12, but also to κριταί (2:4) and κριτήρια (2:6). The affirmation of having *mercy* (ἔλεος twice, also ἀνέλεος) sums up the call to act righteously towards the poor.³³⁴ The command in *T. Zeb.* 8:1, which teaches that the Lord will have mercy on those who are merciful to *everyone*, can further support the connection between Jas 2:13 and practising ἔλεος without discriminating (2:1–9). James 2:13 previews the material within the *inclusio* by urging the hearers to live with a view of impending judgment. The appeal to *judgment* is found explicitly in 3:1, but also subtly in

³³² See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 673; Beale, Ross, and Brendsel, “μέντοι.” Cf. Vlachos, *James*, 77.

³³³ So Adam, *James*, 42–44. Notably, Runge states that the information introduced by δέ in a μέν... δέ association is typically of greater importance than that introduced by μέν. See Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 55. If this principle of the δέ saying being more important applies to James 2:8–9, it gives further support to the cohesiveness of 2:1–13, since the statement about the *law* comes first, but is tied to the latter half of the section.

³³⁴ So Moo, *Letter of James*, 117–18.

other places (2:21–23; 3:10; 4:4). As discussed above, *judgment* is a major theme in 4:11–12, the closing portion of the *inclusio*. Jas 2:13 also previews the following content by introducing the term ἔλεος. The next section, 2:14–26, highlights *mercy* on a poorly clothed person as an example of having faith with deeds. In 3:17, wisdom from above is identified, among other things, by ἔλεος.

Johnson renders James 2:1–13 as two distinct sections, 2:1–7 and 2:8–13. He justifies this segmentation by appealing to the internal coherence of 2:1–7 and the fact that 2:8–13 no longer discusses the poor, but the law.³³⁵ However, as discussed above, the shift is not indicative of a change in the topic; it rather indicates a movement from specific to general. The conjunctive particle μέντοι in 2:8 connects the material after it with the content before it. Besides, the fact that *favouritism* occurs in 2:9 after the *law* is introduced in 2:8 points to more cohesiveness than Johnson recognises. Also, *mercy* (2:13) is the antithesis of *dishonouring* the poor man (2:6). Ultimately, to his credit, Johnson proposes the notion of the “real topic” introduced by the prohibition of favouritism.³³⁶ The author starts with the *specific* command to introduce the *general* value of obedience to the law. Observing the law is intimately tied with judgment (2:12–13), which previews the material within the *inclusio* of 2:12–13 and 4:11–12.

5.3 James 2:14–26

James 2:14–26 discusses the interaction between *faith* (πίστις) and deeds (ἔργα). It begins with two rhetorical questions in 2:14. The first one, a third-class condition, queries the benefit of saying that one has faith but does not have deeds. The second question expects a negative answer: *the faith cannot save him, can it?* The article ἡ in the second question is probably anaphoric, referring to the *faith without deeds* introduced in the first question.³³⁷ The section proceeds to support the argument that faith that does not have deeds is useless, or *dead* (2:17, 26).

The claim that 2:14–26 is a distinct section is relatively uncontroversial.³³⁸ To be sure, its content has connections to previous material. *Faith* is introduced in 2:1, and the two units

³³⁵ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 218–19.

³³⁶ Johnson, 219.

³³⁷ So Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 219.

³³⁸ Scholars are virtually unanimous regarding the boundaries of this section. For example, see Allison, *James*, 425; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 125; Batten, *Friendship*,

are associated through caring for the poor (see 2:15), a theme introduced in 1:27. However, the lack of connectives in 2:14 suggests a new section. The most persuasive evidence for the cohesiveness of 2:14–26 is the repeated interaction between the semantic chains πίστις (eleven times) and ἔργα (twelve times) throughout the passage. Furthermore, the beginning (2:14), middle (2:20), and end (2:26) repeat the concept that *faith apart from deeds* has no value.

5.4 James 3:1–12

Like James 2:1–13, 3:1–12 moves from specific to general. Starting with a command that *not many should become teachers*, the author proceeds to discuss the *use of the tongue*. The content does not return to discuss teachers, suggesting that the focus of the section is on the use of the tongue in general. This section is previewed by the call to *speak* as those who will face future judgment in 2:12.

The author's deterrence of his hearers from becoming teachers in James 3:1 is grounded in two premises. First, he affirms that those who teach will receive a *greater judgment*; the standards are higher for teachers, including himself. Second, in 3:2, he acknowledges that 'we' all stumble in *many things* or *many ways* (πολλά). The author affirms that a *perfect* or *mature* (τέλειος, introduced in 1:4, 17, 25) man does not stumble in word (ἐν λόγῳ); he can bridle (χαλιναγωγῆσαι, introduced in 1:26) his whole body.

The rest of 3:1–12, which includes vivid imagery, discusses the *use of the tongue*. The passage has several ties that hold it together, including the connectives γάρ, δέ, and καί in 3:2–8. The anaphoric ἐν αὐτῇ in 3:9 refers to the *tongue* in the previous saying. James 3:10 continues the discussion of evil things coming from one's spoken words. It puts forth the concept that both blessing and cursing should not come from the same mouth. The questions in 3:11 and 3:12, which expect a negative answer, contain imagery that illustrates the principle in 3:10. The entire passage is tied together with instances of the related terms γλῶσσα (four times in this passage, introduced in 1:26), λόγῳ (3:2), and στόμα (3:3, 10).

134; Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 74; Dibelius, *James*, 149; Johnson, *Letter of James*, 236; Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 207; Martin, *James*, 75; Tsuji, *Glaube*, 77.

5.5 James 3:13–18

The placement of 3:13–18 is controversial. Some group it with content before it in 3:1–12.³³⁹ Others group 3:13–18 with the material following it in Jas 4.³⁴⁰ Some see a grand section discussing *speech* starting in 3:1 and extending into Jas 4.³⁴¹ Others designate 3:13–18 as a distinct section.³⁴² Here, we will make a case for 3:13–18 standing as a section distinct from 3:1–12, responding to other views and using our method of examining cohesive ties. We will propose that James 3:13–18 serves as a transition to Jas 4. In the section after this, we will argue that the content starting in Jas 4, while introduced by James 3:13–18, is a distinct section. The function of 3:13–18 as a transition will be relevant as we discuss *eschatological approval* in Chapter 7.

First, the lack of grammatical connections between James 3:1–12 and 3:13–18 opens the possibility that they are distinct sections. Jas 3:13–18 starts with a question in the same manner as 2:14–26. No connectives like γάρ or δέ in 3:13 that connect it to the previous content. The conjunction καί in 3:13 links the two adjectives σοφός and ἐπιστήμων, and not the question to the previous material.

Second, James 3:13–18 displays internal cohesiveness in ways that do not link it to the previous section. It is tied together by δέ and γάρ in 3:14, 16, 17, and 18. The demonstrative αὕτη in 3:15 refers to the vices in 3:14. Also, σοφός/σοφία occur four times in 3:13–17.³⁴³ The keyword εἰρήνη and the related εἰρηνική occur three times in 3:13–17. Jas 3:18, while not containing a form of σοφία, clusters two catchwords, καρπός and εἰρήνη (twice) which occur in the previous verse (καρπῶν and εἰρηνική in 3:17). Also, Allison rightly points out that this passage contains parallelism through “the repeated linking” καί:³⁴⁴

³³⁹ For example, see Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 138–39; Wall, *Community*, 159–61.

³⁴⁰ For example, see Dibelius, *Jakobus*, 249–50; Jackson-McCabe, “Enduring Temptation,” 172–75; Johnson, *Letter of James*, 267–69.

³⁴¹ For example, see Camp, “Structure of James,” 116–18; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 135; Tsuji, *Glaube*, 91; McKnight, *Letter of James*, 55, 265–66; Moo, *Letter of James*, 145–46.

³⁴² For example, see Allison, *James*, 561–63; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 167–68; Hart and Hart, *Analysis*, 102; Hoppe, *Hintergrund*, 9; Tsuji, *Glaube*, 81–82; Varner, *James*, 243–46.

³⁴³ Martin proposes that σοφός/σοφία in 3:13 and 3:17 create an *inclusio*. See Martin, *James*, 125. However, with additional instances in 3:13 and 3:15, it is probably best to see these instances as semantic chain.

³⁴⁴ Allison, *James*, 536 n10.

3:13	σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων
3:14	ζῆλον πικρὸν...καὶ ἐριθείαν
3:14	κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε
3:16	ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία
3:17	μεστή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν

Third, there is no thematic connection between James 3:1–12 and 3:13–18. While the former is dominated by the theme of *words*, the latter discusses *wisdom* that brings *peace*. While Adamson groups 3:1–12 with 3:13–18 as a contrast between self-conceited speech and the peace of “true wisdom,”³⁴⁵ there is a distinction between *words* in 3:1–12 and *actions* (ἀναστροφή, ἔργα) in 3:13–18. In accordance, the terms providing internal cohesiveness to 3:1–12, especially γλῶσσα and εἰρήνη, do not occur in 3:13–18. Also, σοφία does not appear in 3:1–12 and there is no apparent connection with wisdom. Furthermore, while the question in 3:13 can include teachers, it does not specify a subset of the epistle’s hearers. Frankemölle sees a distinction between teachers (3:1) and the wise man (3:13).³⁴⁶ Townsend rightly deduces: if wisdom from above (3:17) is available to all Christians (see 1:5), then this question’s audience is broader than teachers.³⁴⁷

One might object to a distinction between James 3:1–12 and 3:13–18, since 3:1–18 moves from specific (teachers) to general (tongue, wisdom) like 2:1–13, which we designated as a single unit above. However, 2:1–13 contains overlapping semantic chains (προσωπολημπτεῖτε and νόμος), the conjunctive particle μέντοι, and the summary statements in 2:12–13. These elements tip the scales towards 2:1–13 being one unit, but similar features are not found in 3:1–18.

The arguments for grouping James 3:1–12 with 3:13–18 have some merit but are not compelling. Adamson and McKnight apply the *wisdom* in 3:13–18 to *teachers*, thus grouping this section with the previous one.³⁴⁸ McKnight connects *wise and understanding* with *teaching* in the Hebrew Bible (Deut 1:13–15; 1 Kgs 4:29), Daniel (5:11–12), and the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 4:2-6; also 11:6; 1QS20 19:25).³⁴⁹ While McKnight is correct about these instances, they do not necessitate a connection between *wise and understanding* and *teaching*. Besides, there are Hebrew Bible instances which connect *wise and understanding* without the

³⁴⁵ Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 147–48.

³⁴⁶ Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 488.

³⁴⁷ Townsend, *The Epistle of James*, 68–69.

³⁴⁸ Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 149–50; McKnight, *Letter of James*, 266.

³⁴⁹ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 299–300.

context of teaching, such as Deut 4:6, 2 Chr 2:11, and Prov 1:5. In fact, the terms in 3:13, σοφός and ἐπιστήμων, are found together in LXX Deut 1:13–15; 4:6; Dan 1:4; 5:11. While one could construe Deut 1:13–15 and Dan 5:11 as having a context of teaching, there is no apparent association with teaching in Deut 4:6 and Dan 1:4. Also, the descriptions of wisdom in 3:17 are more closely tied with *community harmony* than with verbal communication. James 3:1 addresses all the hearers, not just teachers, urging them *not* to face greater judgment. Furthermore, there is no indication of the author addressing *teachers* after 3:1, which calls into question the connection with 3:13. The bulk of 3:1–12 is not specifically about teaching, but about the use of the tongue in general. In particular, 3:10–12 is about *blessing* and *cursing*, not about teaching.

Tsuji groups James 3:1–4:12 through *disputes in the church*, connecting *cursing* with *conflicts* in the congregation.³⁵⁰ However, it is not apparent that 3:1–12 involves a church. Also, no references to disputes occur in 3:1–12, which would involve the interaction between two parties. The *cursing* in 3:9–12 only involves one party's treatment of another.

Wall's structure of James is based on the threefold imperative found in 1:19: be *quick to hear, slow to speak, and slow to anger*. He categorises 3:1–18 as “the wisdom of slow to speak.”³⁵¹ However, it is not evident that the *wisdom* in 3:13–18 is directly associated with speaking. Also, as discussed above, *wisdom* does not occur in 3:1–12 and no words related to *speaking* occur in 3:13–18.

To be sure, lexical links exist between 3:1–12 and 3:13–18. Johnson points out that a form of πικρός occurs in 3:11 and 3:14, and a form of ἀκαταστασία in both 3:8 and 3:16.³⁵² I have argued elsewhere that catchwords are more compelling if they occur at adjoining ends of consecutive sections.³⁵³ Of the terms highlighted by Johnson, πικρός is more likely to be a catchword. However, these links do not tip the scales towards these sections forming one larger unit.

I propose that James 3:13–18 serves as a transition to 4:1–10. Along with the connections with 3:1–12 discussed above, 3:13–18 contains other significant links with previous material. In what follows, I will present a list of connections between 3:13–18 and prior content in James listed by Taylor,³⁵⁴ adding points of further support. First, Taylor

³⁵⁰ Tsuji, *Glaube*, 79.

³⁵¹ Wall, *Community*, 36.

³⁵² Johnson, *Letter of James*, 268.

³⁵³ See *Principle 4* in Eng, “Catchwords,” 247–48.

³⁵⁴ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 87–88.

points out that σοφία is introduced in 1:5. I add that this is the only instance of σοφία or its cognates in James outside of 3:13–18. Second, Taylor points out the imperative δειξάτω in 3:13 echoes a challenge in 2:18 to demonstrate what is unseen (faith in 2:18, wisdom in 3:13) through *deeds*. I add that the charge to be a *doer*, introduced in 1:19 and 1:22–25 and developed in 2:14–26, is revisited in 3:13–18. Third, the association of *wisdom* with ἐν πραύτητι in 3:13 echoes how the hearers receive the *word* ἐν πραύτητι in 1:21. Fourth, the prohibition μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε recalls the καυχᾶσθω of the lowly brother in 1:9 and ἀυχεῖ of the tongue in 3:5. Fifth, Taylor highlights the warning against *deception* (μὴ...ψεύδεσθε) as a prohibition of sinful speech. I add that 3:14 recalls the warnings against *being deceived* in 1:16 and *self-deception* in 1:22 and 1:26. Sixth, Taylor highlights that wisdom *from above* in 3:15 and 3:17 echoes gifts *from above* in 1:17. In further support of Taylor’s point, these are the only instances of ἄνωθεν in James. Seventh, the notion that wisdom is *pure* (ἀγνή) in 3:17 recalls θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος in 1:27. Eighth, Taylor points out that μεστή ἐλέους in 3:17 recalls the charge to care for orphans and widows in 1:27 and the merciful person in 2:13. I add that 3:17 echoes the affirmation of caring for a poor brother or sister in 2:15–16.

With so many echoes of previous material, especially material occurring before James 3:1–12, 3:13–18 reminds the epistle’s hearers of the epistle’s key ideas. These reminders point to conduct (3:13) that characterises wisdom from God (1:5), also called *wisdom from above* (3:15, 17).

Also, the repetition of εἰρηνική and εἰρήνη (twice) in James 3:17–18 previews the indictment against the *quarrelling* and *fighting* in Jas 4. We will explore this connection in the next section, as we make a case that James 4:1–10, which is introduced by 3:13–18, stands as a distinct section.

5.6 James 4:1–10

James 4:1–10 discusses quarrels and fights among the hearers of the epistle and calls them to repent. The segmentation of 4:1–10, among other issues, leads Johnson to quip that “otherwise confident commentators here become diffident.”³⁵⁵ With the connections between 3:13–18 and 4:1–10, a strong case can be made for both texts to be in the same unit. However, we will contend that 4:1–10 is distinct from both 3:13–18 and what follows it.

³⁵⁵ Johnson, “James 3:13-4:10,” 327.

The question in James 4:1 suggests a new movement distinct from the previous section. First, the author shows a penchant towards starting a new section with a *question* elsewhere in James (2:14; 3:13). Second, there are no grammatical connections like γάρ or δέ connecting 4:1 to previous material. The conjunction καί in 4:1 only connects the two nouns, πόλεμοι and μάχαι. Third, Taylor correctly points out that ἐν ὑμῖν indicates that, like 3:13, the saying in 4:1 begins another section.³⁵⁶ In fact, the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν characterises the beginning of new topics in the latter half of James (3:13; 4:1; 5:13, 19). Fourth, as Varner points out, the tone of 4:1–10 is distinct from 3:13–18. Jas 4:1–10 contains harsh condemnations of the hearers' behaviour, distinguishing it from 3:13–18. The author appears to take the role of a *sage* discussing *wisdom* in 3:13–18 while assuming the role of a *prophet* urging reform in 4:1–10.³⁵⁷

Elements of James 4:1–10 give cohesion to the passage. The semantic thread of quarrels and fighting (e.g., πόλεμοι, πολεμεῖτε, μάχαι, μάχεσθε) runs through 4:1–6, which includes the terms of enmity (ἔχθρα/ἐχθρός) towards God (4:4) and God opposing (ἀντιτάσσεται) the proud (4:6). A small *inclusio* is framed by the similar sayings of 4:6 and 4:10, describing God favouring the humble. The thread of θεός (five times) along with κύριος (4:10) bridges the material about enmity and opposition (4:1–6) and being humble before God (4:1–10).

The passage also contains cohesion through the presentation of a binary choice: one cannot choose both options. With candour and imagery reminiscent of the prophets and Jesus,³⁵⁸ the author calls the hearers *adulteresses*. One cannot be loyal to both; for friendship with the world is enmity towards God (4:4). Later, the hearers are urged to choose being humble over being proud (4:6) and to choose submission to God over the devil (4:7). In response to their failure to choose one over the other, the author uses another jarring vocative, δίψυχος (*double-minded* or *double-souled*, 4:8), a rare word introduced in 1:8.

Given its string of imperatives, some consider James 4:7–10 distinct from 4:1–6.³⁵⁹ However, the organic tie οὖν in 4:7 connects the material following it to the content

³⁵⁶ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 87.

³⁵⁷ Varner, *James*, 270. Varner considers Jas 4:1–10 the “hortatory peak” of the epistle.

³⁵⁸ Jesus condemned the *adulterous* generation in Matt 12:39; 16:4; Mark 8:38. Also, the prophets used imagery of *adultery* applying to people unfaithful to (e.g. Isa 1:21; 50:1; 57:3; Jer 3:9, 20; 5:7; 9:2; Ezek 6:9; 16:32; Hos 7:4). For discussions of this imagery, see Allison, *James*, 607; Cheung, *Hermeneutics of James*, 186; Martin, *James*, 148.

³⁵⁹ See, for example, Dibelius, *James*, 208.

preceding it. In fact, 4:4 through 4:7 remain linked through a chain of connectives, including οὐν, ἦ, δέ, and διό. Furthermore, the string of instances of θεός bridges these verses together, as does the call to be *singly devoted* (4:4) rather than *double-minded* (4:8).

There is a strong case for grouping 3:13–18 with 4:1–10 as one unit. Jackson-McCabe points out the author’s omission of familial address *brothers* (ἀδελφοί) in both texts, opting for ἐν ὑμῖν. Jackson-McCabe states that, by calling his hearers *adulteresses* (4:4), *sinners* (4:8), and *double-minded* (4:8), the author distances himself from his audience.³⁶⁰ Jackson-McCabe follows Johnson, who calls 3:13–4:10 a “call to conversion” with two major parts, an indictment in 3:13–4:6, and the response in 4:7–10.³⁶¹ Johnson’s argument builds on the repetition of the theme of *envy* (ζῆλος and its forms, 3:14, 3:16, 4:2) and the “synonymous” φθόνος in 4:5. He supports this claim by appealing to both Hellenistic and Jewish writings that render *envy* it a *topos*, especially in association with *friendship*.³⁶² Hartin also follows Johnson regarding the uniting of 3:13–4:10 through this *topos*, proposing a more detailed structure: *theme* (3:13), *reason* (3:14), *proof* (3:15–18), *embellishment* (4:1–6), and *conclusion* (4:7–10).³⁶³

The view of Jackson-McCabe, Johnson, and Hartin is well-argued and intriguing. However, the cohesive ties that give unity to each of the two texts do not extend to the other one. These ties tip the scales in favour of a distinction between the two units. First, there is no grammatical connection between 4:1 and the content before it, opening the possibility that these texts are distinct. Second, as stated above, while 3:13–18 contain chains of the terms σοφία and εἰρήνη, they do not occur in 4:1–10. Third, 4:1–10 contains strings (1) characterised by opposition, (2) the term θεός, and (3) humility, but these do not appear in 3:13–18.

Whether or not 3:13–18 and 4:1–10 are distinct units, there are connections between the two texts. These connections suggest that, if 3:13–18 is a distinct section, it functions to *preview* the content in 4:1–10. Having seen the many connections that 3:13–18 has with previous material, we now examine how 4:1–10 is previewed in 3:13–18. First, ζῆλος, which appears twice in 3:13–18, occurs again in 4:2. Second, the description of *wisdom from above* as *peaceable* stands in contrast to the *quarrels* in 4:1–2. Third, Hartin correctly points out the

³⁶⁰ Jackson-McCabe, “Enduring Temptation,” 173–74.

³⁶¹ Johnson, “James 3:13-4:10,” 332.

³⁶² Johnson, 333–46.

³⁶³ Hartin, *James*, 203–7.

contrast between good and evil, highlighting 3:6.³⁶⁴ A strong connection between 3:13–18 and 4:1–10 is present in the dichotomy between God and the world in 4:4 and the contrast between wisdom from above and earthly ‘wisdom’ in 3:15. Fourth, as Taylor has rightly pointed out, the rhetorical question in 3:13 anticipates four more in 4:1a, 4:1b, 4:4, and 4:5.³⁶⁵ These four questions recall earthly wisdom’s disorder and strife in 3:15–16 and its contrast to the list of virtues in 3:17–18.

In summary, while there is a case for rendering 3:13–4:10 as one unit, the evidence tips the scales towards making 3:13–18 and 4:1–10 distinct but closely connected units. The semantic chains that run through one unit are absent in the other. James 3:13–18, with its connections to prior content as well as 4:1–10, likely serves as a transition with a summary and preview. We will discuss the consequences of distinguishing 3:13–18 and 4:1–10 as we examine *eschatological approval* in Chapter 7.

5.7 James 4:11–12

James 4:11–12 can be difficult to place in the letter. In what follows, we will make a case that this text is distinct from 4:1–10 and from what follows it. We will propose that 4:11–12 serves as a *summary* and *preview* for the content of James.

James 4:11–12 displays internal coherence. The passage opens and closes with a discussion of *the way one treats others*. Jas 4:11 starts with a prohibition of *speaking against* (καταλαλεῖτε) one another, which the author equates to *judging*. The question in 4:12 condemns *judging* a neighbour. The sayings are united by semantic chains of *judge* (κρίνω four times, κριτής twice) and *law* (νόμος four times, νομοθέτης once). The sentences also connect through δέ and other repeated terms (καταλαλεῖ, ἀδελφός, νόμος).

James 4:11–12 appears isolated from the surrounding material. The verses do not have a grammatical connection (like δέ, γάρ, or καί) with the previous content, nor with the content following it. The semantic chains tying together 4:11–12 do not occur in 3:13–4:10 and 4:13–5:6. Furthermore, the shift in verb tense-forms from the aorist to the present indicates a boundary between units.³⁶⁶ The command μὴ καταλαλεῖτε in 4:11, a negated present imperative with elaboration found in 4:12, stands distinct from the string of ten aorist imperatives without elaboration in Jas 4:7–10.

³⁶⁴ Hartin, 205.

³⁶⁵ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 88.

³⁶⁶ So Porter, *Idioms*, 301.

Some make a case for James 4:11–12 as part of the previous content. For example, Blomberg and Kamell view these verses as a conclusion to the passage that begins at 4:1, since *speaking against* a brother is a manifestation of *strife*.³⁶⁷ Also, they consider the affirmation of God as the only judge (4:12) as submission to him (4:7).³⁶⁸ Dibelius, while admitting that Jas 4:11–12 “introduces something new,” groups the command in 4:11 with the imperatives in 4:7–10. He also associates *slander* with worldliness (4:4) and cites the association between *double-minded* and *slanderers* (δίψυχοι καὶ κατάλαλοι) in *Herm. Sim.* 8.7.2.³⁶⁹

The view that Jas 4:11–12 is part of the previous content is intriguing. However, the lack of (1) semantic chains across both texts and (2) grammatical connections between them tips the scales towards making 4:11–12 a distinct unit. Besides, as we will see below, it has connections with previous content in James 1–3, suggesting that it operates as a summary.

Others have taken James 4:11–12 to be the start of the material following it. Wall considers these verses to be part of a unit developing the concept of *slow to anger* in 1:19. He associates 4:11–12 with the sections 4:13–17 and 5:1–6, designating them as three illustrations of how *God resists the arrogant* (4:6).³⁷⁰ Likewise, Johnson groups 4:11–12, 4:13–7, and 5:1–6 based on their manifestations of *arrogance*.³⁷¹ However, while the author condemns the behaviour of the groups in each of these sections, it is not apparent that 4:11–12 has a connection with arrogance. Also, there is no indication that *anger* is involved in any of these texts. Finally, as we will discuss below, there are connections between 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 not found in 4:11–12. These connections include a repeated opening (Ἄγε νῦν) and the lack of markers ἐν ὑμῖν or ἀδελφοί (which appears in 4:11).

To be sure, James 4:11–12 has connections with previous content, suggesting that it serves as a *summary*. A summary would fit well in this place, since, as we will argue below, the sections after it address a different audience. The content of 4:11–12 appears to re-visit previous content. The warning against a particular manner of *speaking* echoes the calls to be *slow to speak* in 1:19 and to *bridle the tongue* in 1:26 and 3:1–12. The exhortations to submit to the *lawgiver* and not to judge the *law* recall the affirmations of the one who perseveres

³⁶⁷ Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 196. Allison agrees, adding that an *inclusio* is marked by the conflict in 4:1–2 and speaking/judging in 4:11. See Allison, *James*, 633.

³⁶⁸ Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 186, 196–97.

³⁶⁹ Dibelius, *James*, 228.

³⁷⁰ Wall, *Community*, 210–13.

³⁷¹ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 292.

with the law (1:25) and fulfils the law (2:8). The appeal to *judgment* recalls the exhortations to act in view of future judgment (2:12-13; 3:1). Finally, the prohibition of *speaking against a brother* may be a reminder of the *disorder* of earthly wisdom (3:16) and the fights and quarrels in 4:1. Indeed, Davids considers 4:11–12 as the ending of a larger segment addressing *conflict in the community*, reaching back to the cursing of others in 3:9–12 and the strife in 4:1.³⁷² However, the connections that 4:11–12 has with Jas 1–2 and 3:1–4:10 support the view that these two verses serve as a *summary* of the epistle’s content to this point.

James 4:11–12 also contains connections with the content following it, suggesting that this unit serves as a *preview*.³⁷³ Wall and Johnson point out the affinities between 4:11–12 and the condemned behaviour in 4:13–17 and 5:1–6. However, the section’s connections with the following content reach beyond 5:6. The vocative address *brothers* in 4:11, which is common in James, occurs again in 5:7 as the author returns to exhortations for the epistle’s primary hearers. The appeal to *judgment*, found in a semantic chain (κρίνω, κριτής) that ties together 4:11–12, appears again in 5:9 (twice) and 5:12. Taylor correctly points out that 5:9 and 5:12, like 4:11–12, contain “identical initiating structures” of a negative imperative and a vocative address. Also, the call to behaviour that impacts *one another* (ἀλλήλων) occurs in 5:9 and 5:16 (twice).

The connections of James 4:11–12 with other material in James reaches beyond the immediately surrounding material, suggesting that it serves as a *transition* with a *dual purpose*. This unit *summarises* the previous content in the epistle, including content in Jas 2–3. It also serves to *preview* the remaining material, including the latter portion of Jas 5.

As discussed above, James 4:11–12 completes the *inclusio* that started in 2:12–13.³⁷⁴ With the appeals to *speak appropriately* (λαλεῖτε, καταλαλεῖτε) and *act in accordance with the law* (ποιεῖτε/ ποιητῆς νόμου) because of impending *judgment* (κρίσις, κριτής), Jas 2:12–13 and 4:11–12 mark 2:14–4:10 with these elements. We will discuss the content of these passages concerning *eschatological approval* later.

³⁷² Davids, *Epistle of James*, 168–69.

³⁷³ Cargal agrees that 4:11–12 is a transitional section, but this author would not go as far in seeing a parallel between *speaking against a brother* in 4:11 and *restoring a wanderer* in 5:19. See Cargal, *Restoring*, 170–72.

³⁷⁴ Blomberg and Kamell do not view these two texts as marking an *inclusio*, even though they detect the “jump” in thought at 4:11 and its connection with 2:1–13. See *James*, 196.

5.8 Apostrophe: James 4:13–17 and 5:1–6

After the transition in James 4:11–12, the author presents two sections that begin with the opening command *come now* (Ἄγε νῦν). In what follows, we will argue that 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 are not only associated, but they also function as *apostrophe*, content *addressed to groups outside of the epistle’s primary audience*.

The two sections of 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 have several connections that link them closely. First, they contain the only two occurrences of the call *come now* (Ἄγε νῦν, 4:13; 5:1). The phrase is rare; not occurring anywhere in the LXX, intertestamental literature, or elsewhere in the NT. Second, the groups addressed in these texts have significant financial means: the merchants in 4:13–17 have the resources to travel, and the rich in 5:1–6 can hire labourers. Third, as Konradt correctly points out,³⁷⁵ the descriptions of the merchants and the rich are both focused on gaining wealth. Fourth, as we will discuss later, both texts have a similar tone of condemnation, excluding a call to repent.³⁷⁶

James 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 most likely address those outside the hearers of the epistle.³⁷⁷ First, these two sections both lack the address *brothers* (ἀδελφοί), which occurs regularly in the epistle (1:2, 9, 16; 2:1, 5, 14, 15; 3:1, 10, 12; 4:11; 5:7, 9, 10, 12, 19), especially at the beginning of new sections. They also lack the phrase *among you* (ἐν ὑμῖν), which also signals that the author addresses the primary hearers elsewhere in James (3:1; 4:1; 5:13, 14, 19). Indeed, after these two sections, the addressees shift back to the primary hearers in 5:7–11, with ἀδελφοί appearing three times.³⁷⁸

Second, the location of these two passages is outside the *inclusio* marked by calls to remember judgment (2:12–13 and 4:11–12). This suggests that their purpose is *not* to motivate its addressees to reform. We will discuss the lack of a call to repentance below.

Third, as Maynard-Reid has highlighted,³⁷⁹ both sections follow a familiar pattern of prophetic condemnation (cf. Num 21:29; Isa 45:10; Jer 48:46; Hab 2:15; *1 En.* 97:8; Luke

³⁷⁵ Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 159. So also Johnson, *Letter of James*, 292.

³⁷⁶ Dibelius, *James*, 230.

³⁷⁷ Allison rejects the “standard view” that 4:13–5:6 serves as apostrophe. His view is based on his contention that James is directed toward both rich and poor, as the salutation in 1:1 addresses the Jewish diaspora without distinction. However, his view is not much different than apostrophe, since he convincingly argues for a distinction between the “insiders” and “outsiders” who receive James. See *James*, 647–48.

³⁷⁸ Allison argues against these sections functioning as apostrophe, pointing out that the groups mentioned here can be subsets of the twelve tribes (1:1). However, he does not address the notable absence of ἀδελφοί and ἐν ὑμῖν in the two passages. See Allison, 647–48.

³⁷⁹ Maynard-Reid, *Poverty and Wealth*, 70–71.

6:24–26), pronouncing *woe* on those who oppose the ways of God. The pattern of prophetic condemnation may suggest a different set of addressees beginning in James 4:13.

Fourth, as McKnight points out, the content shifts to a “pastoral level” after 5:6. The tone changes from the *condemnation* of the merchants and rich in 4:13–5:6 to the *encouragement* of the beloved community in 5:7–11. Instead of the wrathful *Lord of hosts*, the author appeals to the compassion and mercy of the Lord in 5:11.³⁸⁰

Fifth, the call for the oppressive rich to *wail* (5:1) uses a term (ὀλολύζω) only found in prophetic literature in the context of judgment (e.g., Isa 10:10; 24:11; Jer 31:20; Ezek 21:17; Amos 8:3; Zech 11:2). In these instances, the addressees are called to expect misery, not in temporal suffering, but in the wrathful divine punishment on the day of judgment.³⁸¹

Sixth, the *vanishing* of the merchants in 4:14 appears to recall the *passing away* of the rich in 1:10–11, both of which describe a great reversal.³⁸² The condemnation of the rich described in 5:1–6 is linked to 4:13–17 by both the absence of the ἀδελφοί and ἐν ὑμῖν, and the unique call *come now*.

Seventh, unlike the other passages we have examined,³⁸³ neither unit contains an exhortation in the imperative form conveying a chance to reform and receive God’s favour.³⁸⁴ While some construe the phrase ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν in 4:15 as having an imperatival force, we will discuss later that this is not clear. The lack of imperative forms that call for repentance is a significant aberration in James, the NT document with the highest percentage of imperatives.³⁸⁵ For these reasons, 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 are set apart as addressing those outside the hearers of the epistle.

In addressing the groups in Jas 4:13–17 and 5:1–6, the author is likely using *apostrophe*, a literary device addressing those not present in order to present a message to those who are.³⁸⁶ The author is “unconcerned about whether his accusations reach the ears of those whom he accuses.”³⁸⁷ The hearers of the epistle are likely familiar with the two groups

³⁸⁰ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 402.

³⁸¹ So Moo, *Letter of James*, 211; Johnson, *Letter of James*, 298–99.

³⁸² So Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 636.

³⁸³ Especially the passages within the *inclusio* marked by judgment language in 2:12–13 and 4:11–12.

³⁸⁴ So Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 161. Regarding 5:1–6, Varner writes that the content “is not directed toward their reform, but is a warning of certain judgment.” See *James*, 333–34.

³⁸⁵ Varner, *James*, 22.

³⁸⁶ Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 220. So also Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 160–61.

³⁸⁷ Dibelius, *James*, 231.

described in 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 and can draw conclusions from their indictment.³⁸⁸ We will discuss the rhetorical function of these two sections concerning *eschatological approval* in Chapter 7. Next, we will make a case for segmenting 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 as distinct sections that share the function of *apostrophe*. While distinguishing between these two sections will not impact our overall argument much, we must still apply our criteria to segmenting James.

5.8.1 James 4:13–17

In what follows, we will contend that James 4:13–17 is a distinct section in James. First, the section has no grammatical connections like γάρ, δέ, and καί that link it to the material occurring before it, opening the possibility of a distinction between 4:12 and 4:13. Likewise, Jas 5:1, while repeating the call Ἄγε νῦν, does not contain connectives that link it to 4:13–17.

Second, James 4:13–17 displays cohesive ties that support it as one unit. After the call to merchants in 4:13, the next verse connects to the previous through the terms αὔριον and ζωή/ζήσομεν. Jas 4:13 also logically flows to 4:14 through the contrast between the declarations about their future (4:13) and the reality that they *do not know* (οὐκ ἐπίστασθε, 4:14a). Like a vapour, they appear for a while and then disappear (4:13b). Jas 4:15 connects to the previous content through the preposition ἀντί, which *substitutes* the earlier saying in 4:13.³⁸⁹ The dominant usage of this preposition in the LXX and papyri conveys an exchange,³⁹⁰ indicating a connection to the previous material. Also, the term λέγειν in 4:15 directly connects to οἱ λέγοντες in 4:13. Jas 4:16a connects to the previous content through the conjunction δέ, and 4:16b connects to 4:16a through the anaphoric τοιαύτη. Next, 4:17 connects to the previous content through the connection οὖν. While Dibelius claims that the task of connecting 4:17 to the preceding material is “futile” because it speaks of sins of *omission*,³⁹¹ he does not recognise that 4:15 indeed presents an *omission* of the right way of speaking, presented by the preposition ἀντί. Finally, the four instances of forms of ποιέω form a cohesive tie for 4:13–17 that do not occur in the texts immediately before or after it.

³⁸⁸ Jackson-McCabe contends that these two sections of apostrophe serve to “unify the brothers” against a class of people by speaking “over the shoulder” against those who aspire to wealth. See “Enduring Temptation,” 178–79.

³⁸⁹ Beale, Ross, and Brendsel, “ἀντί.”

³⁹⁰ Harris, *Prepositions*, 50.

³⁹¹ Dibelius, *James*, 231.

5.8.2 James 5:1–6

In what follows, we will argue that James 5:1–6 is distinct from its surrounding content. First, there are no connectives like γάρ, δέ, and καί that link 5:1–6 with the previous content, opening the possibility of a new section. Second, while οὖν in 5:7 signals a connection with previous material, the section starting in 5:7 shows much more affinity with content occurring before 4:13, suggesting that the inference made with οὖν relates to content that does not occur in 4:13–17 or 5:1–6. We will discuss this connection further below.

Second, James 5:1–6 shows coherence and logically flows from one statement to the next. The noun οἱ πλούσιοι in 5:1 connects to ὁ πλοῦτος in 5:2, and the descriptions of their *riches, garments, gold, and silver* being depreciated (5:2–3a) are linked together. The *rust* on their precious metals will bring them the *misery* mentioned in 5:1; it will consume the flesh of the rich as fire (5:3). James 5:4–6 explains why they will receive misery: *their treatment of their workers*. They have withheld wages from their labourers, whose cries have reached the *ears of the Lord of armies*. The description of their luxury, which appears in 5:3b and elaborated in 5:5, receives crucial explanation: these rich enjoy wealth because they cheat their workers. Jas 5:6 continues the chain of six aorist verbs (5:3–6) that describe the actions of the rich: they *condemned* and *murdered* the righteous man.

The phrase οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν in James 5:6b can have two different interpretations, indicated by how a modern reader would add punctuation. First, it could describe the righteous man (i.e., the labourers) not resisting the condemnation and murderous intent of the rich. Second, it could be a question describing *the Lord* (expecting a ‘yes’ answer)³⁹² following the usage of ἀντιτάσσεται in 4:6. Either way, this saying connects to previous content within 5:1–6.

The chart below depicts the logic of James 5:1–6:

A	Command	Weep and wail (5:1)
B	Grounds for A	Wealth is rotted (5:2–3a)
C	Justification of A	Wealth is evidence of their guilt (5:3b), and they will suffer.
D	Justification of C	They have cheated their labourers to become wealthy, and the Lord has heard (5:4). They have enjoyed a luxurious lifestyle at their workers’ expense, but the day of slaughter has arrived (5:5–6a). God resists them (5:6b?). ³⁹³

³⁹² So Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 161.

³⁹³ It is possible that οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν in 5:6b is a question with God as the subject.

5.9 James 5:7–20

In James 5:7, the author returns to addressing the epistle’s primary hearers through the familiar address *brothers* (ἀδελφοί). In what follows, we will seek to demonstrate that the closing content in James consists of a *two-part conclusion*.

While the backwards-pointing conjunction οὖν in 5:7 indicates that the command is tied to previous content,³⁹⁴ several points argue against the view that the basis is 5:1–6 in particular. First, as stated above, the author returns to the familiar address *brothers* (five times in 5:7–20), which is absent from 4:13–17 and 5:16. Second, the other indicator of the primary audience, the phrase *among you* (ἐν ὑμῖν, cf. 3:13; 4:1) appears three times in 5:7–20 but not in 4:13–17 and 5:16. Third, the command to *be patient* while waiting for blessing in 5:7 cannot refer to the oppressive rich in 5:1–6, since their current state leads to misery.

The particle οὖν in James 5:7 draws from material occurring *before* the sections of apostrophe in 4:13–17 and 5:1–6. First, the depiction of the *parousia* of the Lord (5:7–8) is characterised by *hope* for the hearers of James. This hope is consistent with the image of the farmer dependent on the rain in 5:7. The hearers are not called to change their behaviour, but simply to wait patiently. This hope has much more affinity with being *saved* (4:12, cf. 2:14) than with the condemnation in 4:13–17 and 5:1–6.³⁹⁵ Second, while the *brothers* in 5:7 could be associated with the *labourers* in 5:4 and the *righteous man* in 5:6, the content of 5:1–6 focuses on the misery in store for the wicked rich. It makes no mention of any favour the righteous man will receive. Also, the address to *brothers* in 5:7 is more likely to be *general* like the other instances in James, than a *specific* address to the labourers oppressed by the rich in 5:1–6. There is no indication that ἀδελφοί in 5:7 has a more specific referent than the other instances in James. Third, the association of the *parousia* with *judgment* (5:9) recalls the content within the large *inclusio* (between 2:12–13 and 4:11–12) and the material that introduces it (2:1–11). Fourth, as we will see below, 5:7 is associated with the content that extends to 5:11. Jas 5:11, as we have seen above, marks a grand *inclusio* through the terms for *blessing* and *endurance* with 1:12, the ‘hinge saying’ in the introductory prologue. Since the prologue introduces the key concepts of the entire epistle, it follows that the text in 5:7–11, which is tied to the prologue, is built on the material throughout James, perhaps excluding

³⁹⁴ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 43.

³⁹⁵ Likewise, Konradt points out that the *parousia* does not come with a threat to these brothers. He associates the call to *wait patiently* with the *fruit of righteousness* in 3:18; the hearers just need to persevere to receive eschatological salvation. Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 292–93.

the two sections of apostrophe. Fifth, James 5:7–11 contains more lexical connections with other places in the introductory prologue, including τέλειοι/τέλος (1:4, 17, 25; 5:11), λαμβάνω (1:7, 12; 5:7, 10), and καρδία (1:26; 5:5).³⁹⁶ Sixth, the Old Testament exemplars in 5:10–11 (and in 5:17) recall the examples of Abraham and Rahab in 2:21–25.

With its context in view, the conjunction οὖν in James 5:7 likely has a *resumptive* function.³⁹⁷ In some NT instances, οὖν signals a *resuming* of a storyline or an argument.³⁹⁸ In fact, Levinsohn states that οὖν is used resumptively in nearly every NT epistle, continuing the *topic* under consideration after some intervening material. Examples of οὖν serving a *resumptive* function in New Testament epistles include 2 Tim 1:8, 1 Tim 2:1, 1 Cor 11:20, and Rom 10:14. In these instances, some digression or supporting material occurs immediately before the saying that includes οὖν. In these cases, οὖν signals a *return* to the topic discussed before the digression or supporting material. In this way, the author’s choice of οὖν rather than δέ conveys meaning, since οὖν returns the content to a previous main topic, while δέ is not constrained in this way.³⁹⁹ The occurrence of οὖν in James 5:7 after the *apostrophe* in 4:13–5:6, along with the aforementioned discontinuities between 5:1–6 and 5:7–11, suggest that the conjunction is being used resumptively. The author likely *resumes* his address of the *brothers* as he exhorts them to live in a way that will lead to a favourable judgment in the eschaton.

To be sure, James 5:7–11 has some connections with 5:1–6. Moo proposes that the link is implicit and states that 5:1–11 fits a “widespread biblical pattern,” especially Psalm 37. In that psalm, the righteous are called *poor* (πτωχός, Ps 36:14 LXX), and they experience injustice from the wicked.⁴⁰⁰ The afflicted may be tempted to envy the prosperity of the wicked (Ps 37:1, 7), but are called to trust in the Lord and to *patiently wait* for him to act (Ps 37:2–7). While Moo’s proposal is intriguing, it is not apparent that a connection with Psalm 37 exists. Also, the wicked are not called *rich* in Psalm 37; the exhortation in 5:7–11 is to wait

³⁹⁶ Frankemölle’s foldout chart shows other significant lexical connections between 1:1–27 and 5:7–20. See Frankemölle, “semantische Netz.”

³⁹⁷ The conjunction οὖν can be used to resume a narrative after a parenthesis or long protasis, citing Xenophon’s *Cyr.* 4:1.22 and Herodotus *Hist.* 1.69. See Liddell and Scott, “Οὖν.” Jacob Heckert calls the “continuative” use of οὖν a “weakened form” of the inferential use. See Heckert, *Discourse Function of Conjoiners*, 91–92.

³⁹⁸ For examples of the resumptive use of οὖν in narrative literature, see Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 85–86.

³⁹⁹ Levinsohn, 126–29; Dana and Mantey, *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 257–58.

⁴⁰⁰ Moo, *Letter of James*, 221.

for blessing in the parousia and not for vindication nor for God to take vengeance on the wicked. Nonetheless, Moo does correctly point out that both 5:1–6 and 5:7–11 refer to the eschaton, and that the hearers of James are indeed called to have *patience* in Jas 5:7–8. In this way, the description of blessing in 5:7–11 can still be “the flip side” of the condemnation of the rich in 5:1–6.⁴⁰¹

Ultimately, the connections that James 5:7–11 has with material occurring before 5:1–6 tip the scales toward the conjunction οὖν serving to draw its inference from the whole of the epistle. While 5:7–11 still has a connection with the content immediately preceding it, the passage recalls more than just 5:1–6, and thus 5:7 is best seen as the start of a new section.

James 5:7–20 contains internal coherence that assists us in identifying it as *one closing unit with two movements*. In what follows, we will show that 5:7–11 has internal cohesion. Then we will show that 5:12–20 displays internal cohesion, but also has connections to 5:7–11.

First, as mentioned above, the call to *be patient* in James 5:7 is associated with the material extending to 5:11. Indeed, *patience* (μακροθυμήσατε/μακροθυμία) occurs four times in 5:7–10, forming a semantic chain. The call to abstain from *grumbling* in 5:9 is grounded in the coming of the Lord (here, the *judge*), just like the command in 5:7–8. The example of Job in 5:11 connects to the example of the prophets in 5:10, and the affirmation of *endurance* (ὕπομείναντας/ὕπομονήν) ties to the themes of *patience* and *suffering* in 5:7–10.

Second, the remainder of the content of James in 5:12–20 connects to 5:7–11 through the organic tie δέ. None of the papyrus letters dated before 200 CE which include the conventional phrase πρὸ πάντων have the string πρὸ πάντων δέ.⁴⁰² Also, δέ does not occur with πρὸ πάντων in 1 Peter 4:8. The absence of this string suggests that the author of James is not using δέ with πρὸ πάντων to adhere to convention, but to connect 5:12 to the material preceding it. We have argued in Chapter 4 that the conjunction δέ signals a new step in a sequence or a “topic-chain.” This function fits with 5:12, supported by other connections that link 5:7–20 together.

Third, James 5:12–20 contains cohesion through several elements. Jas 5:12–18 is linked together by aspects that adhere to ancient letter convention. We have seen above that the formula πρὸ πάντων (5:12), content about oaths and swearing (5:12), content about health (5:14–15), and content about prayer (5:14, 16–18) are common elements in the endings of

⁴⁰¹ Moo, 221.

⁴⁰² While the string πρὸ πάντων δέ occurs in *T. Sol.* 4:6, it is not an epistle.

Greek letters. After these elements of letter-closing, 5:19–20 shows cohesive ties with the material in 5:12–18. The term σώσει in 5:20 offers a lexical link to the same word in 5:15. Also, Penner correctly determines that the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν links together the content in 5:13, 5:14, and 5:19.⁴⁰³

Finally, James 5:19–20 shows cohesive ties with the material in 5:7–11, which supports the view that 5:7–20 serves as the closing of James in two movements linked by the conjunction δέ in 5:12. First, the *death* in James 5:19–20 ends the letter with an eschatological outlook, connecting these final verses to the *parousia* and *judgment* in 5:7–11 and 5:12. Second, the value of *being on the right path of truth* in 5:19 recalls the content about *perseverance* in 5:11. We will discuss the content of these verses when we examine them in light of the theme of *eschatological approval*.

5.10 Outline of James 2–5

With the discussion above, we can now present a tentative outline for James 2–5. As we have seen above, the task of segmenting James is reasonably straightforward in some areas. However, in other areas, good cases can be made for different views. After all, as Allison quips about the structure of James, “Scholars may wish to draw straight lines, but James remains fuzzy.”⁴⁰⁴ In each of these controversial places, we have made a case for the scales to tip towards one view.

Here is an outline of James 2–5 based on our findings above, depicting the summary/transition portions in brackets:

- 2:1–13 Refrain from favouritism is an example of obeying the law
 - 2:1–7 Do not show favouritism
 - 2:8–11 Favouritism makes one a transgressor of the law
 - 2:12–13 [Summary/Transition: Speak and act expecting judgment]
- 3:1–12 Tame the tongue
 - 3:1 Do not be a teacher, since we stumble in what we say
 - 3:2–12 The tongue is powerful, use it only to bless
 - 3:13–18 [Summary/Transition: Display wisdom from above]
- 4:1–10 Submit to God instead of the world
 - 4:1–5 Fights and quarrels show friendship with the world
 - 4:6–10 Submit to God, and he will exalt you
 - 4:11–12 [Summary/Transition: Submit to God as the only judge]
 - 4:11 Do not speak against your brother, which is judging the law
 - 4:12 The one lawgiver is the judge, he will save or destroy

⁴⁰³ Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 151.

⁴⁰⁴ Allison, *James*, 78.

4:13–5:6	Apostrophe: Arrogant merchants and wicked rich are condemned
4:13–17	Apostrophe: Do not presume your future
5:1–6	Apostrophe: Rich who cheat their labourers will have misery
5:7–20	Conclusion
5:7–11	Be patient and endure until the parousia
5:12–20	Final exhortations adhering to letter convention

As discussed above, James 2:1–13 introduces the concept of *obedience to the law* through the example of eschewing favouritism. It begins an *inclusio* between 2:14 and 4:10, bracketed by the summary/transition statements in 2:12–13 and 4:11–12. This section represents the bulk of the content directed towards the epistle’s hearers. After two sections of apostrophe addressing those outside the primary audience (4:13–17; 5:1–6), the author addresses the hearers again, closing the epistle with a two-movement conclusion (5:7–11, 12–20).

In Part Three of this thesis, we will examine the content of these sections in James. In Chapter 6, we will first investigate the content of the introductory prologue of James as it relates to the theme of *eschatological approval*. After that, in Chapter 7, we will examine how *eschatological approval* is discussed in James 2–5. The foundation of Chapter 7 will be the use of *inclusio* and the segmentation of units discussed above.

Part Three: Eschatological Approval in the Content of James

In Part Three, we will present a case that *eschatological approval* is the unifying motif in James. We will be building on the epistle's structure presented in Part Two. We will especially consider the instances of grand *inclusio* as we examine the salient portions of each unit as determined in Chapters 4 and 5.

In Chapter 6, we will examine how the author of James introduces the concept of *eschatological approval* as the main idea of the prologue. In Chapter 7, we will discuss how the sections of James 2–5 relate to the theme of *eschatological approval*. We will conclude in Chapter 8 with a summary of the arguments of this thesis, as well as its contributions to the study of James.

Chapter 6: Eschatological Approval in James 1

In this chapter, we examine how the opening of James introduces the main idea of *eschatological approval*. We have made an argument in Chapter 4 that James 1:1–27 has as an introductory function, previewing the themes and key terms that appear in Jas 2–5.

Considering the parallels in James 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25, we will examine how this tripartite introduction points to the saying in 1:12 as the main idea of the prologue. Then, we will examine the subunits of James 1 and how they point to this main idea. Instrumental in our study is the examination of discourse devices and Greek parallels, discussed in Chapter 2.

6.1 Eschatological Approval in James 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25

In the beginning, middle, and end of the prologue, the author of James communicates *the final result* that motivates his hearers towards specific behaviour. We will examine each of the places that mark the double-*inclusio* in Jas 1.

6.1.1 James 1:2–4

After the salutation (James 1:1), the first subsection of James includes an exhortation to have *joy* in various *trials*. In what follows, we will examine how the author signals the salient parts of 1:2–4.

The main verb of James 1:2–4 is ἠγάσασθε, which often takes a double accusative.⁴⁰⁵ The word order in James 1:2–4 signals an emphasis on the accusative phrase πᾶσαν χαράν. Here the author violates the default word order of verb-subject-object.⁴⁰⁶ Simon Dik’s concept of preverbal positions applies here.⁴⁰⁷ The phrase πᾶσαν χαράν introduces *newly-asserted information* before the main verb, becoming the focal concept.⁴⁰⁸ By default, the new information occurs as close to the *end* of the clause as grammatically allowed.⁴⁰⁹ By moving the focal information from its default position, the author gives it *marked focus*:

⁴⁰⁵ Bauer, “Ἠγέομαι.” So also Adam, *James*, 4.

⁴⁰⁶ Porter, *Idioms*, 293. See the examples in Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 166–70.

⁴⁰⁷ Dik, *Functional Grammar I*, 420–27.

⁴⁰⁸ “...information which is relatively the most important or salient in the given communicative setting.” See Dik, 326. Knud Lambrecht also calls this new information “the focus.” See Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form*, 213.

⁴⁰⁹ Jan Firbas assigns the label “Rheme” to the positioning of newly-asserted focus at the end of a saying. See Firbas, “From Comparative Word-Order Studies,” 115.

greater prominence for an already-focal concept.⁴¹⁰ While *χαράν* links to *χαίρειν* in 1:1 as a catchword, the text reveals a deliberate placement of the accusative phrase at the beginning of the sentence,⁴¹¹ in a “specially marked position.”⁴¹² The emphasised accusative conveys that the response for the event revealed later is to be *all joy*.

While *ἀδελφοί μου* in 1:2 identifies the author’s intended audience, it also serves as a forward-pointing device. Since the vocative does not contain new information, it slows the information rate, further delaying the author’s disclosure of what the hearers are to consider *all joy*.⁴¹³

After the vocative address, the hearers learn what they are to consider all joy: *ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις*. Within this clause, *πειρασμοῖς* is moved from its default position after the verb, signalling that it is the most salient part of this phrase.⁴¹⁴

The term *πειρασμός*, occurring in Jas 1:2 and 1:12, has two usages according to BDAG. First, it could refer to “an attempt to learn the nature or character of something,” a *test* or *trial*. Second, it could refer to “an attempt to make one do something wrong,” a *temptation* or *enticement* to sin.⁴¹⁵ While both definitions of *πειρασμός* involve an attempt, it is the *intent* that is significant in interpreting its usage. In what follows, we will contend that *πειρασμός* in James 1:2 aligns with Bauer’s first definition of this noun.

First, the context of *πειρασμοῖς* in James 1:2 is consistent with that of *testings*. The dependent clause beginning with *γινώσκοντες* in 1:3 includes the term *δοκίμιον*. This rare word refers to either the *process of testing* or *genuineness as a result of a test*.⁴¹⁶ This connotation of *δοκίμιον* receives support from other NT and LXX instances,⁴¹⁷ all of which occur in the context of *testing precious metals*. In LXX Ps 11:7, the sayings of the Lord are like silver burned in the earth, with *δοκίμιον* describing its purity. For precious metals in Prov 27:21, fire is the means of *testing* (*δοκίμιον*). With these usages of *δοκίμιον* in view, *testings*

⁴¹⁰ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 190.

⁴¹¹ Notably, the term *λείπεται* in 1:5 links to *λειπόμενοι* in 1:4 as a catchword, but does not occur at the very beginning of the saying.

⁴¹² Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 272–73. So also Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 38.

⁴¹³ See the discussion of “Redundant Vocatives as Forward-Pointing Devices,” along with six NT examples, in Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 117–23.

⁴¹⁴ So Runge, 275.

⁴¹⁵ Bauer, “Πειρασμός.”

⁴¹⁶ Bauer, “Δοκίμιον.”

⁴¹⁷ Also see the LXX sense of “means of testing,” in Muraoka, “Δοκιμεῖον.” This sense also occurs outside the LXX and NT: “proof, means of examining,” in Montanari, “Δοκιμεῖον.”

for learning the nature or character (see BDAG usage above) is a better fit for πειρασμοῖς in 1:2 rather than *temptation to sin* (which would fit with 1:13–15). First Peter 1:6–7, which remarkably features the same phrase τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως in association with ποικίλοις πειρασμοῖς, declares that the product is worth more than *fire-tested gold*.⁴¹⁸

Second, the call to consider πειρασμοῖς to be *all joy* (James 1:2) points to *testings* more than it does to *temptations*. While *temptations* involve enticement to sin (see Jas 1:14), *testing* is more likely to be an affliction, hence the possible gloss of *trial*. The author likely exhorts his hearers to consider the rough experiences of *testings* to be *all joy*.

Third, the association of πειρασμοῖς with ὑπομονή in 1:3 points to *trials*. The term ὑπομονή can refer to the “capacity to...bear up in the face of difficulty,” or the “state of patient waiting.”⁴¹⁹ Given the exhortation to *joy* in Jas 1:2, ὑπομονή in 1:3 likely refers to *perseverance* through difficulty. This is consistent with usages of ὑπομονή and its cognates in the LXX (e.g., Sus 1:57; 1 Esd 2:15; 2 Macc 6:20), especially the references to the martyrs undergoing their persecution in 4 Maccabees (e.g., 5:23; 6:9; 7:22; 15:30). The ones who withstood torture are revered; they await a reward.

Fourth, the LXX and intertestamental parallels help to confirm the usage of πειρασμός as referring to a *test* for *evaluating* another party or individual (e.g., 1 Kgs 10:1; Tob 12:13; 4 Macc 9:7; Wis 2:17; Sir 4:17;⁴²⁰ 27:5, 7; 37:27; Dan 1:12, 14; *T. Jos.* 16:3; *Jub.* 10:9). In a well-known account found in Deut 33:8 and Exod 17:7, the nouns πείρα and πειρασμός stand in place of Massah (מַסָּה, “test”), the location where the people put Aaron to the *test*.⁴²¹ The people are warned not to put the Lord to the *test* again (Deut 6:16; Ps 94:8).

In some cases, the verb πειράζω appears in the context of *difficulty* (e.g., Prov 16:29; 3 Macc 5:40; Aris. Ex. 1:3; *Sib. Or.* 5:385). For example, the people *test* ‘Levi’ (Deut 33:8) in a *test* (πείρα) at Massah, and the enemies *test* David (Ps 34:16). In the sayings of Jesus, Jesus πειρασμός refers to times of difficulty (Matt 6:13; Luke 11:4). In addressing his disciples (Luke 22:28), Jesus identifies them as those who have remained (διαμένω) with him in these *tests* (πειρασμός).⁴²² Most often, the instances in the sayings of Jesus associate

⁴¹⁸ As with all uses of parallels, the appeal to 1 Peter does not imply a statement about one text’s dependence on the other.

⁴¹⁹ Bauer, “ὑπομονή.”

⁴²⁰ Sir 4:17 describes Wisdom personified, *testing* the one who obeys her.

⁴²¹ Wevers, *Deuteronomy*, 543.

⁴²² Notably, this is the only instance in the Synoptic sayings of Jesus where πειρασμός is plural.

πειρασμός with a specific *time* of *trial* or *testing* (Matt 26:41; Mark 14:38; Luke 8:13; 11:4; 22:40, 46).

What is the basis of the tests in James 1:2? In a dependent clause beginning with γνώσκοντες, the author equates the *testings* (πειρασμός) with δοκίμιον. The rare term δοκίμιον has significant overlap with the act of πειρασμός. It applies to the *testing* of the *genuineness* of something, especially precious metals, as we have seen above. Through this shift from πειρασμός to δοκίμιον, the author makes the *testing* more *specific*: its purpose is to *test* the hearers' faith (ὕμῶν τῆς πίστεως) for *genuineness*.

The *testing* of the hearers' faith for *genuineness* begins a chain-saying that extends to the end of James 1:4. In what Johnson calls a *sorites*, each clause in 1:3–4 builds on the previous one through concatenation until the ultimate goal:⁴²³

ὑπομονήν (1:3) → ὑπομονή ... τέλειον (1:4a) → τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι

While the repetition of a word from the previous clause is semantically unnecessary, Kathleen Callow points out that it serves a *rhetorical* purpose:

Whatever form of repetition is used, the effect is always the same. The second mention of the event provides virtually no new information in itself, hence it slows down the information rate considerably.⁴²⁴

Through chain-saying constructions, an author often slows the rate of information to highlight a *significant* element at the end. Each 'fronting' of δοκίμιον and ὑπομονή in their respective clauses acts as a *topic frame* for the salient information.⁴²⁵ In a chain-saying like James 1:3–4, the significant element occurs at the end of the saying.⁴²⁶

The goal of the process of James 1:3–4 is the motivation for considering *testings* to be *all joy* (1:2). The goal is the ἔργον τέλειον, marked for emphasis in the preverbal P2 position in 1:4. The final clause explains the ἔργον τέλειον through three descriptors: ἵνα ᾗτε τέλειοι

⁴²³ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 177. Also see Dibelius, *James*, 74–76. Both cite 1 Pet 1:6–7 and Rom 5:2–5 as parallels to this chain-saying in James 1:3–4. I have pointed out elsewhere that this chain-saying is another example of the author's use of catchwords. See Eng, "Catchwords," 259 n59.

⁴²⁴ Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 76.

⁴²⁵ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 210–16. Runge uses Jas 1:3–4 as one of five examples of 'topic framing' in the NT.

⁴²⁶ Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 197–200. For more examples of the tail-head linkage device pointing to the significance of the final element, see Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 167–77.

καὶ ὀλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι. Allison points out that shared rhythm, assonance, and consonance link the descriptors.⁴²⁷ We will consider these descriptors together.

The three descriptors in James 1:4b fall within a common range of meaning: reaching the apex of *completeness*. The term τέλειοι, which repeats throughout James (1:15, 17, 25; 2:8, 22; 3:2; 5:11), can refer to (1) “meeting the highest standard,” (2) “being mature,” (3) initiated into a cult, or (4) “being fully developed in a moral sense.”⁴²⁸ Its association in 1:4 with ὀλόκληροι, which conveys “being complete and meeting all expectations,”⁴²⁹ favours the first and second usages of τέλειος, which have significant overlap (see Heb 9:11; 1 Cor 13:10; 14:20; Wis 9:6; Eph 4:13). The third descriptor, ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι, harmonises with the first two adjectival terms; the hearers will have *nothing lacking or deficient*.⁴³⁰

The three associated descriptors likely describe *wholeness* and *completeness* in commitment to God. We will defend this view with τέλειοι as our starting point. Several points assist our interpretation of τέλειοι. First, when it refers to people, τέλειος in the LXX most often corresponds to the terms אֵלֶּיךָ (1 Kgs 8:61; 11:4; 15:3, 14; 1 Chr 28:9) and אֵלֶּיךָ (Gen 6:9; Deut 18:13; 2 Sam 22:26).⁴³¹ The context of these instances points to a *complete* commitment before God: an “undivided loyalty.”⁴³² This usage of τέλειος is likely the connotation of its occurrence in James 1:4. The saying affirms that the *testings* serve to prove the genuineness of faith (1:2–3), much like the figures described by τέλειος in the LXX. They were considered τέλειος because of their *completeness* or *undivided hearts*.⁴³³ This sense of τέλειος is also found in Matt 19:21. Jesus exhorts a rich man, who has kept the commandments, to sell his possessions and follow him in order to be τέλειος. This saying of Jesus communicates that eternal life requires *wholehearted* and *undivided* adherence to him.⁴³⁴

Second, as we have seen, a prominent theme in James is *single-mindedness*. Zmijewski, Hartin, Moo, Cheung, Blomberg and Kamell, McCartney, and Jackson-McCabe are among the scholars who have investigated *singleness/perfection* as a dominant motif in the

⁴²⁷ Allison, *James*, 153.

⁴²⁸ Bauer, “Τέλειος.”

⁴²⁹ Bauer, “Ολόκληρος.”

⁴³⁰ Bauer, “Λείπω.”

⁴³¹ Cf. the description of Noah in Sir 44:17.

⁴³² Allison, *James*, 155.

⁴³³ So Burchard, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 58.

⁴³⁴ Cf. Osborne, *Matthew*, 718.

epistle. In accordance with *singleness*, the author of James condemns *doubleness*, using the rare term δίψυχος to condemn an unstable and wavering man (1:6–8). He also uses δίψυχος for his hearers (4:8), urging his hearers to choose God over the world (4:4). Thus, τέλειος in James 1:4 is likely associated with this *undivided commitment* and *wholehearted faith*.

Third, the view that τέλειος refers to *wholeness* or *completeness* in faith (1:3) is supported by its apposition with ὁλόκληροι, a term that refers to *completeness*. Furthermore, ὁλόκληρος is primarily used in the LXX to correspond to מְלֵאֵם (Deut 27:6; Josh 9:4) and מִלֵּוֹא (Lev 2:15; Ezek 15:5), revealing its significant overlap with τέλειος. Each of the instances conveys a sense of *completeness* or *wholeness*.

Fourth, the phrase ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι reinforces the connotation of τέλειος as *complete*. The *result* of the testings of faith in 1:2–4 is that the hearers would have no deficiency. Thus, they are to consider their *testings* as *all joy*, anticipating the final result.

The term τέλειος in James 1:4 likely *does not convey sinlessness*. Its association with ὁλόκληροι and ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι points to *completeness*. Besides, as Burchard correctly points out, the author asserts that at least the sin of the tongue is ineradicable (3:1–11): he demands perfection, but he is not a perfectionist.⁴³⁵ This usage of τέλειος is consistent with Matt 5:48, which describes a love that goes beyond *good* people to *evil* people (5:45).⁴³⁶ This *complete* love does not mean sinlessness, as Allison rightly points out that Jesus urges his hearers to ask for forgiveness in the Lord’s Prayer.⁴³⁷

Considering the association of τέλειος, ὁλόκληροι, and λειπόμενοι, the motif of singleness, and the Greek parallels, we can conclude that the descriptors in James 1:4 point to *wholeness* or *completeness*. The author urges his hearers to rejoice in *testings* because the process will result in their *completeness*.

As discussed above, the discourse markers highlight two elements of James 1:2–4 as the most important. First, the fronted accusative πᾶσαν χαράν emphasises *joy* in the testings. Second, the descriptors τέλειος καὶ ὁλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι in 1:4 naturally has the most saliency, being at the end of the chain-saying.

The saliency of the *beginning* and *end* of 1:2–4 shows that the author has placed the greatest emphasis on the *final result* of the testings. The hearers should rejoice in their difficulties that serve as *testings*, knowing that their *endurance* (1:3) will bring them to the

⁴³⁵ Burchard, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 58.

⁴³⁶ Weren, “Ideal Community,” 187.

⁴³⁷ Allison, *Sermon*, 104.

favourable state in the end (1:4). This state of *wholeness* and *completeness* will lead to the favourable judgment from God. As discussed above, this favourable verdict is the goal of the *testings*: the term δοκίμιον in 1:3 conveys *testing for genuineness*.

James 1:2–4 communicates hope in a *favourable future state*. Again, the focus of James 1:2–4 is not on the *criteria* for the testing. While testing and its criteria play a significant role in the saying, the author calls his hearers to have *joy*, emphasising the goal.⁴³⁸ Notably, the author considers the favourable state in James 1:4b to be the expected conclusion. He does not question whether the hearers have genuine faith; he presumes that their *endurance* through the testings will result in a complete work (ἔργον τέλειον), using the imperative ἐχέτω. If the testings run their course, the hearers will reach the state of being τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι.

Some contend that the content in James 1:2–4 is not eschatological. For example, Laws claims that “there is no eschatological term to James’s series...probation leads to achieving of personal integrity, apparently an end in itself.”⁴³⁹ However, while James 1:2–4 does not contain explicit eschatological content, its context and connections to other texts support the view that the author is referring to the eschaton.

First, eschatological expectations were likely commonplace for the hearers of James; even the salutation in 1:1 hints at an eschatological expectation of the restoration of the twelve tribes. The sayings of Jesus, which have many connections with James, often interpret the present circumstances in light of the eschaton, especially with Jewish traditions teaching about the great tribulation.⁴⁴⁰ In light of the imminence of the parousia in 5:8, there may be an association between these *trials* (πειρασμός) and the aforementioned teachings about tribulation.⁴⁴¹

⁴³⁸ Cf. Davids, *Epistle of James*, 70. Davids points out that the hearers of James are to rejoice because the goal of the process is eschatological perfection.

⁴³⁹ Laws, *Epistle of James*, 52.

⁴⁴⁰ McKnight, *Jesus and His Death*, 56–58, 81–84; Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 147–50.

⁴⁴¹ The term πειρασμός can refer to end-time tribulation. See Allison, *James*, 148. Daniel 12:10 LXX uses the verb περιάζω to refer to future testing, associated with the verb ἀγιάζω. Allison also cites 4Q174 1-3 2 and 4Q177 2.9–10, which refer to future *testing* and *refining*. See Allison, 159 n172. Also, other NT texts use the word family to refer to end-time testing (Matt 6:13; Luke 11:4; Mark 14:38; Rev 2:10; 3:10). While this usage of πειρασμός is not necessarily associated with eschatological *judgment* (that is, future eschatology) the usage of πειρασμός in James 1 can still evoke thoughts the last days (see Jas 5:3).

Second, ὑπομονή and its verb form ὑπομένω often have an eschatological context in the NT (Matt 10:22; 24:13; Mark 13:13; Luke 21:19; Rom 8:25; 2 Thess 1:4–7; Rev 1:9; 13:10; 14:12) and LXX (Theodotion Dan 12:12; Zech 6:14). Rev 3:10 is probably the most significant instance of the eschatological use of ὑπομονή; it clusters πειρασμός with ὑπομονή just like Jas 1:2–4 (and 1:12) does.

Third, as Allison points out,⁴⁴² the only other NT instance of ὀλόκληρος (1 Thess 5:23), occurs in an eschatological context. With these elements of James 1:2–4 occurring in eschatological contexts elsewhere, a cumulative case can be made for its eschatological nature.

If James 1:2–4 contains an eschatological context, it would be consistent with NT texts that are close parallels. The two passages often mentioned as parallel chain-sayings to James 1:2–4 are Rom 5:3–5 and 1 Pet 1:6–7.⁴⁴³ Both of these passages have an eschatological context, suggesting that James 1:2–4 also has this context. Also, Phil 1:10, which also has ἵνα ᾗτε in association with δοκιμάζειν (like δοκίμιον in James 1:3) and two nominative plural descriptors: εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι, has an eschatological context for its hearers.

Again, James 1:2–4 does not contain explicit eschatological content. However, its connections to other texts make an eschatological reading of this text defensible. Indeed, Mußner calls the combination of ὑπομονή, τέλειος, and ὀλόκληρος an unmistakable eschatological “sound.”⁴⁴⁴ Davids appropriately writes that the author is “instructing his readers to get the proper perspective, i.e. an eschatological perspective, on the situation in which they find themselves.”⁴⁴⁵

6.1.2 James 1:12

As discussed above, James 1:12 marks the end of the first *inclusio* and the beginning of the second *inclusio* of the prologue. Both 1:2–4 and 1:25 point to 1:12 as the centre of the introduction, which also marks a grand *inclusio* with 5:11. Thus, we will give special attention to 1:12 and its function, both in the prologue and for the entire letter.

The function of James 1:12 as a *macarism* implicitly points to *God* as the one granting the *crown of life*. Within the Jewish tradition, macarisms featuring μακάριος serve as

⁴⁴² Allison, *James*, 158 n149.

⁴⁴³ So Dibelius, *James*, 75; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 65–66; Johnson, *Letter of James*, 177.

⁴⁴⁴ “Der eschatologische Klang,” Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 67.

⁴⁴⁵ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 67.

congratulatory declarations exclusively for people, not God.⁴⁴⁶ Likewise, the term יְרֵאָה in the Hebrew Bible—with which μακάριος (or a form of it) corresponds in the LXX—only applies to people, largely describing a favourable relationship with God in the Psalms (e.g., Ps 1:1; 32:1–2; 33:12; 40:4; 65:4). James 1:12 adheres to the formula found in the Matthean Beatitudes: a nominative μακάριος, a subject, and a clause explaining the *cause*⁴⁴⁷ for the declaration of μακάριος.⁴⁴⁸ Like the Matthean Beatitudes, this *cause* includes the implication that the agent of the favourable state is God.

The placement of the term μακάριος in 1:12 marks it for saliency. The anarthrous predicate adjective is fronted before the subject, ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν. The fronting of the adjective makes it more emphatic than the subject.⁴⁴⁹ The subject ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν is already-established since ὑπομονή and πειρασμός already appeared in 1:2–3. μακάριος is in the preverbal P2 position, drawing even more attention to already newly-asserted content.

The ὅτι clause in James 1:12 carries saliency through its connection with μακάριος, with its most prominent part being λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς. The entire clause presents the *cause* of the focal designation μακάριος, and it occurs at the default position for prominence, the end of the saying. The author’s choice to express this clause as an indicative verb with two dependent subclauses (rather than a string of indicative verbs) points to λήμψεται as the recipient of primary attention.⁴⁵⁰ After all, the participial phrase and the relative clause are both dependent on the indicative verb.⁴⁵¹ Therefore, the author places prominence on μακάριος, the *favourable state*, and its cause: *he will receive the crown of life*.

The *crown*, emphasised as the cause of μακάριος, is the *reward* for the man in 1:12. στέφανος denotes an *adornment* worn by someone of *high status* or *esteem*.⁴⁵² This usage of the noun as a symbol of esteem occurs in the LXX and intertestamental literature (e.g., 2 Sam

⁴⁴⁶ Collins, “Beatitudes.”

⁴⁴⁷ See the NT examples of causal clauses beginning with ὅτι in Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 460–61.

⁴⁴⁸ Howell, *Matthean Beatitudes*, 144:197.

⁴⁴⁹ So Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 307.

⁴⁵⁰ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 248.

⁴⁵¹ Köstenberger, Merkle, and Plummer, *Deeper Greek*, 327, 394.

⁴⁵² Bauer, “Στέφανος.”

12:30; 1 Chr 20:2; Esth 8:15; Ep Jer 8; *T. Levi* 8:2, 9),⁴⁵³ with the adornment of Mordecai in Esth 8:15 being particularly illustrative.

The qualifier τῆς ζωῆς indicates that στέφανος is *figurative*. In accordance, the dominant usage of στέφανος indicates *God's bestowing of benefit: blessing and salvation* (e.g., Ps 5:13; 102:4), *high esteem* (e.g., Sir 15:6; Jer 13:18; Prov 12:4; Job 19:9; Lam 2:15), *godly wisdom* (e.g., Prov 1:9; 14:24; Sir 1:11; 6:31), and *prosperity and longevity* (Prov 16:31; 17:6; Sir 25:6). God gives the reward of a crown for righteousness (*T. Benj.* 4:1; *Let. Aris.* 280). Even God himself, the one redeeming his people, is portrayed as a *crown* for the people (Isa 28:5). In these instances, the *crown* largely refers to *the receiving of honour* in which to delight.

The use of στέφανος as a reward for faithfulness elsewhere suggests that James 1:12 depicts the *crown of life* as such a reward. Also, the nature of the crown as a *future result* gives 1:12 more affinity with the NT Beatitudes than with the LXX or Hebrew Bible instances of μακάριος and ʾגְּוֹן, where they typically describe a *present* state of favour. The language of *endurance* in Jas 1:12 and the future λήμψεται suggests that στέφανος is an eschatological reward from God. This connotation of στέφανος occurs in Zech 6:14 and *T. Benj.* 4:1, which convey *eternal reward* consistent with the crown of victory (cf. Wis 4:2; *T. Job* 4:10).⁴⁵⁴ Also, other NT instances convey an end-time reward akin to one received by an athlete⁴⁵⁵ (1 Cor 9:25; 2 Tim 4:7–8; 1 Pet 5:4; Rev 2:10).

In the context of James 1:12, the genitive τῆς ζωῆς is probably epexegetical, as in *the crown, that is life*.⁴⁵⁶ The reward identified as *life* is significant here. The concept of *life* as a reward for the faithful is familiar in the LXX, as the people hear that they ultimately choose *life* when they obey the law (Deut 30:19).⁴⁵⁷ Johnson rightly points out that ζωή often signifies the future eschatological life with God in the New Testament,⁴⁵⁸ especially in the sayings of Jesus (Matt 7:14; 18:8–9; 19:17, 29; 25:46; Mark 9:43, 45; 10:30; Luke 18:30).

⁴⁵³ Also see 1 Macc 1:22; 4:57; 10:20, 29; 11:35, 37, 39; 2 Macc 14:4; Sir 40:4; 45:12; Ps 20:4; Isa 22:18, 21; Jdt 3:7.

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. May, “Covenant Loyalty,” 177..

⁴⁵⁵ Konradt proposes that Christians who overcome desire, the world, and the devil receive the crown in 1:12 as if they were soldiers and competitors after a successful fight. See Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 287–88.

⁴⁵⁶ Adam, *James*, 14.

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. May, “Covenant Loyalty,” 179.

⁴⁵⁸ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 188.

The notion of ζωή as “the eschatological joy of the new age that God will bring in”⁴⁵⁹ fits well; Jas 1:12 describes one who endures trials (cf. 1:2–4) in the current age.⁴⁶⁰ The closest parallel to Jas 1:12 probably is Rev 2:10, which clusters several terms and themes found in James 1. Those in the church in Smyrna receive the στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς after they are *tested* (πειρασθῆτε) with tribulation (θλίψιν) if they are faithful until the end (in this case, θάνατος). The crown of life appears associated with protection from eschatological death (see Rev 2:11). Davids asserts that the “actual reward is salvation itself, for (eternal) life is certainly the content of the crown.”⁴⁶¹ Schreiner and Caneday, comparing Jas 1:12 to the Beatitudes of Jesus, assert that the author “specifies that *blessedness* comes because the man will receive the *crown* that is *life*, the reward of eschatological joy with God in the next age.”⁴⁶² Also, Allison suggests an association with the posthumous awarding of a crown or graves being decorated with wreaths, representing *immortality*.⁴⁶³

Ultimately, the traditions connected to the phrase στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς point to this reward in James 1:12 being *eschatological*. We will add further support to this point below.

While the focus is on μακάριος and the crown of life, the author signals saliency for the *favourable verdict* in James 1:12. Whether γενόμενος can be causal (*because he is approved*) or temporal (*after he is approved*),⁴⁶⁴ δόκιμος is fronted in the clause for saliency, occupying the P2 position before the participle. Its cognate δοκίμιον, introduced in 1:3, refers to the *testing* of faith for *genuineness*. By using δόκιμος in 1:12, the author refers not just to the *final result* of the testing, but a *favourable* one. The term δόκιμος can refer to being (1) *genuine* based on testing, (2) *worthy* of high regard, or (3) *valuable*.⁴⁶⁵ Both the first and second usages fit well in this context: the man is blessed and rewarded, indicating that he receives a *favourable verdict*.

The usage of δόκιμος in James 1:12, in light of its context, likely follows the LXX usage: “tested and found acceptable.”⁴⁶⁶ The use in James may even elicit an association with

⁴⁵⁹ Martin, *James*, 33.

⁴⁶⁰ Likewise, Allison attributes this image of an afterlife crown to the athletic imagery applied to the martyrs (4 Macc 6:10; 11:20; 15:29; 17:11–16). See Allison, *James*, 232.

⁴⁶¹ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 80. Cf. Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 86; Laws, *Epistle of James*, 68; Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 186.

⁴⁶² Schreiner and Caneday, *The Race Set Before Us*, 83. Emphasis theirs.

⁴⁶³ Allison, *James*, 232–33.

⁴⁶⁴ So Adam, *James*, 14. Vlachos designates it as temporal. See Vlachos, *James*, 39.

⁴⁶⁵ Bauer, “Δόκιμος.”

⁴⁶⁶ Muraoka, “Δόκιμος.”

the *tested genuineness* (i.e., high value) of precious metals, especially when viewed with its cognate in 1:3. As discussed above, δοκίμιον in LXX Ps 11:7, Prov 27:21, and 1 Pet 1:7 is associated with the testing of precious metals. Also, every instance of the adjective δόκιμος in the LXX describes a precious metal like gold or silver (Gen 23:16; 1 Kings 10:18; 1 Chr 28:18; 29:4; 2 Chr 9:17; Zech 11:13; cf. *Let. Aris.* 57). Since *pure* and *genuine* gold and silver are of great worth, the term δόκιμος indicates high value. For example, in LXX Zech 11:13, the Lord instructs the prophet to put silver pieces into the smelting-furnace and examine if it is δόκιμος.⁴⁶⁷ If the author of James indeed relies heavily on the LXX, a case can be made that δοκίμιον and δόκιμος in Jas 1 points to metallurgic imagery.

Whether or not the imagery of precious metals is in view, the adjective δόκιμος necessitates an *evaluator*. There must be one who determines whether the man in James 1:12 is approved. It follows that the unnamed evaluator in 1:12 is God, especially given the connections between 1:12 and 1:2–4, which discusses the testing of *faith*. The presence of one who evaluates in 1:12 is confirmed by much of the tradition surrounding the δόκιμος word family. In many LXX and intertestamental cases of δόκιμος and the verb δοκιμάζω, *God* is portrayed as the one who tests people. God is often portrayed as one who tests hearts and minds⁴⁶⁸ to approve them (e.g., Ps 16:3; 65:10; 138:1, 23; Prov 17:3; Wis 3:6; Zech 13:9; Jer 20:12; Wis 11:9–10). In Jer 6:27–30, the prophet acts like a metal assayer, *testing* the people for God. Later, God is portrayed as the one refining his people (Jer 9:7–9). Likewise, in intertestamental usage of δόκιμος/δοκιμάζω, *God* determines one to be approved after judgment (*Sib. Or.* 2:45–46; 8:88–92; *T. Jos.* 2:7). The patriarch in *T. Jos.* 2:6–7 teaches that God *tries* (δοκιμάζω) the soul, and affirms that he is *approved* (δόκιμος) because of his *perseverance* (ὑπομονή) through the ten trials. In *Sib. Or.* 2:80–94 and *T. Ab.* 12.14 (Long Recension), terms with the δοκιμ- root denote the testing of one's deeds in the eschaton. *Jub.* 10:9, *T. Ash.* 5:3–4, and Eup. 32 also demonstrate *approval* as a result of God's evaluation.⁴⁶⁹

Further supporting God as the *evaluator* for the declaration of δόκιμος, an association exists between the δόκιμος word family and *judgment*. In the Psalms, God is the one to *test* and *judge* one's character (Ps 16:2–3; 25:1–2). In speaking of *judgments* (κρίματα), Jeremiah (11:20) appeals to his own heart being *tested* (δοκιμάζων). In connection with judgment,

⁴⁶⁷ The Leyden Papyrus X (42–43) describes the process for testing gold or silver. When fired, pure gold and silver will keep its colour. However, if the metal blackens, it contains lead. See Jensen, *The Leyden and Stockholm Papyri*, 28–29.

⁴⁶⁸ νεφρός, lit. “kidneys” is used to refer to the inner mind.

⁴⁶⁹ Fallon, “Eupolemus,” 867.

there is often an expressed *criterion*, as well as a *verdict* pronounced. Ben Sira asks if anyone has been tested by gold and been *made perfect* (ἐτελειώθη, Sir 31:10). Virtue, testing (δοκιμάζουσα) the martyrs for *perseverance* (δι' ὑπομονῆς), offered them rewards (4 Macc 17:12). Ben Sira urges the hearer to be *approved* (δεδοκιμασμένος) by all after discipline and training (Sir 42:8). With these instances associating δοκιμάζω with *judgment*, there is a sense that James 1:12 has the implied evaluator being *God*.

The two relative clauses in James 1:12, while receiving less emphasis, give the *criteria* for the favourable judgment. The man who is designated as δόκιμος is specified as ὁ ὑπομένει πειρασμόν, using two terms already introduced in 1:2–4. As discussed above, the author of James sees *endurance* through the difficulties of *testing* as a virtue.

The clustering of terms associated with ὑπομονή in the *Testament of Joseph* and *Testament of Job* supports the hope of a *divine reward* in Jas 1:12. *T. Jos.* 2:7 clusters ὑπομονή with πειρασμός, as the patriarch is ultimately shown by God to be approved (ἐν δέκα πειρασμοῖς δόκιμόν με ἀνέδειξε) through ten trials. He states that God gives many things, connecting endurance with *reward*.⁴⁷⁰ In *T. Jos.* 10:1–2, the patriarch appeals to the *reward* of the Lord dwelling with them if they show ὑπομονή. He advises that endurance (ὑπομονή) produces (κατεργάζομαι, cf. Jas 1:3) great things and that it will result in the Lord dwelling among them. In *T. Job* 1:5, Job describes his *endurance* (Ἰὼβ ἐν πάσῃ ὑπομονῇ γενόμενος),⁴⁷¹ for which God promises a *reward* of great notoriety (*T. Job* 4:6). Thus, these texts connect *endurance* with a *reward*.

Theodotion Dan 12:12, which clusters μακάριος with ὑπομένω,⁴⁷² is a strong parallel to Jas 1:12. It describes the *blessedness* of the one *persevering*, for he will come to the one thousand three hundred thirty-five days. The association of the perseverance with the consummation (συντέλεια, Dan 12:4, 13) affirms that it refers to *perseverance to the end*. This perseverance is consistent with the *ongoing* nature of multiple trials in Jas 1:2–4, as well as the eschatological reward in 1:12. Based on Dan 12:12, Allison suggests a “theological commonplace” of eschatological content associated with concepts in James 1:12.⁴⁷³

⁴⁷⁰ Notably, ὑπομονή is used in apposition with μακροθυμία (cf. Jas 5:7–11) here.

⁴⁷¹ Robert Kraft renders this phrase “who exhibits complete endurance.” See Kraft, *Testament of Job*, 23.

⁴⁷² Instead of ὑπομένω, the Old Greek of Dan 12:12 contains the related term ἐμμένω.

⁴⁷³ Allison also cites Dan 12:10, Isa 30:18, LXX Zech 6:14, 2 Bar. 52:5–7, Herm. Vis. 2.2.7. See Allison, *James*, 227–28.

Another strong parallel to James 1:12 is Zechariah 6:14 LXX, which *clusters* στέφανος and ὑπομένω. With a possible eschatological context,⁴⁷⁴ the *crown* is reserved as a symbol of honour for those who endure.

Finally, Revelation 2:10 and 3:10–11 may be the strongest parallels to James 1:12, both in an eschatological context. Revelation 2:10, which is addressed to the church in Smyrna, contains πειράζω, a cognate of πειρασμός, and the same phrase στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς.⁴⁷⁵ Those who remain faithful through the *tests* until death will receive the *crown of life*. Revelation 3:10–11, addressed to the church in Philadelphia, contains ὑπομονή, πειρασμός, and στέφανος. Those who *endure* will be kept from the hour of *testing*, and they will have their *crown*.

The second relative clause refers to the reward, the crown of life: ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. This qualifier indicates the criteria for the crown's recipient, the one who is δόκιμος. The verb ἀγαπάω can indicate (1) warm regard for another, (2) high esteem for something, or (3) proving one's love.⁴⁷⁶ The context of *testing* and *approval* point to the third usage of ἀγαπάω here. The man in 1:12 demonstrates his commitment to God by his perseverance through trial. This connotation of *love* is supported by the Greek parallels with *God* as the object. The phrase τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν likely alludes to the Shema, which features the command to *love God* in Deut 6:5.⁴⁷⁷ *Love of God* is held in apposition with *walking in God's ways* and *obeying* his commandments (Deut 10:12; 11:1; Josh 22:5). The command to *love God* also occurs frequently in intertestamental literature, and the sayings of Jesus often paired with the command to *love others* (*T. Benj.* 3:1; *T. Iss.* 5:2; 7:6; *T. Dan* 5:3; *Apoc. Sedr.* 1:12; Matt 22:36–40; Mark 12:28–34; Luke 10:25–28).

While the author of James gives the criteria for δόκιμος in the two relative clauses of James 1:12, the focus is still on the *favourable verdict*. The macarism follows the format of the Matthean (and Lukan) Beatitudes, focusing on the *final result* and *reward*. As the author urges his hearers to endure through trial, demonstrating love for God, he encourages them with the emphasis on a favourable judgment at the eschaton. Regarding James 1:12, Hartin

⁴⁷⁴ See Meyers and Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 330–32, 341.

⁴⁷⁵ Taking τῆς ζωῆς as an epexegetic genitive, Moo sees the word *life* indicating what the reward is in both Jas 1:12 and Rev 2:10. See Moo, *Letter of James*, 70.

⁴⁷⁶ Bauer, “Ἀγαπάω.”

⁴⁷⁷ See Edgar, “Love-Command,” 15.

declares that the author correlates the present and the future; the eschatological reward motivates the behaviour of the hearers.⁴⁷⁸

6.1.3 James 1:25

Marking the second *inclusio* in the introductory prologue, James 1:25 (1) repeats the terms μακάριος and γενόμενος from 1:12, (2) uses παραμείνας, a word related to ὑπομένω in 1:2–4 and 1:12, and (3) repeats the terms τέλειον and ἔργον from 1:2–4. In what follows, we will discuss how 1:25 fits into the context of Jas 1, then examine the focus on its favourable result, and the criteria for this result.

James 1:25 is connected to a threefold exhortation in 1:19: be *quick to hear, slow to speak*, and *slow to become angry*. The first part, *quick to hear*, is developed in 1:22–25. The hearers are exhorted to be *doers* of the word and not just *hearers*. These verses appear to have a chiasmic arrangement:

- 1:22 Be doers, not hearers only
- 1:23–24 a hearer only sees themselves in a mirror but forgets
- 1:25 A doer does not forget, but acts

The conjunction δέ in James 1:25 signals a development from the previous material.⁴⁷⁹ The saying describes the desired behaviour of the *doer* after 1:23–24 illustrates the undesired behaviour of the *hearer*. Both the undesired behaviour and the desired behaviour are developments of the command in 1:22.

The author of James indicates the focus of the saying in 1:25 in three ways. First, he presents a complex sentence with one indicative verb (ἔσται) and several participles, emphasising the indicative verb. The three adjectival aorist participles (παρακύψας, παραμείνας, γενόμενος) refer to the *subject* of the verb. They set the actions in the background of the main verb.⁴⁸⁰ Since the author chose to have one indicative verb and participle descriptors instead of a string of indicative verbs, the focus is on ἔσται. Second, by using already-established concepts in the participles, the author emphasises newly-asserted information. The participle παρακύψας recalls the man examining a mirror in 1:22–23, παραμείνας recalls being a doer of the *word* in 1:22, and γενόμενος with οὐκ ἄκροατῆς

⁴⁷⁸ Hartin, “Wise and Understanding,” 974.

⁴⁷⁹ Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 112.

⁴⁸⁰ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 129. Runge points out that since participles already elaborate on the main verb, they are not an option for prominence marking.

ἐπιλησμονῆς and ποιητῆς ἔργου recalls the *forgetfulness* of the *hearer* (1:24) and the call to be a *doer* in 1:22. These participial phrases occupy the preverbal P1 position in Dik’s paradigm, using already-established information to point to the main clause. Therefore, the focus is on the newly-asserted μακάριος ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται. Third, the indicative verb occurs at the very end of the sentence, the default position for the most important part of the utterance.⁴⁸¹ Violating the default verb-subject-object word order,⁴⁸² the author marks the verb for saliency.

The predicate of ἔσται in James 1:25 is the nominative adjective μακάριος, which is *fronted* to the preverbal P2 position. Again, this word order violates the default sequence, giving saliency to the fronted adjective. The author emphasises the *result* for the person described in the saying.

The pattern displayed in James 1:2–4 and 1:12 provide support for a future hope conveyed by 1:25. These passages both indicate a favourable future state for the subjects of the μὲν-ω-family verb. This pattern suggests that the affirmed action in 1:25 occurs in the present while the favourable state occurs in the future. This rendering would favour an *instrumental* or *causal* use of the preposition in the phrase ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ (*by his doing*) rather than a usage characterized by location or sphere (*in his doing*).⁴⁸³ Reading the preposition this way (in light of 1:2–4 and 1:12) renders the future hope indicated by ἔσται as being brought about by the present action indicated by ποιήσεις.

Greek parallels are consistent with James 1:25 in communicating a *significant future hope*. In fact, many of these parallels, like Jas 1:12, are *eschatological* in nature. While these parallels are not decisive indicators of an eschatological reading of 1:25, they render such a thesis defensible. The woe in *I En.* 103:5, portraying an ironic pronouncement on sinners who are “blessed,” promises that the *righteous* will have *future prosperity* instead. The Erythrean Sibyl looks to a future day of God’s coming, calling it “most blessed” (*Sib. Or.* 28:1). Also, there is eschatological consolation in the Ethiopic text of *I En.* 58:2, which

⁴⁸¹ “...the default position for the most important constituent of the comment is as far towards the end of the sentence as the grammar of the language permits.” Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 32.

⁴⁸² Porter, *Idioms*, 293.

⁴⁸³ An instrumental or causal use of ἐν would make μακάριος the result of ποιήσεις. See the categories and examples of ἐν in Harris, *Prepositions*, 118–24.

describes the elect as *blessed*, looking to a future inheritance.⁴⁸⁴ Theodotion Dan 12:12, which we have discussed above, *clusters* μακάριος with ὑπομένω, conveys eschatological favour for the one who perseveres. Many of Jesus' macarisms also involve a hope in an *eschatological state* (e.g., Luke 12:37–38, 43; Matt 24:46). Predicting Jerusalem's destruction on the way to the cross, Jesus pronounces μακάριαι on barren women (Luke 23:29), indicating a future reversal. The Matthean and Lukan Beatitudes⁴⁸⁵ also point to eschatological favour. Unlike some macarisms from the LXX, the Beatitudes point to the *future*, some explicitly set in the eschaton (Matt 5:3, 5; Luke 6:20, 22–23).⁴⁸⁶ Ultimately, the Beatitudes as a whole exhort their hearers to particular behaviour and attitudes, conveying a favourable eschatological state for those who adhere to the exhortation.⁴⁸⁷ Furthermore, the nominative instances of μακάριος in Revelation (1:3; 14:13; 16:15; 19:9; 20:6; 22:7, 14) all follow the pattern of (1) describing an adjectival participle and (2) a favourable eschatological state for the referents.

In summary, three factors make defensible the view that the favourable state conveyed by μακάριος in James 1:25 is eschatological in nature. While these are not conclusive, the evidence fits. First, the future tense ἔσται opens up the possibility that μακάριος is set in the eschaton. Second, the Greek parallels from the New Testament and intertestamental literature, especially in the synoptic Gospels and Revelation, support the plausibility that 1:25 is eschatological. They follow the pattern seen in 1:25, having one or more adjectival participles describing the subject. Third, the lexical connections that 1:25 has with the eschatologically-oriented saying in 1:12 tip the scales towards the future hope in 1:25 being eschatological as well. Bertram and Hauck, basing their view on the NT

⁴⁸⁴ E. Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction," in *OTP 1*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 39.

⁴⁸⁵ Admittedly, the structure of each of the Beatitudes does not precisely fit with James 1:25. In the Matthean and Lukan Beatitudes, a party is considered μακάριοι, a present state, because of their future hope. In Jas 1:25, the subject *will be* (ἔσται) μακάριος.

⁴⁸⁶ Allison insists that this perspective of a future hope in the Beatitudes is "crucial for their interpretation." See Allison, *Sermon*, 41–42.

⁴⁸⁷ Jonathan T. Pennington demonstrates that the Matthean Beatitudes, and the Sermon on the Mount as a whole, offer declarations of *human flourishing* to those already aligned with the teaching of Jesus, which will result in ultimate flourishing in the eschaton. See *Sermon on the Mount*, 55–66. Pennington draws from how the wisdom and apocalyptic traditions are woven together in the Second Temple period. For more on this, see Macaskill, *Revealed Wisdom*.

macarisms, contend that μακάριος in both 1:12 and 1:25 refers to eternal salvation, which “shines over the sorry present position of the righteous.”⁴⁸⁸

The context preceding 1:25 bolsters the case that μακάριος is eschatologically oriented. The author presents faithfulness to the law as being a *doer* (1:25). The noun ποιητής occurs twice in 1:22–23 with its object being λόγος, which has power for eschatological salvation (1:21). Faithfulness to the law stands in contrast to *sin* in 1:13–15, which leads to eschatological death. Furthermore, an eschatological nature of μακάριος would be consistent with Jas 1:12, as well as Jesus’ Beatitudes. If Konradt is correct that receiving of the λόγος in 1:21 is tied to the faithfulness to the law in 1:25,⁴⁸⁹ then the entirety of 1:12–25 has a consistent eschatological emphasis.

Likewise, commenting on James 1:2–4, 1:12 and 1:25, Guthrie and Taylor declare that all three texts are eschatologically oriented. 1:12 is the centre of the chapter, providing structural and thematic unity. In other words, the double-*inclusio* points to this “overlapping transition.” They rightly conclude that 1:2–4 and 1:25 are to be understood with the eschaton in mind: trials are to be viewed in light of their perfecting outcome (1:2–4) and blessing comes to those who endure in obedience (1:25).⁴⁹⁰

While not the focus of James 1:25, the author gives the *criteria* for μακάριος. It is the one who, after looking, *remains by* (παραμείνας) the law. The verb παραμένω, with the same root as ὑπομένω in 1:3 and 1:12, conveys that (1) one remains in a state or (2) continues in an official capacity.⁴⁹¹ The context in James 1:25 fits both usages, especially the second, as *remaining by* the law necessitates *obedience* to it. Indeed, outside of the LXX, intertestamental literature, and NT, the noun παραμονή and its cognate verb παραμένω often convey a continuation of service, especially for slaves.⁴⁹² LXX instances of παραμένω referring to the act of someone *staying with* or *remaining loyal to another person* confirm this usage (Gen 44:33; Sir 6:8, 10).

The action of *remaining* or *persevering* with the law conveys adherence to it, for this person is described as a *doer of deed* (ποιητής ἔργου, 1:22–25), *staying with* God. The

⁴⁸⁸ Bertram and Hauck, “Μακάριος, Μακαρίζω, Μακαρισμός.”

⁴⁸⁹ Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 289.

⁴⁹⁰ Guthrie and Taylor, “Structure,” 684.

⁴⁹¹ Bauer, “Παραμένω.”

⁴⁹² Montanari, “Παραμονή.” This usage is confirmed in papyri, describing freed slaves willingly *continuing* to serve, or a shopkeeper *continuing* to work. See *NewDocs*, 4:98–99.

participle γενόμενος is likely attributive,⁴⁹³ equating παραμείνας with being a doer. The one who *perseveres* has not abandoned the law; this person *acts* following the law. After all, someone with a passive approach is like one who examines a mirror and walks away forgetting their likeness (1:23–24). Rather, the one *persevering* remains devoted, keeping the law and being blessed. Thus, the act of παραμείνας has a favourable consequence in 1:25, just like *perseverance* does in 1:2–4 and 1:12.

The usage of παραμένω suggests an intentional association between 1:12 and 1:25. The decision to pair παραμένω with νόμον is curious; these terms are not connected anywhere else in the NT, LXX, or intertestamental literature. Verbs associated with νόμον as its object include φυλάσσω (e.g., Lev 19:19; Acts 7:53; *Sib. Or.* 12:111; *T. Ash.* 6:3), ποιέω (e.g., Lev 19:37; Num 9:3, 14; Ps 39:9; *Apoc. Sedr.* 15:4), and τηρέω (Tob 14:9; Acts 15:5; *T. Dan* 5:1; Jas 2:10). The unique use of παραμένω with the object νόμον points to an intentional choice to associate 1:25 to ὑπομένω in 1:3 and 1:12. While ὑπομένω would not fit with νόμος, the aforementioned association of παραμένω with *obedience* and *service* fits it well. The occurrence of μακάριος in both 1:12 and 1:25 further supports an intentional connection.

The connections that 1:25 has with 1:2–4 and 1:12 also suggest that God is the *judge* who will reward the one who remains with the law. Indeed, the next and final subsection of the introductory prologue, 1:26–27, alludes to God as the *judge*. In 1:27, the value of *piety* (θρησκεία) is measured by its state as being pure and undefiled in the presence of God. We will discuss this imagery more below.

In James 1:25, the author affirms that the one remaining constant with the law can expect a *favourable state*. As discussed earlier, living in obedience to God expresses loving loyalty to God. This obedience leads to a reward from God. The author exhorts his hearers to stay on the path of adherence to God’s will, obeying the law.

6.1.4 Synthesis of James 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25

The double-*inclusio* marked by James 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25 together is framed by several common elements. First, the *focal point* of each saying is on the *favourable result* of the activity in view: *all joy* and *complete* in 1:2–4, μακάριος and the *crown of life* in 1:12, and the future state (ἔσται) of being μακάριος in 1:25. Thus, while the author delineates the

⁴⁹³ Adam, *James*, 30.

criteria for the favourable future state in each of the sayings, they do not receive the emphasis.

Second, these sayings at the beginning, middle, and end of the prologue point to an *evaluator* or *judge*. In 1:2–4, the language of *πειρασμός* and *δοκίμιον* conveys the process of *testing for genuineness* of faith. In this context, God is the implied judge or assayer of the hearers. In 1:12, *δόκιμος* necessitates an evaluator who *approves* the one who perseveres under trial. The latter portion of 1:12, with the criterion *τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν*, implies that *God* promised the crown and evaluates people. No evaluator is explicit in 1:25, but one naturally considers the *lawgiver* God as the judge (see 4:12) of whether one remains with the *law*. Also, the proximity of God who sets the standard of *piety* in 1:27 suggests that God is the evaluator in 1:25.

Third, a cumulative case can be made that all three sayings are *eschatological* in nature. First, they all describe a favourable future state: *completeness* (1:4), the *crown of life* (1:12), and *μακάριος* in the future (1:25). Second, as discussed above, the usage of *πειρασμός* and *ὑπομονή* (1:2–4, 1:12), along with *όλόκληρος* (1:4) often occur in the context of the eschaton in the New Testament. Third, the connotations of *στέφανος τῆς ζωῆς* in 1:12 point to this saying being eschatological, and both 1:2–4 and 1:25 have significant connections with this ‘hinge’ saying. Fourth, 1:12 and 1:25 describe a future result, unlike the OT instances of *יְרֵאָה* and *μακάριος*, which typically describe a favourable state in the present. In this way, Jas 1:12 and 1:25 have a greater affinity with Jesus’ Beatitudes, which point to a favourable eschatological state.

Together, James 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25 point to *eschatological approval*. These texts emphasise a favourable future state, a divine evaluator, and a reward set in the eschaton. While each of them presents the *criteria* for the favourable future state, this is not the focus of the sayings. At the beginning, middle, and end of the epistle’s introductory prologue, the author emphasises the *final result* for those who are judged favourably by God.

As discussed above, the central statement in the prologue of James is the macarism in 1:12. James 1:2–4 and 1:25 each point to the saying in 1:12, which, as discussed in Chapter 5, is the ‘hinge statement’ that most prominently promotes the concept of *eschatological approval*. Jas 1:12 speaks of eschatological reward as a result of a favourable judgment.

In what follows, we will examine the remaining content of James 1, making a case for their relation to the theme of *eschatological approval* as indicated in the key statements in 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25. We will show how the saying in 1:12 plays a key role in the

introductory prologue. As the overlapping transition of the double-*inclusio*, it both *sums up* the previous content in the prologue and *preview*s the content following it.

6.2 Eschatological Approval in the Rest of James 1

As discussed above, the beginning, middle, and end of the prologue emphasise the *result* of a favourable eschatological judgment. Those *approved* (δόκιμος) are considered blessed and will receive the crown of life. To receive this verdict of approval, one must *persevere* through testings, staying in *adherence to the law*.

Testings present a time for the hearers to choose between *faithfulness* to God or *turning away* from him. The hearers have a *binary choice*; the better of two ways will result in their approval from God in the end. Johnson, referring to these *binary choices* as *polar oppositions*, contends that they occur throughout James 1.⁴⁹⁴ Likewise, Cargal shows how “oppositions of actions” plays a large role in the epistle, especially in Jas 1.⁴⁹⁵ Weren argues that the testings reveal *one of two ways*: the way of God’s wisdom or the way that leads to death.⁴⁹⁶ This pattern in James fits with paraenetic letters; Stowers states that paraenetic letters, which involve both exhortations and dissuasions. He sums up these antithetical exhortations as “be like this and not like that.”⁴⁹⁷

In what follows, we will discuss the *binary choice* presented by testings is reflected in the rest of Jas 1. This section will contend that *eschatological approval* presented in 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25 is bolstered by the author’s series of admonitions to *choose the better of two ways* in the introductory prologue. Also, the *final result* is often the focal point of these exhortations. Choosing the better of two ways will lead to *eschatological approval*.

6.2.1 James 1:5–8

James 1:5–8 supports the notion that the better of two ways leads to eschatological approval. After 1:2–4 ends with the descriptor ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι, 1:5 offers development, linking to 1:2–4 through the conjunction δέ and the catchword λείπεται. In this subsection,

⁴⁹⁴ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 175.

⁴⁹⁵ Cargal, *Restoring*, 53–55, 61–92. Cargal includes a helpful chart of oppositions in Appendix B (229–232).

⁴⁹⁶ Weren presents a chart of the “two ways contrast” throughout the letter, illustrated by antithetical statements. See Weren, “Ideal Community,” 191–92.

⁴⁹⁷ Stowers, *Letter Writing*, 94–95.

the author introduces the concept of godly wisdom (σοφία), a prerequisite for being τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι.

The focal point of the saying in 1:5 is the *giving of wisdom*, the *result* of asking God. The placement of δοθήσεται αὐτῷ at the very end marks it for saliency.⁴⁹⁸ After all, the author could have ordered the words differently. While the *generosity of God* and *asking* are essential concepts, the focal idea in the saying is the *final result*. Just like τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι have saliency in 1:2–4, the focus of 1:5 is on *the receiving of wisdom*. As a prerequisite for τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι, receiving wisdom leads to the favourable state in the end: *eschatological approval*.

The rest of the saying in 1:5 adds detail to *receiving wisdom*. The author urges the hearers to *ask*, and that *God gives to all* without demeaning or finding fault.⁴⁹⁹ The call to ask and the affirmation of God’s non-reviling generosity are conditions for receiving wisdom.

James 1:6–8 narrows the condition for receiving wisdom. Following the pattern of “be like this and not like that,” the author urges his hearers to ask ἐν πίστει μηδὲν διακρινόμενος. The middle-passive verb διακρίνομαι is controversial. Some commentators render this verb as *doubt*, indicating a questioning of God’s character.⁵⁰⁰ However, διακρίνω has a wide range of meaning in extrabiblical literature: *to separate, distinguish, render a legal decision, or be in a dispute with someone*.⁵⁰¹ While Bauer claims that the rendering *doubt* originated with the New Testament,⁵⁰² Spitaler finds no evidence from patristic sources for a special NT meaning of διακρίνομαι. He posits that the semantic shift results from interpretation processes that reflect the western “preoccupation with the individual” rather than the eastern group-centric anthropology.⁵⁰³

⁴⁹⁸ “The default expectation of natural information flow is that focal information will be placed as close to the end of the clause as the typology of the language allows.” Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 190.

⁴⁹⁹ Bauer, “Ὀνειδίζω.”

⁵⁰⁰ Dibelius, *James*, 80; Laws, *Epistle of James*, 56; Martin, *James*, 19; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 52.

⁵⁰¹ Liddell and Scott, “Διακρίνω”; Bauer, “Δοκιμασία.”

⁵⁰² Spitaler questions Bauer’s usage of the 6th-century biographer Cyril of Scythopolis as evidence for the meaning of *doubt*, showing how the context these instances support the traditional meanings outside the NT. See Spitaler, “Διακρίνεσθαι,” 7–9.

⁵⁰³ Spitaler, 39.

The participle διακρινόμενος likely refers to one characterised by *division*.⁵⁰⁴ Spitaler proposes, based on the usage in 2:4, the Classical/Hellenistic usage, and the context of James 1:6 that διακρινόμενος refers not to one doubting within oneself, but to one *disputing with God*.⁵⁰⁵ Similarly, DeGraaf, given the context in 1:6–8 of being ‘double-minded’ and the usage of the same verb in 2:4, proposes that this participle refers to being *free from divided motives and divisive attitudes*.⁵⁰⁶ Porter and Stevens, in light of the previous studies, lexicographic principles, and the call to steadfastness in 1:3–4, similarly conclude that διακρινόμενος refers to one *divided in purpose*.⁵⁰⁷ The contrast between ἐν πίστει and διακρινόμενος in 1:6 is best explained by the usage of πίστις conveying *faithfulness* and *commitment*.⁵⁰⁸ This, according to Porter and Stevens, would be most compatible with the *testing of faith* associated with *endurance* in 1:3–4. It would also be most compatible with the context of the one who is διακρινόμενος being described as δίψυχος, as pointed out by DeGraaf.

The illustration of διακρινόμενος in 1:6b–8 fits well with the interpretation that ἐν πίστει μηδὲν διακρινόμενος refers to *faithfulness, not disputing* with God. The individual is described as *unstable* and *double-souled* (1:8) with *a wave tossed by the wind* (1:6b) illustrating *unfaithfulness*. This person is not characterised by singleness, and will not receive from the Lord (1:7). This characterization adheres to the “be like this and not like that” pattern found in paraenetic letters. The hearers receive the challenge to display faithfulness and singleness.

Ultimately, the emphasised outcome of receiving wisdom (1:4–5)⁵⁰⁹ points to a criterion of being *approved* in the eschaton. The approved person is *singularly* faithful to God, not characterised by division (1:6) or being double-souled (1:8). This characterization is compatible with tested *faith* and perseverance (1:3–4). Just like the *testings* lead to the ultimate result of being *complete*, the person who asks in *faith(fulness)* also ends up *not lacking* but receiving wisdom. In 1:2–4 and 1:5–8, the emphasis is not on the *testings* or the

⁵⁰⁴ For more on how this term in James relates to its usage in Jude, see Lockett, *Letters from the Pillar Apostles*, 191–94.

⁵⁰⁵ Spitaler, “James 1,” 572–79.

⁵⁰⁶ DeGraaf, “Doubts,” 741–42.

⁵⁰⁷ Porter and Stevens, “Doubting,” 53–67.

⁵⁰⁸ Bauer, “Πίστις.” DeGraaf describes this usage of πίστις as *faithfulness*. See DeGraaf, “Doubts,” 737–38.

⁵⁰⁹ Cargal agrees that the focus of 1:2–5 is on the result: *trials* bring about their full effect, wholeness and completion. See Cargal, *Restoring*, 75.

criteria, but on the state of *completeness* that includes having wisdom. This completeness brings *approval* in the end.

6.2.2 James 1:9–11

In James 1:9–11, the author again urges his hearers to choose the better of two ways.⁵¹⁰ A dichotomy exists between the *lowly* (ταπεινός) and *rich* (πλούσιος). Like 1:2–4 and 1:5–8, the focal point of 1:9–11 for each of these figures is the *final result*.⁵¹¹

In James 1:9–11, which connects to the previous material via the conjunction δέ,⁵¹² the *height* of the lowly and the *lowliness* of the rich occur in the *default place of emphasis* at the end of each clause. Therefore, the focus of 1:9–10a is the favourable result for the lowly and the unfavourable result for the rich. This focus is reinforced by the clause beginning with ὅτι in 1:10b and the “expansion”⁵¹³ sentence with γάρ in 1:11. The phrase ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου occupies the salient preverbal P2 position, highlighting that the rich, *as a flower of grass*, will pass away. Both sayings end with the *result* of the rich *passing away* or *fading away* (παρελεύσεται and μαρανθήσεται, respectively).

The nature of the *height* for the lowly is most likely *spiritual*, especially given the exhortation using related words in James 4:10, ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς. It is unlikely that *exaltation* and *lowering* refer to *earthly fortunes*; wealth is a social advantage in virtually every society.⁵¹⁴ The social power held by the rich in the world of the author is illustrated later in the epistle, as they can use the courts to their advantage (2:6) and cheat their labourers (5:4).

The future states of the *lowly* and *rich* in James 1:9–11 are likely *eschatological*. First, the explanation of the *lowliness* of the rich is characterised by *finality*, which favours an eschatological rather than a temporal meaning. While the rich prosper now, they will ultimately reach their demise. Second, Jas 1:10–11 has similarities with the indictment against the oppressive rich in 5:1–6. The *coming misery*, *eating of flesh like fire*, *last days*, the *Lord of hosts*, and the *day of slaughter* in 5:1–6 all point to eschatological misery for the rich.

⁵¹⁰ Notably, Cargal does not include this passage in his list of “Oppositions of Actions.”

⁵¹¹ Allison shows the parallel nature of 1:5–8 and 1:9–11, citing eight parallels. See Allison, *James*, 195.

⁵¹² So Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 116.

⁵¹³ So Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 45.

⁵¹⁴ Dibelius points out that all of Israel became “poor” after losing national strength. See *James*, 39.

Third, the structure and connotations of James 1:9–10 appear to echo sayings of Jesus that refer to eschatological reckoning. Matthew 20:16 and Luke 13:30 teaches that the *last will be first and the first will be last*. Luke 14:11 teaches that *the one who exalts himself will be exalted*. The latter saying uses ταπεινῶω and ὑπόω (twice each), cognates of which are used in Jas 1:9–10. The eschatological honouring of the lowly recurs in the sayings of Jesus (Matt 18:4; 19:14; Luke 18:16–17; 22:26; Mark 10:15). Fourth, the logic of 1:9 favours the result of ὕψος αὐτοῦ being eschatological. The *exaltation* of the lowly most likely occurs after this current life, for otherwise, people would strive for lowliness. Blomberg and Kamell rightly point out: “if scarcity of goods inherently improves one’s spirituality, no biblical text would ever command help for the poor! Far more likely is the view that sees James as referring to...promised exaltation in the life to come.”⁵¹⁵ Fifth, as Allison has convincingly delineated, the author likely uses language from Isaiah 40 to describe the fate of the rich. James 1:9–11 shares much vocabulary with LXX Isa 40:2–9, including ταπεινώσις, ἄνθος χόρτου, ἐξήρανεν, ἐξέπεσεν, and ὑψώσατε.⁵¹⁶ Both Jews and early Christians often interpreted Isaiah 40 as a comforting message of the eschatological reversal.⁵¹⁷ Sixth, as discussed above, the *eschatological context* runs through Jas 1:2–12: the goal of *completeness* in 1:2–4, the way to reach that goal in 1:5–8, and the *crown of life* in 1:12. The man who is *approved* and *receives* the symbol of esteem in 1:12 appears to be an echo of the lowly receiving exaltation in 1:9, and a contrast to the rich receiving lowering in 1:10–11.⁵¹⁸

While James 1:9–11 focuses on the result for the lowly and poor, the author provides the *criteria* for these fates. While the *lowly* (ταπεινός) brother is not called *poor* in 1:9, the contrast with the *rich* in 1:10–11 points to the lowly person’s disadvantaged status. Ropes points out that this contrast suggests that ταπεινός refers to an “outward condition, not inner

⁵¹⁵ Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 55. Likewise, Allison comments, “it is only the eschatological future that makes real the difference between rich and poor.” See *James*, 213.

⁵¹⁶ Allison, *James*, 197–98. Davids appears to contend that LXX Ps 103:15–16 (which is not necessarily eschatological) is just as close to Jas 1:10 as Isa 40. But Allison shows that Jas 1:10 has significantly more connections with Isa 40:2–9. See Davids, *Epistle of James*, 77.

⁵¹⁷ See Snodgrass, “Streams of Tradition,” 31. In support of the dominant interpretation of this text being eschatological, Penner cites *I En.* 1:6; 53:7; *Pss. Sol.* 11:4; *T. Mos.* 10:4; 1QS 8.14; Mark 1:2; *Sib. Or.* 3.680; 8.234; 2 *Bar.* 82 and the Isaiah Targum. See Penner, *James and Eschatology*, 203–5. In addition to James 1:9–11, Robert Davidson discusses the eschatological use of Isaiah 40 in 1 Pet 1:24, Matt 24:22, and early extrabiblical sources. See Davidson, “Isaiah 40:6–8,” 45–55.

⁵¹⁸ Konradt sees continuity between the eschatological fate of the humble brother in 1:9–11 with that of the persevering man in 1:12. See *Christliche Existenz*, 287–88.

spirit.”⁵¹⁹ McKnight agrees, appealing to the connotation of ταπεινός with monetary poverty in Mary’s *Magnificat* (Luke 1:48, 52–53) as paradigmatic of the worldview of the messianic Jewish community.⁵²⁰ Also, a significant overlap exists between the connotation of *lowly* with subservience, which often indicates poverty.⁵²¹ With this context in view, Blomberg calls ταπεινός a “virtual synonym” for the impoverished.⁵²² Still, Martin correctly points out that the author does not use πτωχός, which describes someone destitute in 2:2–6.⁵²³ Through ταπεινός, the author highlights *social status* without excluding an economic connotation.

The identity of the one described as πλούσιος is controversial. A case can be made that James 1:10–11 refers to a rich *believer* who is part of the community that the author addresses. Proponents of this view supply ἀδελφός from 1:9 to go with ὁ πλούσιος in 1:10.⁵²⁴ In this case, the *boasting* or *rejoicing* would be a heroic one; the rich Christian humbles himself before God, losing his wealth through providing for the poor brother.⁵²⁵

However, a case for πλούσιος referring to an *unbeliever* outside the audience of the epistle is more compelling. First, the omission of ἀδελφός opens the possibility that the rich person is not a brother, and the parallel with 1:9 does not necessitate supplying ἀδελφός in 1:10. The omission of ἀδελφός is glaring given its recurrence throughout the epistle (twenty times including ἀδελφή). Second, the term πλούσιος is only used in the context of their wickedness elsewhere in James (2:5–6; 5:1–6), where they appear excluded from the group addressed by the epistle. Even if we set aside the view that 5:1–6 is a section of *apostrophe*, James contains some of the strongest critiques against the rich in the New Testament.⁵²⁶ The other instances of πλούσιος in James make it more likely that the rich are not favoured in 1:10–11. Since, as discussed above, James 1 serves as an introduction, the identity of

⁵¹⁹ Ropes, *St. James*, 145. Ropes cites Sir 11:1; 29:8; 1 Macc 14:14; Prov 30:14; Eccl 10:6; Dan 3:37; Ps 9:39; 82:3 LXX, especially its use in apposition with πένης in Prov 30:14.

⁵²⁰ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 95–96.

⁵²¹ Edgar, in view of the depiction of the rich (1:10–11) following the call to have wholeness in commitment to a generous God (1:2–8), proposes that the author is appealing to Greco-Roman patronage. In this system, the client is subservient to the patron. He goes on to point out that there is no indication if the lowly brother is subservient in society or subservient to God, but these are not mutually exclusive. See Edgar, *Chosen the Poor*, 146–48.

⁵²² Blomberg, *Neither Poverty nor Riches*, 149. So also Maynard-Reid, *Poverty and Wealth*, 38–41.

⁵²³ Martin, *James*, 23.

⁵²⁴ For example, see Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 61 n55.

⁵²⁵ Martin, *James*, 25. Also Boggan, “Wealth,” 254.

⁵²⁶ Batten, *Saying*, 64.

πλούσιος as *unbelievers* fits better with the way they are described elsewhere in James. Third, *παρελεύσεται* and *μαρανθήσεται* in 1:10–11 refer to the subject πλούσιος himself,⁵²⁷ not his wealth.⁵²⁸ This *passing away* of the rich themselves is illustrated by the imagery of the withering grass and the falling flower in 1:10. As McKnight points out, this imagery applies to *people* in Ps 90:3–6 and 103:15–16, but especially in the aforementioned Isaiah 40,⁵²⁹ which has other connections with Jas 1:9–11. Fourth, the binary pattern of “be like this and not that” in James, especially in its prologue, favours the hearers being called to be *lowly* (and not rich), which leads to eschatological exaltation. Fifth, McKnight correctly points out that the emphasis is on the *withering away* of the rich.⁵³⁰ The final result, the demise of the rich, occurs at the default place of saliency—the end of the utterance. This stands in parallel to the exaltation of the lowly, which is likely eschatological. If it is indeed rich unbelievers, the *boasting* or *rejoicing* is an ironic one: they boast now in their success, but they will face disaster in the end.⁵³¹ While Moo contends that 1:10–11 does not necessarily refer to eschatological judgment,⁵³² Allison astutely points out that the mention of *heat* in 1:11 prepares the hearer for the rich suffering in eschatological *fire* in 5:1–6, and adds that “only the eschatological future makes real the difference between rich and poor.”⁵³³

The work of René Krüger is especially enlightening here. Krüger systematically addresses the different views of the identity of the *rich* and *poor* in James 1:9–11. Against the interpretation that *lowliness* is a virtue for the rich to embody, he correctly points out that 1:11 does not convey a personal initiative, but an *imposed process*. There is no mention of a call to repentance. Also, he notes the difference between Jas 1:9–11 and Isa 40: while the Isaiah passage speaks about the general perishability of all people, the death of the plant in Jas 1:11 only refers to the rich themselves (and not their wealth). Contra Boggan and Martin, Krüger points out that the tone of 1:10–11 lacks a mention of the rich renouncing wealth to help the poor, which favours the finality of the lowliness. James 1:9–11 has the character of a prophetic announcement, the contents of which will be announced later. He states that the

⁵²⁷ Maynard-Reid, *Poverty and Wealth*, 42.

⁵²⁸ Contra Ropes, who claims that it denotes “lose his wealth.” See Ropes, *St. James*, 146.

⁵²⁹ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 101–2.

⁵³⁰ McKnight, 102.

⁵³¹ Maynard-Reid, *Poverty and Wealth*, 42.

⁵³² “Destruction of some kind is plainly intended, but James may just as well be thinking of the death of the rich man as of his condemnation.” Moo, *Letter of James*, 68.

⁵³³ Allison, *James*, 212–13.

perishing plant points to the eschatological judgment of God over the rich. This is not a warning to turn; they are “caught off guard” by this pronouncement in 1:10–11. They will *perish* in the eschaton, for which the polysemic verb ἀπόλετο in 1:11 allows. Krüger declares that we are left with the straightforward interpretation that the rich are moving towards final disappearance and eternal damnation. Anything that adds conditions or contingencies to this would be “eisegesis.”⁵³⁴

Krüger’s thorough work is correct. There is no indication from the text to consider the rich part of the Christian community of the hearers. The sayings fit well with the great eschatological reversals of the OT and Jesus traditions which are likely familiar to the epistle’s hearers. Given that James 1 functions as an introduction, 1:9–11 introduces the eschatological destruction of the rich found in 5:1–6. Krüger adds a strong supporting point: the imagery in 1:10–11 using terms from Isa 40 only conveys death for the rich themselves and not their wealth. The view that Jas 1:10–11 only refers to the physical death of the rich would compromise the parallelism with 1:9, since the height in 1:9 is eschatological. This view would also compromise the contrast being made between the two groups since the lowly would also physically die. Furthermore, declaring that the rich would physically die is not a new revelation to the hearers; their physical mortality is not remarkable. These points support the argument that the *rich* in 1:10–11 are not believers, not part of the hearers of the epistle, and will suffer eschatological destruction.

James 1:9–11 introduces the topic of *rich* and *poor* in James. With the focus on the *final result* for each group, the author encourages his hearers that those who are *lowly* in this life will enjoy a favourable future state. Choosing the better of two ways, they can look forward to *exaltation in the end*. This leads us to the overlapping transition in 1:12, with the one receiving the crown of life.

6.2.3 James 1:13–18

James 1:13–18 connects to the overlapping transition in 1:12 through the catchword πειρασμόν/πειραζόμενος, forms of which appear five times in this text. There is probably a semantic shift (or narrowing) occurring between 1:12 and 1:13, as the *testing* in view is specifically meant “to entice to improper behaviour, *tempt*”⁵³⁵ as 1:15 indicates.

⁵³⁴ Krüger, *prophetische Kritik*, 126–30.

⁵³⁵ Bauer, “Πειράζω.” Emphasis his.

The command in James 1:13 prohibits its hearers from identifying God as the source of the *testing* in view. The author gives a basis for the command in 1:13b, and offers a contrasting basis in 1:14–15.⁵³⁶ After that, he expands on the first basis in 1:16–18 by explaining that God is only the source of good things.

As the first basis for the command, the author gives a theodicy. The description of God as ἀπειραστός, occurring in the salient preverbal P2 position, is unique to James in the NT and not found in the LXX or intertestamental literature.⁵³⁷ The connotation of this adjective and its relationship with the genitive κακῶν is debated. Moo and Laws epitomise the view that this phrase refers to God not being susceptible to the desire for evil.⁵³⁸ Adam proposes the simpler rendering of “inexperienced,”⁵³⁹ attested by Liddell-Scott in literature outside the NT.⁵⁴⁰ Either way, the clause disassociates God with evil, which leads to the next point: πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα.

The assertion that *he himself tempts no one* is placed in the default location for saliency, the end of the utterance. The author states that God is not the source of temptation, which is the basis of the prohibition in James 1:13a. The present tense is probably gnomic, indicating that God never tempts anyone at any time.⁵⁴¹ The entire saying, if indeed limited to 1:13, begins and ends with *no one* (μηδεὶς, οὐδένα).⁵⁴² The author affirms that God tempts no one to do evil.

The contrasting basis for the command in James 1:13a is found in 1:14–15, which occupies the place of highest saliency at the end of the utterance. Again, the author emphasises the *final result*. Jas 1:14–15 displays *repetition*, a discourse device that slows down the information rate. Each of the second instances of πειράζεται, ἐπιθυμία, and ἁμαρτία do not add any new information, spreading out the content and placing more emphasis on the focal point at the end.⁵⁴³ The focus of the utterance is that actively responding to temptation ultimately leads to *death*.

⁵³⁶ So Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 66–67.

⁵³⁷ Nor does it appear in the texts of the apostolic fathers.

⁵³⁸ Laws, *Epistle of James*, 71; Moo, *Letter of James*, 74.

⁵³⁹ Adam, *James*, 15.

⁵⁴⁰ Alciph. 3.37; Gal. 13.459; Phld. Rh. 1.45 S. See Liddell and Scott, “Ἀπειραστος.”

⁵⁴¹ Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 71.

⁵⁴² Varner, *James*, 86.

⁵⁴³ Callow, *Discourse Considerations*, 74; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 163.

The *death* in view at the end of the lifecycle of sin is *spiritual*: death to God.⁵⁴⁴ The noun θάνατος occurs again at the very end of the epistle in 5:20, also referring to spiritual death as a result of sin. The author focuses 1:14–15 on the unfavourable eschatological result. This *death* contrasts the crown of *life* in 1:12.⁵⁴⁵ While enduring in love for God leads to *eschatological life*, the parallel with 1:12 suggests that sin leads to *eschatological death*.

James 1:16–18 contains discourse devices that point to its focal point: God is not to blame for the temptation to sin (1:13) but is the *source of good things*. The “metacomment” μὴ πλανᾶσθε in 1:16 *points forward* to the focal point, giving extra attention to what follows.⁵⁴⁶ The “redundant vocative” ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί provides another discourse marker that highlights the important information after it.⁵⁴⁷ The focal point of the latter half of James 1:13–18 is that *God is the source of good gifts*. The salient content in the final clause of 1:17 conveys the *unchanging* nature of God; he is not capricious. Only good comes from God, and never evil that results in eschatological death (1:15).

James 1:18 offers an illustration of the assertion in 1:17. It contains a stark contrast with 1:14–15: God’s will is the opposite of harmful human desire (1:14) and God birthing the firstfruits corresponds to sin giving birth to death (1:15).⁵⁴⁸ God is the provider of good things, and a prominent example of this providence is his birthing of ‘us.’ The birthing’s purpose is asserted at the end of 1:18—that ‘we’ *would be firstfruits of his creatures*.

The understanding of James 1:18 is controversial. Allison delineates three major views for its referent: (1) the creation of humanity, (2) the birth of Israel, and (3) the begetting of Christians.⁵⁴⁹ The view that 1:18 refers to creation receives support from the usage of κτισμάτων (*creatures*)⁵⁵⁰ rather than *man*,⁵⁵¹ the phrase λόγῳ ἀληθείας being

⁵⁴⁴ There may be a connection between this sin that leads to death and the declaration in Rom 6:23 that *the wages of sin is death*.

⁵⁴⁵ Popkes, *Jakobus*, 108.

⁵⁴⁶ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 101–7, 112.

⁵⁴⁷ Runge, 117–18.

⁵⁴⁸ Allison, *James*, 278–79.

⁵⁴⁹ Allison, 280. Also see Laws, *Epistle of James*, 75–78.

⁵⁵⁰ Liddell and Scott, “Κτίσμα.”

⁵⁵¹ Elliott-Binns calls lack of instances of κτίσμα applied to mankind as “decisive” for Jas 1:18 referring to the *creation of humanity* rather than Christians. See Elliott-Binns, “James I. 18,” 154–55.

anarthrous,⁵⁵² and the context of creation in 1:17.⁵⁵³ Allison holds the minority view that Jas 1:18 refers to the election of Israel, supporting his view with the address to the twelve tribes (1:1) who meet in synagogues (2:2), the imagery of birthing in Deut 32:18, the designation of Israel as firstfruits (ἀρχή in LXX) in Jer 2:3, and the ‘word of truth’ as *Torah* in many texts, especially Ps 119.⁵⁵⁴ However, the majority of recent commentators view Jas 1:18 as referring to the birthing of Christians.⁵⁵⁵ This view has support from the NT usage of ἀπαρχή referring to believers (Rom 8:23; 1 Cor 15:20, 23; 16:15; 2 Thess 2:13; Rev 14:4), the ‘word of truth’ referring to the Christian message (Eph 1:13; Col 1:5; 2 Tim 2:15), birthing imagery used for Christian conversion (John 1:13; 3:1–10; Tit 3:5; 1 Pet 1:23; 1 John 2:29),⁵⁵⁶ and a possible connection with Christian baptism.⁵⁵⁷ Thus, a case can be made for all three of these views.

Perhaps the most compelling solution to James 1:18 is the view held by McKnight and Varner: the saying indeed refers to *Christians*, but in particular the *messianic community*.⁵⁵⁸ This view is compatible with both the solid argument made by Allison and the address in Jas 1:1 and 2:1. The author of James uses language reminiscent of the election of Israel to convey (as other Christian writings do) the *redemption* of Christians for his Jewish Christian hearers. Versepunt, examining the Jewish morning recitation of the Shema, supports the view that 1:18 is *soteriological*. He demonstrates that the designation of God as the creator of the luminaries (cf. *father of lights* in 1:17) in such prayers is associated with God’s intent to *save* rather than destroy his people.⁵⁵⁹ Esther Yue L. Ng adds further support to

⁵⁵² Hort, *St. James*, 32. Hort argues that the revelation given to a Christian would never be indefinite, and “St. James never indulges in the lax omission of articles.”

⁵⁵³ Kaiser objects to this view by stating that the rest of the epistle does not show any interest in distinguishing mankind from the rest of creation. See Kaiser, “Innate Word,” 466.

⁵⁵⁴ Allison, *James*, 282–83. Allison lists six reasons in total. Kaiser, however, objects that the LXX never contains the phrase λόγος ἀληθείας in the context of the Torah. See Kaiser, “Innate Word,” 467.

⁵⁵⁵ See, for example, Dibelius, *James*, 90; Martin, *James*, 40–41; Moo, *Letter of James*, 79–80; McKnight, *Letter of James*, 128–30; Varner, *James*, 98.

⁵⁵⁶ For a lengthier discussion of the parallels discussing birth, see Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 44–47.

⁵⁵⁷ Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 95–96. Kamell points out that the *birthing* indicates a new nature in contrast to 1:13–15; they go from fallen natures to being re-created by the word. See Kamell, “Soteriology,” 137.

⁵⁵⁸ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 131; Varner, *James*, 98. Kaiser makes a more sustained argument along the same lines, applying the Israel terminology it to Christ-believers in general. See Kaiser, “Innate Word,” 469–72.

⁵⁵⁹ Versepunt, “James 1,” 188–91.

Verseput's argument, pointing out that the quotation of the morning benediction quotes Ps 136:7. She proposes that Jas 1:17–18 should be interpreted in light of the redemption inherent in Psalm 136.⁵⁶⁰

Decisive for the view that 1:18 refers to the birthing of the messianic Jewish community is the context of James 1:18, especially the most salient portion: the contrast with *eschatological death* (1:15). God birthing the hearers of James to eschatological life would be a *good gift* (1:17) of God's will (1:18). This would fit well if 1:13–15 is an allusion to the tragic decision of Adam and Eve in Gen 3,⁵⁶¹ as God's response to *sin* and *death*. God's birthing demonstrates that he is not the source of eschatological death, but of *good*. In fact, as Kaiser argues, this response from God leads to eschatological salvation, as the progression of the λόγος continues to 1:21.⁵⁶² Fittingly, Konradt equates the transition between the sphere of death and the sphere of God's life in 1:13–18 with *conversion*,⁵⁶³ which preserves the connection between the present and the eschatological in the birthing imagery.

Ultimately, the salient content of James 1:13–18 points to a *final result*. The first half (1:13–15) discusses temptation to sin, with the focus is on the eschatological result of *death*. If 1:17–18 indeed contrasts 1:13–15 in the pattern of “be like this and not like that,” then the birthing imagery in 1:18 is the antithesis of the life-cycle of 1:15; the firstfruits (being in the default position of saliency) are eschatological *life*. The author calls his hearers to choose the better of two ways that will lead to a favourable final result.

6.2.4 James 1:19–25

James 1:19–25 features a three-part exhortation and developments of the first and third parts. James 1:19 starts with a *meta-comment* in ἴστε, a forward-pointing device which marks the next content as especially significant.⁵⁶⁴ The command to be *quick to hear, slow to speak*, and *slow to anger* introduces themes found later in the epistle.

The third part of the command, *slow to anger*, receives emphasis, being in the final position as well as deviating from the τό + infinitive formula of the first and second parts. James 1:20, through the conjunction γάρ, gives the basis of the third part of the command.

⁵⁶⁰ Ng points out eight parallels in “vocabulary and thought” between Jas 1:17–18 and Ps 135 LXX. See Ng, “Father-God,” 45–47.

⁵⁶¹ As pointed out by Allison, *James*, 282. Also see Elliott-Binns, “James I. 18,” 155.

⁵⁶² Kaiser, “Innate Word,” 467–68.

⁵⁶³ Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 287–88.

⁵⁶⁴ See the discussion with examples in Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 104–17.

The repetition of ὀργή does not add new information but gives a topical frame ensuring that the hearer associates the following content with *anger*.⁵⁶⁵ The focus is on the final part of 1:20: δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐ κατεργάζεται. With the object moved from its default position to the preverbal P2 position, it receives emphasis; the author focuses this saying on δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ.

To be sure, the interpretation of δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ in James 1:20 is thorny.⁵⁶⁶ The noun δικαιοσύνη alone could refer to (1) a quality of fairness, (2) correctness based on redemptive action, or (3) a characteristic of uprightness.⁵⁶⁷ The usage of δικαιοσύνη elsewhere in James (2:23; 3:18), according to Allison,⁵⁶⁸ favours the third usage, pointing to uprightness like God's.⁵⁶⁹ This interpretation could render the genitive θεοῦ as attributive: *godly righteousness*.⁵⁷⁰ Taking another view, Ropes, Moo, Hartin, and Blomberg/Kamell interpret δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ as the *righteousness that God approves*, rendering θεοῦ as an objective genitive.⁵⁷¹

However, a case can be made that δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ refers to *justification bestowed by God*, the second usage of δικαιοσύνη. This would make θεοῦ a subjective genitive, consistent with δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ elsewhere in the NT (e.g., Rom 1:17; 3:5, 21–22; 10:3; 2 Cor 5:21). McKnight correctly points out an intimate association between *standing before God* and a *behavioural moral attitude* as a result of redemption. He cites God's saving action as described by δικαιοσύνη in LXX Isa 46:13.⁵⁷² It would also preserve the parallel between ὀργή ἀνδρός and δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ, with both as subjective genitives. Also, justification from God would harmonise best with the final result of the next saying in Jas 1:21, which derives its logic from 1:20 through διό. Jas 1:21 most likely has a *favourable eschatological judgment* in view, as we will see below.

Whether δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ in James 1:20 refers to *godly justice, righteous acts pleasing to God* or *justification bestowed by God*, the outcome is the same. They point to God

⁵⁶⁵ See the discussion on topical frames, with NT examples, in Runge, 211–15.

⁵⁶⁶ McKnight calls it a “New Testament quagmire.” See *Letter of James*, 139.

⁵⁶⁷ Bauer, “Δικαιοσύνη.”

⁵⁶⁸ Allison, *James*, 304.

⁵⁶⁹ So also Davids, *Epistle of James*, 93.

⁵⁷⁰ Köstenberger, Merkle, and Plummer, *Deeper Greek*, 90–91. Adam calls this the “simplest alternative” among the interpretations of James 1:20. See *James*, 24.

⁵⁷¹ Ropes, *St. James*, 169–70; Moo, *Letter of James*, 83–84; Hartin, *James*, 96; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 86.

⁵⁷² McKnight, *Letter of James*, 139.

as the *standard* and *judge* of uprightness. God is the one to evaluate and approve in the end. The author urges his hearers to do what would bring approval in the end. The next saying in 1:21 affirms that the hearers are to look to a favourable eschatological judgment.

The content concerning *anger* in James 1:20–21 reaches its conclusion with an exhortation in 1:21. The command is inferred from the previous content through the conjunction διό.⁵⁷³ The author exhorts his hearers to remove πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν καὶ περισσεΐαν κακίας,⁵⁷⁴ including anger (1:19–20). The participle ἀποθέμενοι, while having the imperatival force of δέξασθε,⁵⁷⁵ is subordinate to that verb. The author’s choice to express the saying as a participle-imperative rather than two equal imperatives indicates that the focus is on the imperative.⁵⁷⁶ The hearers of James are to *receive the implanted word*. The qualifier ἐν πραύτητι contrasts the *anger* in 1:19–20.

To what does τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον in 1:21 refer?⁵⁷⁷ The adjective ἔμφυτος could be translated *innate*,⁵⁷⁸ as Wis 12:10 indicates, favouring the natural capacity to understand divine revelation.⁵⁷⁹ But Moo correctly points out that view is “too general” in light of the ability of the λόγος to *save*.⁵⁸⁰ Allison sees this innate λόγος as more specific, proposing that the author refers to *Torah observance*. This would be consistent with λόγος as something to be *obeyed* in 1:22–25, and the LXX usage of δέχομαι + λόγον referring to the obedience of teaching (Prov 4:10; 30:1; Zech 1:6; Jer 9:20).⁵⁸¹ However, McKnight objects to an innate Torah, since one would “not be told to receive something that is in innate.”⁵⁸² Others view

⁵⁷³ Porter, *Idioms*, 209.

⁵⁷⁴ Elliott-Binns suggests that Jas 1:21 might have a parallel idea with the *filthiness* due to harlotry in Ezek 16:36, but the English rendering is “pure coincidence.” Elliott-Binns, “James I. 21 and Ezekiel XVI. 36,” 273.

⁵⁷⁵ The use of the participle here is probably *attendant circumstance* rather than of *temporal, causal, or means*. See Adam, *James*, 24.

⁵⁷⁶ See the discussion and examples of prenuclear anarthrous participial clauses in Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 187–90.

⁵⁷⁷ Matt Jackson-McCabe presents a lucid argument that the concept of “the implanted word” draws on Stoic thinking that the seeds of rationality are planted in each individual at birth. Jackson-McCabe argues that Jas 1:18 refers to initial creation, not conversion. See Jackson-McCabe, *Logos and Law*, 29–80.

⁵⁷⁸ See the first definition in Liddell and Scott, “Ἐμφυτος.”

⁵⁷⁹ This is the view that Hort holds about Jas 1:21. See Hort, *St. James*, 37–38.

⁵⁸⁰ Moo, *Letter of James*, 87.

⁵⁸¹ So Allison, *Sermon*, 312–16. Martin calls this idiom “OT-Jewish” (*James*, 49.)

⁵⁸² McKnight, *Letter of James*, 143. Allison may have an answer to this objection, pointing out that one may choose not to heed something in the heart, pointing to Deut 30:14 and Rom 2:12–16. See *James*, 315.

this phrase as a reference to the *gospel message* since this is the usage of receiving (δέχομαι) the λόγος (e.g., Luke 8:13; Acts 8:14; 11:1; 1 Thess 1:6; 2:13).⁵⁸³ This interpretation would fit well with the final clause that the λόγος has the power to *save your souls*.⁵⁸⁴ However, as Allison rightly points out, the author of James uses λόγος in the immediate context as something to *do* (1:22), while the gospel message is typically something to be *believed*.⁵⁸⁵

McKnight's and Kaiser's holistic view is perhaps the most satisfactory. Considering the figurative use of ἔμφυτος in Barn. 1:2 and 9:9, McKnight prefers *implanted*,⁵⁸⁶ referring to the "general idea" of God's work in believers. An *implanted word* has connotations similar to the Christian teaching of a new birth, the eschatological placement of the law into God's people in Jeremiah 31,⁵⁸⁷ and the Holy Spirit as a seal on believers (e.g. Rom 8:16; Eph 4:30). McKnight's view recognises both the Jewish and Christian nature of the epistle, the λόγος as the word of *truth* (1:18), *saving souls* (1:21), and the law of *liberty* (1:25). This understanding of λόγος may represent the "earliest messianic thinking about Torah, Word of God, gospel, and Spirit."⁵⁸⁸ Similarly, Kaiser has a Christian view of λόγος not limited to the salvific message. Contra Allison, she contends that an implanted λόγος can refer to both (1) the gospel and (2) a moral code; the message of the cross and resurrection is not divorced from Jesus' ethical teaching.⁵⁸⁹

Whatever the referent of ἔμφυτον λόγον, God's revelation has the *power to save your souls* (1:21). This qualification τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν has saliency at the end of the utterance. Again, the author emphasises the *final result* of the action. The result of removing evil (1:20) and receiving the λόγος (1:21) is the salvation of one's soul.

The connotation of δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν⁵⁹⁰ is relatively clear, referring to *eschatological salvation*.⁵⁹¹ The verbs δύναμαι and σῶζω is an LXX idiom (e.g., 2 Chr

⁵⁸³ So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 95; Johnson, *Letter of James*, 202.

⁵⁸⁴ Moo, *Letter of James*, 87.

⁵⁸⁵ Allison, *James*, 312.

⁵⁸⁶ See the second usage in Liddell-Scott.

⁵⁸⁷ Moo and Bauckham also tie the λόγος with the "internalized" law of new covenant in Jer 31. See Moo, *Letter of James*, 32; Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 141, 146.

⁵⁸⁸ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 142–43.

⁵⁸⁹ Kaiser, "Innate Word," 469. So also Deppe, "Jesus in James," 71. Kaiser sees ἔμφυτος continuing the birth metaphor that runs through 1:13–21.

⁵⁹⁰ Some MSS have ημῶν—*our* souls.

⁵⁹¹ So most of modern commentators, including Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 81–82; Martin, *James*, 49; Moo, *Letter of James*, 88; Burchard, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 82; Allison, *James*, 317–18; Varner, *James*, 107.

32:14–15; Wis 14:4; Ezek 33:12; Dan 6:27) with Hebrew counterparts.⁵⁹² It is also frequent in the NT in the context of eschatological salvation (Matt 19:25; Mark 10:26; Luke 18:26; Acts 15:1; Heb 7:25). Furthermore, the clustering of σῶζω with a singular λόγος in the NT refers to eschatological salvation (Luke 8:12; 1 Cor 1:18; 15:2). In the other instances in James (2:14 and 4:12), which we will examine later, the phrase is used for eschatological salvation as well.⁵⁹³ Burchard connects the power of the word in eschatological salvation in Jas 1:21 with Acts 20:32, 2 Tim 3:15, and Barn. 19:10.⁵⁹⁴

The *salvation* in view in Jas 1:21 has a *future* orientation, as do the other instances of σῶζω in James that refer to spiritual deliverance (2:14; 4:12; 5:20).⁵⁹⁵ The NT usage of σῶζω and its cognates referring to ultimate deliverance is common (e.g., Rom 5:9, 10; 13:11; 1 Thess 5:9; Phil 2:12; 1 Tim 4:16; 2 Tim 4:18; Heb 9:28; 1 Pet 1:5, 9; 2:2; 4:18).⁵⁹⁶ Also, if Moo, Bauckham, and Kamell are correct that Jer 31 is the background to ἔμφυτον λόγον, then Jas 1:16–21 conveys a new relationship between God and his people that leads to eschatological salvation.⁵⁹⁷ Jer 31:31–34 depicts God making a new covenant with his people in the end, placing his law on their minds and hearts so that they do not have to teach one another. This transformed eschatological relationship bears similarity to the *implanted word* which can save the hearers of James. Furthermore, as Laws points out, 1 Pet 1:23–2:2, which is a striking parallel with Jas 1:18–21⁵⁹⁸ the renouncing of κακία, receiving λόγος from God, and the birth metaphor, is tied to eschatological hope.

The emphasis on a favourable final result continues in the development of *quick to hear* in James 1:22–25. As stated above, the verses appear to have a chiasmic arrangement, with 1:22 urging the hearers be *doers* and not just hearers. After the metaphor of a hearer being like a man forgetting his appearance (1:23–24), Jas 1:25 contains the newest information—designating the one described by παραμείνας as μακάριος.

⁵⁹² Allison points out כִּל + ל + Hiphil of נָצַל as in 2 Kgs 18:29; Isa 36:14 and כִּל + ל + Hiphil of שָׁעַ as in Jer 14:9 in *James*, 462 n180.

⁵⁹³ Johnson asserts that the eschatological context of 1:2 fits best with 1:12; 2:12–13; 3:1; 5:5, 7 (*Letter of James*, 202.)

⁵⁹⁴ Burchard, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 83.

⁵⁹⁵ The ψυχή in Jas 1:21 in accordance with the LXX usage corresponding to ψῆν, probably refers to the whole human, not a part distinct from the physical body (see Mark 8:35; John 10:11; Acts 2:41).

⁵⁹⁶ As pointed out by Moo, *Letter of James*, 88.

⁵⁹⁷ Kamell, “Soteriology,” 144–45.

⁵⁹⁸ Laws, *Epistle of James*, 84.

As discussed above, James 1:25 is focused on the clause featuring the indicative verb: μακάριος ἐν τῇ ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται. The salient information is the hope of a favourable future, which is probably eschatological.

Both 1:12 and 1:25 refer to a present act of *remaining*: through *testing* in 1:12 and with the *law* in 1:25. The author exhorts his hearers to *remain faithful* in the *present* age, looking forward to a *future* described by μακάριος.⁵⁹⁹ Given the recurring references to eschatological results in James 1, we can conclude that the figure in 1:25, the one who remains a doer of the law, will be rewarded in the eschaton.

James 1:19–25 presents binary choices for the hearers to make. Since anger will not bring righteousness (1:20), they should put away that filth and receive the word—this will lead to their *salvation* (1:21). The author then challenges the hearers to be doers of the word, remaining faithful with the law; this brings *future blessing* (1:22–25). With the salient portions of these sayings pointing to the *ultimate result* of their choices, the hearers are motivated by eschatological consequences.

6.2.5 James 1:26–27

James 1:26–27 falls outside the double-*inclusio* and serves as a transition that previews the rest of the epistle. However, even these transition statements have elements of *eschatological approval*. They contain a *binary choice* between two types of piety: (1) useless and (2) pure and undefiled before God. They also affirm that God is the *judge* of their piety.

James 1:26 presents the worse of the two options, much like the sentence beginning with εἴ τις in 1:23. The author portrays someone who considers himself pious, but *not bridling his tongue* (μὴ χαλιναγωγῶν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ). Jas 1:26 develops the second part of the threefold command in 1:19, *slow to speak*.

The newly-asserted information in James 1:26 occurs at the end, the default position of saliency.⁶⁰⁰ This assertion contradicts the figure’s presumption of being pious: τούτου μάταιος ἢ θρησκεία. In this final clause, the predicate adjective μάταιος is fronted for

⁵⁹⁹ So Bertram and Hauck, “Μακάριος, Μακαρίζω, Μακαρισμός.”

⁶⁰⁰ For a discussion on newly-asserted content as the focal point, see Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 188–89.

emphasis in Dik’s preverbal P2 position: the author focuses on the so-called piety’s *uselessness* or *worthlessness*.⁶⁰¹

Like in 1:23–25, the author follows the first option in 1:26 with the better option in 1:27. The statement in 1:26 raises the question: *if not bridling the tongue is worthless piety, what is considered piety of value?* The opening of 1:27 addresses this: θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὕτη ἐστίν. Departing from the default verb-subject-object order,⁶⁰² θρησκεία serves as a framing device, delaying the newly-asserted information.⁶⁰³ Then, the predicate (αὕτη ἐστίν) elucidates the subject. The object αὕτη also appears before the verb, indicating greater saliency.

The subject describes *God* as the *judge* of piety. The prepositional phrase παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ conveys that God holds the standard. Most instances of παρὰ (τῷ) θεῷ occur in contexts where God judges against a standard (e.g., Prov 16:2, 21:3; Wis 4:1; 4 Macc 13:3; 3 Bar. 4:9; Luke 1:30; Rom 2:11, 13; Gal 3:11; 1 Pet 2:20). Regarding James 1:27, Harris asserts: “this usage [of παρὰ τῷ θεῷ] indicates the ultimate standard...by which all aspects of human thought and conduct should now be addressed and will in the end be judged.”⁶⁰⁴

The qualifiers καθαρὰ and ἀμίαντος are newly asserted, and they bolster the concept that God judges according to a standard. These adjectives conveying *clean* and *undefiled* are often used in cultic contexts. The positive and negative statements are nearly synonymous, forming a hendiadys (cf. Heb 7:26; 1 Pet 1:4). Allison points out that the LXX use of καθάρως conveys both cultic purity (e.g., Gen 7:2; Mal 1:11; often in Leviticus) and ethical purity (e.g., Gen 20:5; Ps 51:10; Job 33:9; Hab 1:13).⁶⁰⁵ The term ἀμίαντος and its related verb μιαίνω (*to defile*) can also be either cultic (e.g., Lev 11:25; Heb 7:26; *Ps. Sol.* 2:3) or ethical (e.g., Wis 3:13; *Sib. Or.* 2:55; *T. Reu.* 1:6). Considering the practical applications in the second half of 1:27, these terms are most likely ethical in nature. Again, the standard is held by God; he judges θρησκεία if it is pure and undefiled.

The expansion of αὕτη delineates the clean and undefiled piety before God: *to visit orphans and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unstained by the world*. The criterion of *caring for the less fortunate* occurs again in James 2. Eschewing the ways of the world, the hearers remain *unstained*. The term ἄσπιλον, fronted for emphasis before the verb,

⁶⁰¹ Bauer, “Μάταιος.”

⁶⁰² Porter, *Idioms*, 296.

⁶⁰³ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 118–19.

⁶⁰⁴ Harris, *Prepositions*, 172–73.

⁶⁰⁵ Allison, *James*, 360.

recalls the descriptors καθαρά καὶ ἀμίαντος. The call to eschew the world will occur again in 4:4.

Even the transition statements in James 1:26–27 contain elements of the theme of *eschatological approval* presented in 1:2–25. Not bridling the tongue amounts to θρησκεία that is *useless*, while care for the poor and staying unstained by the world is θρησκεία that is *pure and undefiled* before God. Again, the author does not focus on the criteria, but the result of an *evaluation*. The *evaluator* is God; he is the one to judge. The concept of *divine evaluation* further supports the notion that 1:26–27 serves as a preview of the following content, since 2:12–13 and 4:11–12 discuss divine judgment, framing an *inclusio*.⁶⁰⁶

6.3 Summary

With statements at the beginning (1:2–4), middle (1:12), and end (1:25) of the introductory prologue, the author frames the introduction with exhortations grounded in a *future* hope of *eschatological approval*. For each of them, the focal point is on the *favourable result*. Also, each of them points to God as the evaluator. The ‘hinge’ statement of 1:12 points to this favourable result being *eschatological*.

The rest of James 1 contains repeated references to *eschatological approval*. In each subsection, the focal point is the final result: *having wisdom leading to completeness* (1:5–8), *eschatological raising or lowering* (1:9–11), *eschatological life or death* (1:13–18), *salvation and future blessing* (1:19–25), and a *verdict of useless or pure and undefiled* (1:26–27). Inherent in this content is a binary choice: the author exhorts his hearers to choose the better of two options to receive the favourable result.

While not all these results are explicitly eschatological, the cumulative weight of the introductory prologue points to an *eschatological consequence* for each of the binary choices. Also, while a *divine* judge is not explicit in all of them, each binary choice points to an *evaluator*. The author urges his hearers to choose behaviour that will result in a favourable judgment in the eschaton.

⁶⁰⁶ Allison suggests that 1:26–27, which he considers to be a distinct section, previews the honouring of the poor in 2:1–13, helping those in need in 2:14–17, bridling the tongue in 3:1–12, the language of the heart in 3:14 and 4:8, the use of purity language in 3:17 and 4:8, and the notion of friendship with the world in 4:4. See 351–52.

The introductory function of James 1 suggests that its prominent theme of *eschatological approval* also recurs through the rest of James. In the next chapter, we will apply the same method to James 2–5 to determine the extent to which this theme appears.

Chapter 7: Eschatological Approval in James 2–5

In this chapter, we will examine the content after the introductory prologue in James. As we study each unit of James 2–5 as delineated in Chapter 5, we will attempt to demonstrate that the discourse features point to the *final result* of the affirmed actions of the exhortations, often in connection with eschatological judgment and reward. We will make a case that each unit relates to the motif of *eschatological approval*. Also, based on this study, we will propose that James 1:12, which is a pivotal statement in the prologue, serves as a thesis statement for the epistle: it introduces the unifying motif of *eschatological approval*.

7.1 James 2:1–13

As the entry into the letter’s body, James 2:1–13 appears to function as a *bridge between the prologue and the rest of the epistle*. First, this section re-visits elements of Jas 1, including the contrast between the rich and lowly in 1:9–11 and favour on the less fortunate in 1:27.⁶⁰⁷ As Taylor points out, striking parallels exist between 2:1–13 and 1:1–27, which occur in nowhere else in James. These parallels appear in the same order: (1) διακρίνω in 1:6 and 2:4, (2) the phrase ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν in 1:12 and 2:5, and (3) the phrase *law of freedom* in 1:25 and 2:12.⁶⁰⁸ Also, rather than *one* theme of 1:26–27, *all three* appear in 2:1–13—bridling the tongue (*say, speak* in 2:3, 12), mercy to the poor (2:2–6) and being unstained from the world (not showing favouritism, 2:1–9).⁶⁰⁹ Second, 2:1–13 previews the next section; its parallels with 2:14–26 are different from its parallels with 1:1–27. Both texts open with a *thesis* (2:1, 14), a supporting *hypothetical situation* (2:2–4, 15–17), *exposition* of the thesis (2:5–13, 18–25) and a *conclusion* with a *gnomic statement* (2:12–13, 26).⁶¹⁰ Also, both 2:1 and 2:14 discuss *faith*, and καλῶς ποιεῖτε/ποιεῖς occur in similar ways (2:8, 19). These points suggest that 2:1–13 has a unique role of (1) reminding the hearer of the prologue and (2) previewing the rest of the epistle’s body. In what follows, we will contend that 2:1–13 highlights *eschatological approval* as the unifying motif in James.

James 2:1–13 moves from a *specific* exhortation of prohibiting favouritism (2:1–7) to the *general* call to obey the whole law (2:8–11). After that, 2:12–13 both *concludes* the unit

⁶⁰⁷ So Allison, 374.

⁶⁰⁸ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 61–62.

⁶⁰⁹ So Taylor, 91.

⁶¹⁰ This is an edited version of the scheme proposed by Cranford, “James 2,” 20.

and *introduces* the next content, marking a grand inclusio that ends at 4:11–12. These exhortations point to the theme introduced in James 1: *eschatological approval*.

The opening command in James 2:1 urges the hearer to *have faith* in Christ without showing *favouritism*. The phrase ἐν προσωπολημψίαις is fronted before the imperative (μὴ) ἔχετε for saliency.⁶¹¹ The author indicates that having faith is incompatible with showing favouritism.

James 2:1 receives three bases of support in 2:2–11: (1) one is not to become a judge, (2) the poor are favoured by God, and (3) one must obey the whole law. In what follows, we will show how these bases point to *approval* at divine judgment in the eschaton.

7.1.1 Making Distinctions as Judges with Evil Thoughts (2:2–4)

The first basis for the exhortation in 2:1 occurs in 2:2–4, with γάρ signalling a connection with the previous verse.⁶¹² In the author’s third-class conditional statement, a rich and a poor man enter the gathering (2:2). The situation involves the hearers offering a good place to the rich man, relegating the poor man to a lesser place.⁶¹³ The favouritism to the rich man is likely based on the opportunity to receive favour from them in return.⁶¹⁴ The author condemns the hearers for the “tendency to honour the rich more than is really warranted or proper.”⁶¹⁵

The most important part of the saying in 2:2–4 is in its final clause. With the situation in 2:2–3 as a framing device,⁶¹⁶ the main clause receives focus as the newly-asserted information. As Runge points out, if the author had placed the conditional clause after the question in 2:4, it would imply that the condition contains new information. Rather, he uses the condition as an illustration of the favouritism in 2:1.⁶¹⁷ This build-up to 2:4 ensures that the hearers get the main point.

⁶¹¹ So Hart and Hart, *Analysis*, 62.

⁶¹² Porter, *Idioms*, 207–8.

⁶¹³ The recent change in the placement of ἐκεῖ in the Editio Critica Maior (cf. NA27 and NA28) does not change the thrust of the situation; the poor man is still given a lesser place. For more on this change, see Gurry and Wasserman, “Salvation in James,” 223–29.

⁶¹⁴ For a discussion of reciprocal gift-giving, see Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 11–51. Batten argues that patron-client relationships are in view in James 2:1–13. See Batten, *Friendship*, 127–34.

⁶¹⁵ Keck, “Poor in the NT,” 117.

⁶¹⁶ Runge states: “Conditional frames...establish a specific condition that must be met before the main clause that follows holds true.” See Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 228.

⁶¹⁷ Runge, 231–32.

The salient information in James 2:4 supports the command in 2:1; the hearers must eschew favouritism because it amounts to *making distinctions* and *becoming judges with evil thoughts*. The two reasons use terms that are etymologically related: διεκρίθητε and κριταί. We will examine each of these in turn.

The hearers are to eschew favouritism, not *making distinctions*. As discussed above, the verb διακρίνομαι in 1:6 likely refers to being *divided in purpose and disputing with God*. In 2:4, the author again uses the verb in the context of *faith* (see 1:3, 6; 2:1, 4). With the context of *making a distinction* between rich and poor, διεκρίθητε probably refers to making distinctions based on class,⁶¹⁸ causing *division* among the community (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς),⁶¹⁹ which the author condemns (e.g., 4:1–4, 11; 5:9). Also, ἐν ἑαυτοῖς possibly refers to *making judgments inside themselves* (i.e. dividing attitudes within each person),⁶²⁰ which re-visits the virtue of *wholeness* and *consistency* (1:4, 6–8; 2:1). In any case, the author condemns favouritism to the rich because of the distinctions they would make.

The hearers also must eschew favouritism, not becoming *judges with evil thoughts*. The use of κριταί is notable considering the use of κριτής elsewhere in James, which refers to God (4:11–12; 5:9). God is the one who has that role (see 4:12), and the hearers must live knowing they will receive judgment (2:21). The genitive διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν is probably used attributively: *evil thoughts*.⁶²¹ The author urges the hearers to refrain from usurping God’s role as judge and discriminating with their evil desires.⁶²²

7.1.2 Associating with the Poor, Not the Rich

The second basis for James 2:1 relates to the *poor* and *rich* themselves. In 2:5–7, the author asks three rhetorical questions about the poor and rich, each expecting an affirmative answer. We will examine these questions in order.

⁶¹⁸ Allison, *James*, 393–94.

⁶¹⁹ So Spitaler, “James 1,” 576; DeGraaf, “Doubts,” 742.

⁶²⁰ Evil attitudes would be consistent with κριταί διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν in 2:4b. See Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 119.

⁶²¹ So Wallace, who uses Jas 2:4 as an example in *Greek Grammar*, 88. So also Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 109; Adam, *James*, 39.

⁶²² Maynard-Reid proposes that the situation in 2:2–4 occurs in a rabbinical *court*, which would make the accusation of being *judges* more intelligible. See *Poverty and Wealth*, 57–58. If Maynard-Reid is correct, then the language of *courts* and *judgment* occurs throughout 2:1–12.

7.1.2.1 The Poor (2:5–6a)

In James 2:5, the author affirms that God chose the poor to be *rich in faith* and *heirs to the kingdom*. The reference to *the poor* is a *frame of reference* without newly-asserted information. It is the *comment* (θεὸς ἐξελέξατο... πλουσίους ἐν πίστει καὶ κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας) that is newly-asserted, and most important in the saying.⁶²³

While πλούσιος usually refers to having an abundance of material possessions, in 2:5 it indicates a different sort of wealth qualified by ἐν πίστει.⁶²⁴ The phrase πλουσίους ἐν πίστει has several possible renderings, (a) *having an abundance of faith* (cf. Eph 2:4; 1 Tim 6:18), (b) *rich by means of faith* (instrumental dative), and (c) *rich in the sphere of faith* (dative of sphere).⁶²⁵ Option (a) does not fit well; since “rich with regard to faith,” would construe faith as a reward for material poverty.⁶²⁶ Option (b) fits better since *faith* would be associated with loving God (Jas 2:5). It also points to riches that might result from faith: inheriting the kingdom. However, while the hearers could have faith (Jas 2:1, 14), they are not necessarily grouped with the poor in 2:5. Option (c), which construes πλουσίους ἐν πίστει as a *reward*, fits best for several reasons. First, this rendering recognises a parallel between ἐν πίστει and τῷ κόσμῳ:⁶²⁷ the poor in the sphere of the world become rich in the sphere of faith. They are wealthy when “judged by God’s standards.”⁶²⁸ Secondly, this rendering recognises the saying’s incongruent reversal, as they remain materially *poor* in one realm but *rich* in a different realm.⁶²⁹ Thirdly, this view receives support from the sayings of Jesus that urge having treasure in heaven (e.g., Matt 6:20; 19:21; Mark 10:21; Luke 18:22).

The second affirmation, κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας, adds an *identity: heirs to the kingdom*. In what follows, we will examine the concept of *inheritance*, and then investigate the connotation of *the kingdom* in Jas 2:5.

The noun κληρονόμος refers to one who receives an inheritance.⁶³⁰ The traditional imagery of *inheritance* often refers to a *future reward* for God’s people. This imagery can

⁶²³ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 210.

⁶²⁴ Bauer, “Πλούσιος.” Bauer gives other examples, like πλουσία ψυχῆ in *Let. Aris.* 15, πλούσιος ἐν ἐλέει in Eph 2:4, and πλούσιος τῷ πνεύματι in *Barn.* 19:2.

⁶²⁵ Wallace observes that dative of reference/respect and dative of sphere often overlap and the nuance is difficult to detect, as in Matt 5:8 (οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ). Jas 2:5 appears to fit this description as well. See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 145–46.

⁶²⁶ Dibelius, *James*, 138.

⁶²⁷ So Dibelius, 138; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 111–12; Moo, *Letter of James*, 105.

⁶²⁸ Ropes, *St. James*, 194.

⁶²⁹ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 195.

⁶³⁰ Bauer, “Κληρονόμος.”

convey the land (e.g., Gen 12:7; 48:4; Exod 15:17; Deut 8:1; *T. Dan* 7:3; *Ps. Sol.* 7:2; 9:1). Psalm 36 LXX repeats the *inheritance* imagery (36:9, 11, 18, 22, 29, 34) as a reward for the righteous that is *eternal* (36:18, 29).⁶³¹ Other instances of κληρονόμος and κληρονομέω refer to an eternal reward for the faithful (*Sib. Or.* 23:46–48 [frag. 3]; *Jos. Asen.* 12:12; *Ps. Sol.* 12:6; 14:10)⁶³² and punishment for the wicked (*Ps. Sol.* 14:9; 15:10–11). Post-exilic literature often conveys that the righteous inherit the land as an *eschatological reward* (Isa 60:21; 61:7; *1 En.* 3:6–8; *Ps. Sol.* 17:23–26).⁶³³ Matthew conveys an *inheritance* as a *future reward* (Matt 5:5; 19:29; 25:34). Matt 25:34, which, like James 2:5, *clusters* κληρονομέω with βασιλεία with a similar context of *inheritance, eschatological reward, and caring for the poor.*

The language of *inheritance*, based on the parallels, supports the view that the saying in James 2:5 indicates an *eternal reward*. Like the LXX instances of an inheritance from God, the poor in Jas 2:5 are *heirs*; they receive divine favour. Jas 2:5 is notably similar to Matt 5:3 and 5:5, with a promised eschatological reversal of the world’s system: the poor will be rich.

What will the poor inherit? In what follows, we will argue with support from the Greek parallels that the *kingdom* in Jas 2:5 refers to an *eschatological state of blessing* associated with eternal life.

In the LXX and intertestamental literature, the Lord’s reign is described as everlasting (e.g. Ps 145:10; Wis 3:8; Isa 24:23; *Ps. Sol.* 17:3), with the *kingdom of God* having eschatological connotations (*Sib. Or.* 3:663–679; 762–71; *1 En.* 84:2–3; 90:16; Isa 37:16; Obad 21; Zech 14:1–9; *Ps. Sol.* 17:21–32; Dan 7:18, 22, 27). While some view the frequent⁶³⁴ phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in the Synoptic Gospels as referring to God’s *present* dynamic ruling activity (e.g., Matt 12:28; Luke 13:18–19),⁶³⁵ the expression predominantly conveys a *future* divine rule of the world.⁶³⁶ Many instances describe the kingdom as occurring in the future (e.g., Matt 5:20; 25:1; Mark 9:1; Luke 21:31; 22:16), and an *asset* that humans can *possess* (Matt 5:3, 5). Also, they frequently point to the *kingdom* being a *location*

⁶³¹ Notably, Psalm 36 LXX clusters several parallels with James, including grass withering (36:2; Jas 1:10–11), affirmation of the ὑπομένοντες (36:9; Jas 1:3, 12; 5:11), πραεῖς (36:11; Jas 1:21; 3:13), and δίκαιοι (36:29; Jas 5:6, 16; cf. 1:20; 2:21–25; 3:18).

⁶³² Atkinson, *Intertextual*, 287.

⁶³³ The psalm reveals a belief in life after death (*Ps. Sol.* 14:4). See Atkinson, 350.

⁶³⁴ Occurring in fifty-eight sayings. Allison identifies ten occurring in both Matthew and Luke. See Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 164–68.

⁶³⁵ France, “Church and Kingdom,” 33; Marcus, “Kingly Power,” 663–64; Dalman, *Words*, 91–147.

⁶³⁶ For a discussion of the two meanings for ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, see Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*, 160–85.

(e.g., Matt 13:41–42; 23:13; Luke 22:28–30), often associating it with a verb of motion connoting *entry* (εἰσέρχομαι or εἰσπορεύομαι).⁶³⁷ *Entry* recalls LXX sayings that describe *entering the land* (e.g., Exod 12:25; Lev 14:34; Num 14:30; Ezek 13:9), some of which also use the language of *inheritance* (Num 14:24; Deut 4:1; Judg 18:9; Neh 9:15; 1 Esd 8:80 cf. *T. Levi* 12:5). Allison points out that the Synoptic sayings denying entry into the kingdom (e.g., Matt 5:20; 23:13; Mark 10:15; Luke 18:17) recall the LXX descriptions of someone not *entering the land* because of “moral failure” (Num 20:24; Deut 4:21; Ezek 13:9; 20:38).⁶³⁸

The sayings of Jesus associate entering or inheriting the *kingdom* with *eternal life* (Matt 19:29; 25:46; Mark 10:30; Luke 18:29–30), revealing a semantic overlap: an *eschatological state* for God’s people. Jesus equates *entering life* with *entering the kingdom* (Matt 19:17; Mark 9:43–45). In the Olivet discourse, Jesus teaches that the judging king will invite the righteous to (1) inherit the *kingdom* (κληρονομήσατε τὴν ... βασιλείαν, Matt 25:34), and (2) have *eternal life* (25:46).⁶³⁹ Thus, there is a significant overlap between these two concepts.

Since it does not follow that βασιλεία refers to the present dynamic reign of God in James 2:5, the reward for the poor is a specific *possession* in the future.⁶⁴⁰ This is consistent with LXX instances of an eschatological reign. Despite their present state, the poor should expect an eschatological inheritance.

Notably, the address *twelve tribes of the diaspora* (1:1) is consistent with the *kingdom* being a specific realm. The expectation of restoration to the land especially recurs in the prophets (e.g., Isa 56:8; Ezek 34:11–16; Jer 29:14; Mic 2:12; Bar 5:5). Expressions of this expectation often specifically mention the *tribes* (e.g., Isa 49:6; Sir 48:10; *Ps. Sol.* 17:26–27; *T. Benj.* 9:2). The expectation of Israel’s restoration was so widespread that Sanders suggests that any references to *twelve* “necessarily mean restoration.”⁶⁴¹

⁶³⁷ See Matt 7:21; 18:3; 19:23, 24; 23:13; Mark 9:47; 10:15, 23, 24, 25; Lk. 18:17, 24, 25.

⁶³⁸ Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 180–81.

⁶³⁹ Allison adds that the rabbinic tradition largely equates the “the life to come” with a utopian future of God’s rule. See Allison, 186–89.

⁶⁴⁰ This is the only instance of βασιλεία in James, though there is a reference to the βασιλικός (*royal law*) in 2:8.

⁶⁴¹ Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 98. Some scholars have pointed out that this reference in James 1:1, in accordance with Sanders’ approach, does evoke the hope of eschatological restoration of the twelve tribes. For example, see Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 1*, 131; Jackson-McCabe, “Wisdom and ‘Apocalyptic’ Eschatology in James,” 506; Popkes, *Jakobus*, 72; Morales, *Poor and Rich*, 82.

Examined alongside James 1:12, there is further warrant to see the *kingdom* in 2:5 as a favourable future state for the righteous. The phrase *which he promised to those who love him* in 2:5 also occurs in 1:12, suggesting that 2:5 is to be read in connection with the key statement in the epistle’s prologue:

1:12	τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς	ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν
2:5	κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας	ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν

The overlap between βασιλεία and ζωή in the sayings of Jesus support a connection in James between *inheriting the kingdom* and *receiving the crown of life*. Both convey God’s favour on those in a disadvantaged state (trial or poverty) and future hope of exaltation.

The author offers newly-asserted information at the end of 2:5: God *promised the kingdom to those who love him*. It is not the *poor* without distinction who receive the kingdom, but *those who love God*. The phrase τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν recalls the Shema, featuring the command to *love God* in Deut 6:5.⁶⁴² *Love for God* is associated with *obeying* his commands (Deut 10:12; 11:1; Josh 22:5). The command to love God frequently occurs in intertestamental literature and the sayings of Jesus, often paired with the command to love others (*T. Benj.* 3:1; *T. Iss.* 5:2; 7:6; *T. Dan* 5:3; *Apoc. Sedr.* 1:12; Matt 22:36–40; Mark 12:28–34; Luke 10:25–28).

In Jas 2:5, those who *love God* are promised the kingdom, a concept that resonates in Israel’s tradition and shapes the identity of God’s people. Love for God is expressed through faithfulness and obedience, consistent with the call to eschew the world’s values (1:27; cf. 4:4) and resist temptation (1:13–14).⁶⁴³

The emphasis on those who love God serves as an implicit *exhortation for the hearers to do the same*. By refraining from favouritism, the hearers of James can benefit from the promise in Jas 2:5. First, in shunning the world’s ways, they love God by *following his ways alone* (cf. 4:4). Dibelius states that poverty and Christianity coincide; both show humility and aversion to the world’s ways.⁶⁴⁴ Second, the hearers show love for God by *caring for the poor*. The context of Jas 2:5 (2:2–4, 6–11, cf. 2:15–16) teaches that the treatment of the poor is bound up with obedience to and love for God.⁶⁴⁵ Third, the hearers love God by favouring

⁶⁴² See Edgar, “Love-Command,” 15.

⁶⁴³ See the discussion in Furnish, *Love Command*, 175.

⁶⁴⁴ Dibelius, *Jakobus*, 65.

⁶⁴⁵ Konradt states that favouring the poor expresses a living relationship with God. See *Christliche Existenz*, 289–90.

those whom God favours. This principle, taught in Prov 19:17, occurs in Matt 25:34–40. Similarly, *caring for the poor* is equated with *giving to God* in Prov 19:17. By favouring the poor, the hearers can look forward to receiving a reward.

James 2:5 motivates the epistle’s hearers: if they adhere to God’s view of the poor, they can expect a favourable decision in divine judgment. As 2:12–13 indicates, their mercy on the poor will bring them mercy. If they imitate God’s favour towards the poor, they too will be *approved* and *rewarded* at the judgment.

In summary, the reward described in James 2:5 is twofold. First, the author declares that the poor who love God are chosen to be *rich in the sphere of faith*, where the standard is defined by God. Second, the author declares that the poor who love God are chosen to be *heirs to the kingdom*, an ideal state for the righteous. With its connection to Jas 1:12 and ζωή in the sayings of Jesus, the *kingdom* is held in apposition to *eternal life*. Thus, the author of James describes the *future reward* of those who faithfully trust and love God.⁶⁴⁶ Moo and Tamez are correct that inheriting the *kingdom* is associated with *salvation*.⁶⁴⁷

James 2:6a returns the hearers to the situation described in 2:2–4. The conjunction δέ indicates the development of previous content. By practising favouritism to the rich, the hearers *dishonour the poor man*. The author condemns this dishonouring based on the content in 2:5. With all of 2:5–6a in view, the author calls his hearers to honour those chosen by God, associating with them rather than the rich.

7.1.2.2 The Rich (2:6b–7)

The two rhetorical questions⁶⁴⁸ in James 2:6–7 reinforce the call for the hearers to refrain from favouritism. The rich are guilty of three accusations from the author: (1) *oppressing* the hearers, (2) *dragging them into court*, and (3) *blaspheming the name called on them*. Unlike the poor who love God in 2:5, the rich act in ways that the author condemns.

First, the rich *oppress* the hearers. The term καταδυναστεύω is often associated with *exploiting* the poor (e.g., Ezek 18:2; 45:8; Amos 4:1; Wis 2:10).⁶⁴⁹ This oppression is

⁶⁴⁶ McCartney points out the progressive nature of ἀγαπᾶσιν, “implying a continuous, ongoing love for God.” McCartney, *James*, 142.

⁶⁴⁷ Moo, *Letter of James*, 107; Tamez, *Scandalous Message*, 31–33.

⁶⁴⁸ Both expect an affirmative answer.

⁶⁴⁹ Bauer, “Καταδυναστεύω”; Allison, *James*, 398.

specified: the rich *drag the hearers into court*. The rich probably use their wealth and influence to remain wealthy and “get favourable verdicts against the poor.”⁶⁵⁰

The rich also *blaspheme the good name on which the hearers are called*. The referent of τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα is unclear; scholars propose that it refers to God’s name (cf. Deut 29:10; 2 Chr 7:14; Acts 15:17)⁶⁵¹ or the name of Christ.⁶⁵² In any case, this accusation against the rich serves as a basis for not showing favouritism to them.

7.1.3 Transgressors of the Law

The third basis for the exhortation in James 2:1 occurs in 2:8–11. As discussed above, the emphatic μέντοι in 2:8 connects to the previous material. The particle also serves to point forward to the next saying, which begins with εἰ δέ. Together, Jas 2:8–9 convey that the prohibition of favouritism in 2:1 is based on the notion that doing so would violate the law.

The conjunctions μέντοι and δέ in James 2:8–9 connect the sayings, with the second likely being of primary importance. In μὲν ... δέ constructions, μὲν usually introduces a *concessive* clause (i.e., *on the one hand*) while δέ introduces the *contrasting* clause (i.e., *on the other hand*).⁶⁵³ James 2:8 displays the principle that the first saying often serves as a *background* for the second, *downgrading* its importance.⁶⁵⁴ First, the information in 2:8, that *one does well if obeying the law*, is not new. The *newly-asserted* information comes later, that *favouritism amounts to committing sin and transgressing the law*. Second, the emphatic nature of μέντοι (*of course*) appears to fit with the almost self-evident assertion in 2:8.⁶⁵⁵ Ropes assigns a “confirmative” meaning,⁶⁵⁶ which reinforces the view that the saying is not newly-asserted. Third, the importance of the saying in 2:9 is bolstered by the further discussion in 2:10–11 introduced by γάρ.⁶⁵⁷ The cohesion of νόμου and παραβάται in 2:9

⁶⁵⁰ Moo, *Letter of James*, 209.

⁶⁵¹ So Maynard-Reid, *Poverty and Wealth*, 65; Allison, *James*, 400. Notably, it is the man James who appears to quote Amos 9 at the Jerusalem council in Acts 15.

⁶⁵² The verb ἐπικληθέν could refer to the name of Jesus *called* upon Christians during baptism. See Laws, *Epistle of James*, 105; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 113; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 115.

⁶⁵³ Bauer, “Μέν.”

⁶⁵⁴ While Runge states that downgrading does not always occur, the principle proposed by Levinsohn fits with James 2:8. See Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 54–55; Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 170.

⁶⁵⁵ Liddell and Scott, “Μέν”; Adam, *James*, 42.

⁶⁵⁶ Ropes, *St. James*, 198.

⁶⁵⁷ So Adam, *James*, 45; Varner, *James*, 157–58.

with παραβάτης νόμου in 2:11 link 2:9–11 together.⁶⁵⁸ The semantics and context, therefore, point to the content in 2:8 being downgraded and 2:9 being the focal point.

James 2:9–11 primarily conveys that breaking one commandment condemns someone as a *transgressor*.⁶⁵⁹ In 2:9 and 2:11, the accusation of παραβάτης receives saliency at the end of the saying.⁶⁶⁰ Furthermore, in the case of 2:9, παραβάτης is moved from its default place (after the participle), adding greater saliency.⁶⁶¹ The repetition and order of the clauses reveal that the focus of 2:9–11 is less on the keeping of the law, and more so on the *result*: the conviction of being a *transgressor* of the law. The legal connotation of ἐλέγχω (cf. John 8:46; *Sib. Or.* 5:34; Titus 1:9),⁶⁶² fits with the context this saying, especially 2:12. The noun παραβάτης occurs three times in the NT outside James, all in connection with the *law* (Rom 2:25, 27; Gal 2:18 cf. παράβασις in 2 Macc 15:10; Wis 14:31; Heb 2:2), describing a violator of a command.⁶⁶³ The legal language in the salient parts of Jas 2:9–11 points to the focus being on the negative verdict of παραβάτης pronounced on those who disobey a commandment.

The all-or-nothing approach to the law points to *purity* in adherence. This call to purity recalls the *wholeness* introduced in James 1:4 and the *purity* of piety before God in the transition statement in 1:27. As the author expands on concepts found in the prologue, he reinforces the call for the hearers to live so that they can be judged favourably by God.

7.1.4 Living in Expectation of Judgment

James 2:12–13 serves several functions. First, the sayings sum up the previous content. The adverb οὕτως, occurring before each imperative in 2:12, could be cataphoric, referring to *speaking* and *doing* portrayed in 2:1–11 or even in 1:19–25.⁶⁶⁴ Jas 2:12 also reiterates the emphasis on adherence to the law, repeating the phrase νόμος ἐλευθερίας from 1:25. In any case, the cohesion of 2:1–13, especially through the ties of *favouritism* and the

⁶⁵⁸ Moo, *Letter of James*, 113–14.

⁶⁵⁹ A connection exists between the unity of the law, the oneness of God, and the condemnation of double-mindedness in James. See Kovalishyn, “Salvation in James,” 136.

⁶⁶⁰ See “predicate-focus structure” in *Information Structure and Sentence Form*, 226.

⁶⁶¹ See “pronominal constituent” in Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 34. In accordance, Davids writes that “παραβάται stands out in bold relief at the end” of 2:9. See *Epistle of James*, 115.

⁶⁶² Bauer, “Ἐλέγχω.”

⁶⁶³ Moo, *Letter of James*, 113.

⁶⁶⁴ So Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 86; Varner, *James*, 163.

law, indicate that 2:12 is an inference from the discussion preceding it. The call to *show mercy* in 2:13 recalls the affirmation of God favouring the poor and the call to do the same. Second, Jas 2:12–13 previews the content following it. *Speaking* and *doing* are themes found in reverse order in 2:14–26 and 3:1–12.⁶⁶⁵ As Taylor correctly points out,⁶⁶⁶ the *lack of mercy* in 2:13 is immediately found in 2:14–16, and the usage of speech in view of *judgment* (see 3:1) is addressed in 3:1–12. Third, as discussed above, 2:12–13 marks an *inclusio*, of which the *epiphora* occurs at 4:11–12.

The sayings in James 2:12–13 point to *eschatological approval*. Drawing from the concept that showing favouritism makes someone a transgressor, the author urges living in a way that expects impending judgment. The author’s decision to place μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι at the end marks the appeal to *judgment* as salient. The phrase διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας, describing *means* or *agency*,⁶⁶⁷ is also emphatic, occupying the P2 position. The author urges right *speaking* and *acting* but emphasises judgment for his hearers. His exhortation to eschew favouritism is based on judgment; he exhorts so that his hearers would not be convicted as transgressors (2:9, 11). The saying in 2:13, connected to the previous content by the conjunction γάρ and the cohesive tie of judgment,⁶⁶⁸ reinforces this concern for a *favourable* rather than unfavourable verdict. Allison rightly points out that *showing mercy* in 2:13 recalls its antithesis of showing favouritism in 2:1–7.⁶⁶⁹ The inverse of the saying in Jas 2:13a is that *God will show mercy to those who show mercy*; the author exhorts so that his hearers would be shown *mercy* when judged.⁶⁷⁰ The articular ἡ κρίσις suggests a specific judgment—eschatological judgment from God in the end.⁶⁷¹ The final saying in 2:13, κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως, reiterates the importance of showing mercy: divine mercy trumps judgment.

⁶⁶⁵ So Cladder, “Die Anlage des Jakobusbriefes,” 46–47.

⁶⁶⁶ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 86.

⁶⁶⁷ Adam, *James*, 47.

⁶⁶⁸ Contra Mußner, who holds that 2:13 is disconnected from the previous content.

See *Jakobusbrief*, 126.

⁶⁶⁹ Allison, *James*, 419.

⁶⁷⁰ Konradt sees the imitation of God’s mercy as a characterisation of a Christian—those who will ultimately be shown mercy at eschatological judgment (cf. Matt 5:7). See *Christliche Existenz*, 298.

⁶⁷¹ Wall identifies this as “God’s eschatological courtroom.” See *Community*, 128.

7.1.5 Summary

James 2:1–13, with its parallels with the prologue and other parallels with 2:14–26, serves as a *bridge* to the rest of the main body. The salient portions in 2:1–13 point to the author’s concern that the hearers receive a *favourable judgment*. The example of eschewing favouritism leads to a general exhortation to obey the whole law (2:10–11) and to live in full view of the impending judgment. Davids summarises this section:

Thus those who hold “the faith of our glorious Lord” with partiality are not debasing just any belief, but rather a faith-commitment in the one exalted Lord Jesus whose glory will be fully revealed in eschatological judgment. As the tone implies, this is no matter for casualness or trifling; final judgment is at stake.⁶⁷²

The appeal to judgment re-visits the theme of the pivotal saying in 1:12—that those who adhere to God’s ways will receive a reward. Also, the call to consistency with the law gives an expansion of *wholeness* and *pure piety* (1:27). Finally, the summary-transition statements in 2:12–13 offer a preview of the following sections, which will expand the exhortations to *speak* (3:1–13) and *act* (2:14–26) in expectation of *judgment*. The grand *inclusio* marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12 will frame the next several sections of the epistle.

7.2 James 2:14–26

The first section of James within the *inclusio* marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12 describes the interplay between *faith* and *deeds*. Much ink has been spilt discussing the relationship between James 2:14–26 and Paul’s teaching on *justification* in Romans and Galatians.⁶⁷³ However, we will focus on the text of James and its salient points, allowing, in Johnson’s words, an examination “on its own literary terms.”⁶⁷⁴ In what follows, we will contend that James 2:14–16 is focused on the *impotence of faith without deeds*. Through this recurring assertion, the author exhorts his hearers towards correct behaviour to accompany their faith—this will result in *eschatological approval*, and eschatological salvation. Distributed throughout James 2:14–26 are sayings that assert the uselessness of *having faith without deeds*. We will address each of them as they occur:

⁶⁷² Davids, *Epistle of James*, 107.

⁶⁷³ The literary relationship between the epistle of James and Paul (either his letters or his theology) is beyond the scope of this study. For a discussion of this possible relationship, see Davids, 2–5, 19–22, 125–26; Allison, *James*, 62–67; McCartney, *James*, 14–19, 36, 53–56; Stein, “Faith Alone.”

⁶⁷⁴ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 246.

Having faith without deeds cannot save (2:14)
Faith by itself, without deeds, is dead by itself (2:17)
Faith apart from deeds is useless (2:20)
Faith apart from deeds is dead (2:26)

In James 2:14, the author asks two rhetorical questions. The first question asks, *what benefit is there to assert that one has faith, but does not have deeds?* The vocative address ἀδελφοί μου points forward to the important information.⁶⁷⁵ The focused content occurs at the end, with πίστιν and ἔργα fronted in their respective clauses. The fronting of πίστιν, according to Levinsohn, brings *faith* temporarily into focus, anticipating the attention on the corresponding constituent, ἔργα. The question, therefore, focuses on the *lack of deeds*. The second question (2:14) expects a negative answer; it reveals that faith without deeds is useless. Such faith⁶⁷⁶ *is not able to save him*. As Huther correctly points out, the force of the pronoun αὐτόν indicates that the *particular* faith, which is without works, will not save *him*.⁶⁷⁷

The second question in 2:14 also offers newly-asserted specification of the *benefit* (τὸ ὄφελος) of faith in the first question: the ability to *save*. The connotation of σῶσαι in 2:14 is most likely *eschatological salvation*. First, while one instance of σῶζω in James (5:15) probably refers to physical restoration,⁶⁷⁸ the context in 2:14 suggests that the salvation in view is eschatological. The author uses πίστις four times in the preceding content (1:3, 6; 2:1, 5), pointing to the sort of faith that Abraham and Rahab have, in contrast to the faith without deeds in 2:14. Heide correctly determines that all these instances of πίστις convey an *eternal matter*, “faith that is unto *eternal salvation*.”⁶⁷⁹ Also, the discussion of *salvation* follows a discussion of *judgment* (Jas 2:12–13), further supporting the eschatological reading of σῶζω. Second, the other instances of σῶζω paired with δύναμαι in James (1:21; 4:12) have eschatological connotations.⁶⁸⁰ Given the instances of σῶζω in the epistle, Allison declares

⁶⁷⁵ See Runge, “Redundant Vocatives as Forward-Pointing Devices” in *Discourse Grammar*, 117–22.

⁶⁷⁶ Contra Dibelius, who asserts that ἡ πίστις refers to Christian faith in general, the lack of an article in the first question suggests that the article in the second is *anaphoric*, especially considering αὐτόν, which makes this faith particular. See Dibelius, *James*, 152. The *sort* of faith without deeds, as presented in Jas 2:14a, does not save. So Moo, *Letter of James*, 123; Allison, *James*, 462; Varner, *James*, 173.

⁶⁷⁷ Huther, *James and John*, 117–18.

⁶⁷⁸ Zane C. Hodges holds the minority view that σῶζω (1:21; 2:14) refers to *rescuing* from *physical death* in *James*, 29, 60–61.

⁶⁷⁹ Emphasis mine. Heide, “Soteriology,” 77.

⁶⁸⁰ So Moo, *Letter of James*, 123–24.

that “the issue here is manifestly eschatological salvation,” also pointing to the unsaved ending up in Gehenna (3:6).⁶⁸¹ The story of the rich man and Lazarus affirms that Abraham, the exemplar of faith in Jas 2:21–23, receives eschatological salvation; Lazarus ends up in the bosom of Abraham, the antithesis of Hades (Luke 16:22–23). Third, the illustration in 2:15–16, which echoes the question τί τὸ ὄφελος from 2:14, describes someone who does not provide for the poor. As discussed above with 1:25–27 and 2:1–13,⁶⁸² how one treats the poor and marginalised determines if one receives a *favourable judgment in the eschaton*.

The situation in 2:15–16 illustrates that faith without deeds is *unable to save*. The author places the situation in Dik’s P1 position, using it to frame the final clause (τί τὸ ὄφελος;).⁶⁸³ The author depicts an individual lacking clothing and food, and another person well-wishing without providing for their physical needs. The final clause, in the form of a question, is the most salient portion, indicating that well-wishing without action has *no benefit*.

James 2:17 restates the *impotence of having faith without deeds*. The adverb οὕτως is probably anaphoric, referring to 2:15–16.⁶⁸⁴ Like well-wishing apart from action is useless, faith apart from deeds is *dead by itself*. The author uses another P1 conditional frame introduced by ἐάν in 2:17, pointing to the newly-asserted content in the default position for saliency: νεκρά ἐστὶν καθ’ ἑαυτήν. The predicate νεκρά occurs before the verb for emphasis, highlighting a new way of expressing the impotence of faith without deeds.

James 2:18–19 again asserts the *impotence of faith without deeds for saving*. In a passage difficult to navigate,⁶⁸⁵ the author presents a diatribe-like exchange between two voices, one having faith and one having works. With the accusatives placed before the verbs in σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις καὶ γὰρ ἔργα ἔχω in 2:18a, an emphatic contrast is made between the two.⁶⁸⁶ Then, 2:18b also presents two contrasting clauses, each beginning with δείκνυμι. One voice

⁶⁸¹ Allison, *James*, 461–62.

⁶⁸² Johnson writes that the illustration in 2:15–16 reveals that one is not “unstained from the world,” and not “pure and undefiled before God.” *Letter of James*, 247. Edgar states that one cannot miss this connection with the aforementioned “poor.” See Edgar, *Chosen the Poor*, 170.

⁶⁸³ See “Framing Devices” in epistolary literature in Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 227–33.

⁶⁸⁴ Adam, *James*, 52.

⁶⁸⁵ The difficulty lies in deciphering to whom the pronouns refer. Allison has a thorough list of the possible explanations (*James*, 468–71).

⁶⁸⁶ Also, Dik considers *contrast* by itself an indicator of focus. See *Functional Grammar I*, 68.

issues a challenge to show faith without deeds, and he, in turn, will show his faith *from deeds*. The contrast is made in two ways in 2:18b. First, the *role of deeds* is contrasted: *faith without deeds* and *faith shown from deeds*. Second, the accusative πίστιν occupies a different position in each clause. While the key constituent πίστιν occurs right after the imperative in the first clause,⁶⁸⁷ the shift of πίστιν to the very end of the second clause attracts attention.⁶⁸⁸ The focus of 2:18b, then, is on the final term in the final clause: *faith* that is shown from deeds. This is the kind of faith the author affirms; it saves someone (2:14).

James 2:19 illustrates that having *faith without deeds does not save*. The author contrasts two kinds of faith: (1) *theological belief*, which is useless, and (2) the faith of Abraham and Rahab, which co-operates with deeds.⁶⁸⁹ This sort of faith agrees with propositions, indicated by πιστεύεις ὄτι. The content of the faith in 2:19 comes from the Shema (Deut 6:4): εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ θεός.⁶⁹⁰ With *one* (εἷς) in the preverbal P1 position, the author indicates that this kind of faith is an assent to a basic confession Jewish/Christian belief. After that, like the usage of a similar saying in 2:8, the “semi-ironic”⁶⁹¹ καλῶς ποιεῖς anticipates a contrast. Belief in the confession is good, but it is not enough. With καί bringing τὰ δαιμόνια into focus as the parallel to σύ in the first clause,⁶⁹² the author compares this faith to that of the *demons*. The verb φρίσσουσιν shows the sincerity of their faith: *they tremble*.⁶⁹³ However, the faith that merely agrees to a confession without deeds does not save. The appeal to the Shema leaves out the call to *love God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your might*. Adhering to the latter portion would ironically pair this faith with *deeds*. As Moo points out, “the problem lies not with the confession itself, but from the implication that it does not go beyond the verbal to touch the heart and the life.”⁶⁹⁴

⁶⁸⁷ See Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 31.

⁶⁸⁸ Levinsohn uses Jas 2:18 as an example of a core constituent placed at the end of the clause for focus. See this and other examples in 35, 38.

⁶⁸⁹ So Allison, *James*, 443.

⁶⁹⁰ Laws sees the contrast between God’s oneness and the duplicity of humans. See “Doctrinal Basis,” 300–301.

⁶⁹¹ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 125.

⁶⁹² See Titrud, “Καί.” Titrud gives other examples of the appositive-introducing function of καί.

⁶⁹³ Stokes proposes a connection between the demons φρίσσουσιν and the demons receiving their eschatological condemnation with τρόμος in *1 Enoch* 13:1–3. See Stokes, “Devil and Demons,” 156. If Stokes is correct, it would strengthen the link between James 2:19 and eschatological judgment.

⁶⁹⁴ Moo, *Letter of James*, 130.

James 2:20 emphatically re-states the assertion that *faith without deeds does not save*. The vocative ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ and the already-established ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων occupy Dik’s P1 position and point forward to the salient portion at the end of the question. The newly-asserted predicate ἀργή occurs in the preverbal P2 position, representing another way the author is describing *impotence*; Faith apart from deeds is *idle* or *useless*.⁶⁹⁵

In James 2:21–25, the author answers the question posed in 2:20 with two OT examples. In contrast to the demons’ faith, the faith of Abraham and Rahab was accompanied by deeds. Each exemplar is introduced (2:21, 25) with a question containing a topical frame (Ἀβραάμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν and Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη) in the P1 position. The focus of each saying is ἐξ ἔργων in the salient preverbal P2 position⁶⁹⁶ in both questions: each was justified *from works*. The phrase ἐξ ἔργων likely indicates basis (*based on deeds*)⁶⁹⁷ or means (*through deeds*).⁶⁹⁸ Thus, the focus is not on ἐδικαιώθη,⁶⁹⁹ but on the phrase which indicates *how* they were justified. This emphasis preserves the purpose of appealing to the exemplars: just like they were justified *by/through deeds*, so will the hearers be saved by *faith that has deeds*.

One might object to the view that James 2:14–26 discusses *eschatological approval* by pointing out that the appeal to the OT exemplars *does not* relate to eschatological salvation. After all, the events conveyed by ἐδικαιώθη appear to occur within the lives of Abraham and Rahab.⁷⁰⁰ However, even if the term ἐδικαιώθη in 2:21 and 2:24 does not connote eschatological salvation for the two exemplars, we see that the entire unit is introduced in 2:14 with a reference to eschatological salvation for the epistle’s *hearers*. The term σῶσαι refers to eschatological salvation, especially considering the context of *judgment* in James (2:13).

Relevant to this discussion is the use of δικαίω in James. In 2:14–26, we observe a usage of δικαίω that is distinct from some instances in Pauline literature. In using this term in 2:21 and 2:25, the author of James refers to a declaration about Abraham and Rahab *as a result* of their relevant deeds. This usage fits with LXX and intertestamental instances of

⁶⁹⁵ Bauer, “Ἀργός.” Popkes sees both aspects: such faith does not do anything, and it is useless. See *Jakobus*, 202.

⁶⁹⁶ Levinsohn uses Jas 2:21 as an example of constituent order in *Discourse Features*, 51.

⁶⁹⁷ Harris, *Prepositions*, 104.

⁶⁹⁸ Adam, *James*, 56.

⁶⁹⁹ For a recent survey of the scholarship addressing this verb and the allusion to Genesis 15:6, see Morales, *Poor and Rich*, 156–64.

⁷⁰⁰ Hodges suggests that Rahab’s *physical life* was saved. See *James*, 71.

δικαίωω, the first meaning of which is *to declare just and righteous, vindicate*⁷⁰¹ (e.g., Jer 3:11; Ezek 16:51–52; *Ps. Sol.* 3:5; 9:2; T. Ab. 13:7–14).⁷⁰² This is also consistent with usage in the sayings of Jesus at Luke 7:35 and Matt 11:19; one is *vindicated, or found to be in the right*.⁷⁰³ In other words, the author of James uses δικαίωω to refer to a declaration made *after* a demonstration of deeds. However, Pauline literature sometimes uses δικαίωω to refer to Christian conversion, or the entry into a relationship with God (e.g. Rom 3:26, 30; 4:5; 8:30; Gal 3:8). This Pauline usage of δικαίωω is independent of deeds (*χωρὶς ἔργων*, Rom 4:6).⁷⁰⁴

Even if the declaration about Abraham and Rahab described in James 2:21–25 happens within their lives, it is not disconnected from eschatological salvation. The present life relates to the eschaton; Allison correctly states that justification in the present means salvation in the future.⁷⁰⁵ Besides, the author does not indicate that the hearers of the epistle will receive justification in this life; the aphoristic statement in 2:24 is inconclusive.

Ultimately, even if ἐδικαιώθη refers to a present event and not related to σῶσαι, the discourse devices reveal that the focal point of each appeal to an exemplar is *not the verb*, but ἐξ ἔργων. Thus, regardless of the referent of ἐδικαιώθη, the author uses these examples to support the notion that *eschatological salvation* (through faith, given 2:13–14) is ἐξ ἔργων. In other words, the point of continuity between the hearers and the two OT exemplars is ἐξ ἔργων. Just like Abraham and Rahab were *justified by their deeds* (2:21–25), one is saved by faith that *has deeds* (2:13–14).

In James 2:26, the author again gives the axiom that *faith without deeds is impotent to save*. This time, an analogy supports the point. With clauses introduced by ὡςπερ and οὕτως,

⁷⁰¹ Muraoka, “Δικαιώω.” For an argument that this LXX usage of δικαίωω is “idiosyncratic” because it is used positively, see Prothro, “Strange Case,” 56–58.

⁷⁰² T. Ab. 13:7–14 shares motifs with James, including testing, approval, and judgment. Allison suggests that δικαιοῦται in 13:13 “creates a word play” with the Δοκίμηλ, the angel’s name (13:10) and descriptions of righteousness (13:14; 14:2, 4, 8). See *Testament of Abraham*, 292.

⁷⁰³ Bauer, “Δικαιώω.”

⁷⁰⁴ In his lexicon entry, Bauer indicates, “Since Paul views God’s justifying action in close connection with the power of Christ’s resurrection, there is sometimes no clear distinction between the justifying action of acquittal and the gift of new life through the Holy Spirit as God’s activity in promoting uprightness in believers.” Likewise, Robert V. Rakestraw distinguishes between the “demonstrative-analytical sense” of δικαίωω in James and the “declarative-forensic-judicial usage” found in Paul. See Rakestraw, “James Contradict,” 40. For a recent discussion on the peculiarities of Paul’s use of δικαίωω in relation to James and other NT documents, see Prothro, “Strange Case,” 64–66.

⁷⁰⁵ So Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 484. Cf. Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 147.

the first clause acts as a framing comparison; the focus is on the second clause.⁷⁰⁶ Word order is used to highlight the important element in each clause: νεκρόν/νεκρά is in the preverbal P2 position, indicating saliency. As a body without a spirit is *dead*, so is faith without deeds. In other words, deeds bring *life* to faith, making the faith potent. This potency is not a matter of degree: “James is not merely arguing that a 'faith working with works' is more "righteous" before God... What is at stake is salvation and justification in an eschatological sense.”⁷⁰⁷

We must note the order of events in James 2. The author refers to an evaluation done *after the actions* of Abraham and Rahab. He is not concerned about conversion, or entrance into the faith community. The hearers of James are already *brothers* (2:14) and hold faith in Christ (2:1). Rather, a *divine evaluation* of the evidence of one’s faith is in view. This is consistent with the notion that trials serve as a *test* of their faith (1:2–3). In 2:14–26, the author writes about a “divine declaration of righteousness that is in accord with the facts.” Also, the text indicates that professed faith without good deeds is “grossly deficient ... without divine approval.”⁷⁰⁸ Botha correctly determines that the author of James exhorts acting in accordance with their faith to be “sure of attaining the crown of life.”⁷⁰⁹

James 2:14–26 reinforces the author’s concern for *eschatological approval* for his hearers. This section occurs immediately after the framing statements of 2:12–13, priming the hearer that they should act as those who will be *judged*. The author calls his hearers to have the sort of faith of Abraham and Rahab—accompanied by deeds. Deeds demonstrated Abraham and Rahab to be righteous, and deeds⁷¹⁰ will bring eschatological approval for the hearers of James.

In James 2:14–26, the author exhorts his hearers so that they will have *eschatological approval*. The entire section states and reinforces the message that faith must have *deeds* in order to *save*. Through the salient points, the author reiterates this point in different ways. The illustrations of (1) well-wishing but not acting and (2) the OT exemplars support the point. Without works, the faith *has no benefit* (2:14, 15), is *dead* (2:17, 26), and is *useless* (2:20). The author urges his hearers so that they would exhibit deeds that will lead to their vindication; this will *save them* (2:14).

⁷⁰⁶ See other examples of ὡςπερ...οὕτως constructions in Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 301.

⁷⁰⁷ Cargal, *Restoring*, 132. Cf. Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 289.

⁷⁰⁸ Allison, *James*, 483.

⁷⁰⁹ Botha, “Simple Salvation,” 405–6.

⁷¹⁰ For Mayor, ἔργα in 2:14 refers to ἔλεος in 2:13. See Mayor, *St. James*, 96.

7.3 James 3:1–12

In James 3:1–12, the author develops the idea previewed in 1:26 and 2:12, of *speaking as those who will be judged*. This section also occurs within the inclusio marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12, with the calls to *speak* in expectation of judgment.

The section begins with an explicit appeal to divine judgment. In James 3:1, the author exhorts that *not many should become teachers*. The predicate μή πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι occurs in the preverbal P2 position, being the newly-asserted information. The address ἀδελφοί μου, which is semantically redundant, slows down the information rate with a break in the discourse. This indicates that the focus of 3:1 is not on the imperative, but on the final clause. Had the author placed the vocative at the *beginning* of the clause (like in 2:1), the saliency would be on the first clause.⁷¹¹ But the placement of the discourse break in 3:1 points *forward* to the focal point, which occurs in the latter half of 3:1, the *reason* for the imperative.

The focal clause in James 3:1b, introduced by εἰδότες ὅτι, prominently supports the imperative: *we will receive a greater judgment*. The accusative μεῖζον κρίμα occurs in Dik's preverbal P2 position, receiving saliency. With the first-person plural, the author includes himself among the teachers. The noun κρίμα can refer either to the *action of judging* or the *decision rendered by a judge, usually punishment*.⁷¹² Laws correctly points out the unlikelihood that teachers receive a greater *punishment*, thus the author most likely conveys judgment with “particularly rigorous scrutiny” in the eschaton.⁷¹³ Indeed, the implicit agent of λημψόμεθα is God (cf. 1:7, 12; 4:3). The exhortation is grounded in the divine judgment they will face.

With the future tense λημψόμεθα, the author exhorts his hearers in 3:1 because of eschatological judgment. While κρίμα only occurs here in James, κρίνω (2:12; 5:9) and κριτής (4:12) occur elsewhere in James with the agent as God, referring to eschatological judgment.⁷¹⁴ Allison notes close parallels to Jas 3:1 that refer to eschatological judgment:

⁷¹¹ See the examples of placement in Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 117–22.

⁷¹² Bauer, “Κρίμα.”

⁷¹³ Laws, *Epistle of James*, 144. Cf. Varner, *James*, 212. Likewise, Mußner relates James 3:1 to two sayings of Jesus: the more severe punishment on the teachers of the law in Luke 20:47, and the accountability for every word a man speaks in Matt 12:36. See Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 159.

⁷¹⁴ So Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 489.

κρίμα λήμψονται in Rom 13:2, the warnings regarding speech in Matt 5:21–26; 12:36, and οὔτοι λήμψονται περισσότερον κρίμα in Mark 12:40 and Luke 20:47 (cf. Matt 23:14).⁷¹⁵

More compelling for the eschatological reading of the judgment in James 3:1 are discussions about speech elsewhere in the epistle. Speech is first introduced in the exhortation in 1:19: *slow to speak*. This command receives development in the transition statements in 1:26—piety without bridling the tongue is worthless before God (see 1:27), a reference to judgment. Also, the author exhorts regarding the use of speech; his teaching is grounded in eschatological judgment: the warning not to complain (5:9) and the prohibition of oaths (5:12). Ultimately, the *anaphora* (2:12–13) and *epiphora* (4:11–12) of the *inclusio*, with appeals to eschatological judgment and use of speech, point to this included passage also being grounded in eschatological judgment.

In James 3:2, the author expands his discussion of speech to include *everyone*, which suggests a concern for the eschatological judgment for *all* the epistle’s hearers. While some propose that 3:2 refers to teachers,⁷¹⁶ several factors point to 3:2 (and all of 3:1–12) referring to *all people*. First, the author’s address in 3:1 is *not limited to teachers*, but all his hearers (ἀδελφοί μου). There is no indication that this address has a more limited referent than its other instances in James.⁷¹⁷ In fact, the author urges that many *not* become teachers; thus a general application of ἀδελφοί μου makes more sense of the command, which receives support in 3:2–12.⁷¹⁸ Second, the emphatic nature of ἅπαντες in 3:2 points to a universal application. The term is emphatic in three ways. The term ἅπαντες is emphatic itself,⁷¹⁹ an intensive form of πᾶς.⁷²⁰ Its position at the end of the clause also indicates emphasis. Also, the word order of 3:2a deviates from the default verb-subject-object, placing the subject ἅπαντες a salient position.⁷²¹ Third, if the author were simply continuing an address to

⁷¹⁵ Allison, *James*, 522.

⁷¹⁶ Ropes, *St. James*, 226; Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 140. Cf. Martin, *James*, 109. Adamson justifies his view that “all” in 3:2 does not indicate universal human fallibility by stating that the logic of passage would then be “entirely tacit.” However, it is unclear how it would be tacit, and how that would be evidence against a universal view.

⁷¹⁷ Contra McKnight, who construes ἀδελφοί μου in 3:1 as referring to teachers. See *Letter of James*, 268.

⁷¹⁸ Frankemölle points out the function of 3:2a as a “hinge” of transition, from the command in 3:1 to the discussion of the tongue in 3:2b–12 in *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 490.

⁷¹⁹ Hart and Hart, *Analysis*, 93. Also Adam, *James*, 61.

⁷²⁰ Bauer, “Ἄπας.”

⁷²¹ Allison also points out that the intensive nature of ἅπαντες in 3:2 points to “all human beings.” See Allison, *James*, 523.

teachers alone, the verb *παιόμεν* would suffice, making *ἅπαντες* unnecessary. The adjective *ἅπαντες*, then, adds new information that emphatically signals a wide referent.⁷²² Fourth, the passage appears to move from a specific exhortation to general content that applies to everyone.⁷²³ Fifth, James 3:2 has an affinity with proverbs like Sir 19:16⁷²⁴ and Prov 10:19,⁷²⁵ maxims that are universally applied. Sixth, Johnson points out that the sentiment in James 3:2a is “Hellenistic commonplace,” applying universally.⁷²⁶ Seventh, in describing the man able to bridle his tongue in 3:2, the author uses *τέλειος*, which was introduced in 1:4 to apply to all the hearers, not just a subset of them.⁷²⁷

The purpose of the pessimistic content about the tongue’s power (and one’s inability to control it) is to deter the hearers from having to face higher scrutiny in the coming judgment. After all, the comparative adjective *μείζον* in 3:1 indicates the *greater* eschatological scrutiny teachers will face. Implicit in this comparison is the notion that *all* will receive judgment. God will judge all according to their words (1:26, 2:12). Thus, the author writes this section for *all* his hearers, so that they would be judged favourably.

While Davids is correct that James 3:2–12 describes the problems of speech, he and Laws incorrectly place the focus on the *teachers*.⁷²⁸ As discussed above, the discourse devices point to the focus in 3:1 being about avoiding the *greater judgment*. This focus makes sense of the pessimistic content about the tongue in 3:2–12. Since the tongue is capable of great evil and it is difficult to control, one should avoid taking on a role that would incur greater judgment based on one’s speech.

⁷²² Cf. McKnight, *Letter of James*, 272. McKnight still considers all of 3:1–18 to be about teachers.

⁷²³ Allison likens that James 3 to Matthew 10, the missionary discourse which addresses the Twelve at the beginning but moves to imperatives that apply to all Christians. He likely refers to the applicability of Matt 10:32–42 to all Christians. See *James*, 519.

⁷²⁴ Moo points out the similarity of with Sirach 19:16, which is universally applied: “A person may make a slip without intending it. Who has never sinned with his tongue?” See Moo, *Letter of James: Introduction and Commentary*, 151. Moo also appeals to the universality of the application of Proverbs 18:6–7.

⁷²⁵ Mußner sees 3:2a as a universally-applicable maxim like Old Testament proverbs, including Prov 10:19 See *Jakobusbrief*, 160.

⁷²⁶ Johnson cites Thucydides, *Peloponnesian War* III, 45.3 (“All are by nature prone to err both in public and in private life”); Seneca, *Clem.* 6.3 (peccavimus omnes); Epictetus, Discourses I, 11.7 (“even that vices are natural, because all, or most of us, are guilty of them”). See Johnson, *Letter of James*, 256.

⁷²⁷ So Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 483.

⁷²⁸ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 136. Laws states that the author is “seeking to limit the number of teachers.” See Laws, *Epistle of James*, 141.

In James 3:2, the author affirms the virtue of controlling the tongue, and points to a favourable judgment. In the first saying, πολλά occurs in the preverbal P2 position, indicating saliency on *many things* or *many ways*. This first saying leads to the second saying, a first-class condition which discusses a man who *does not* stumble in word and can bridle his whole body. The pleonastic⁷²⁹ ἄνθρωπος slows the information rate and points forward to the description. This description of the man, which includes τέλειος and δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, is the focal point of this saying in 3:2b. As discussed concerning 1:4, τέλειος does not refer to sinlessness, but *completeness*. With this description of the τέλειος ἄνθρωπος, the author picks up his exhortation towards *wholehearted adherence* to God. Just like τέλειος in 1:2–4 conveys a favourable future state, striving for τέλειος in 3:2 will result in a favourable judgment (See 3:1). Furthermore, the verb χαλιναγωγέω in the context of the tongue echoes its usage in 1:26–27, which contains God as the one defining the standard for piety. Thus, 3:2 points to the *eschatological approval* in store for one who bridles the tongue.

The rest of James 3:1–12 gives further support for *bridling the tongue*. The author next discusses the power of the tongue despite its small size. Using χαλιναγωγῆσαι in 3:2 as a point of departure, the fronted genitive τῶν ἵππων indicates a shift from people to the imagery of horses.⁷³⁰ Through the illustrations of a horse’s bit and a ship’s rudder in 3:3–4, the author conveys that the small tongue has great power and should be controlled. Indeed, 3:5a affirms both the small size of the tongue and its power to *boast great things*.

James 3:5b–8 continues addressing the tongue’s power but focuses is on its *destructiveness*. In 3:5b, the author illustrates with a small fire destroying a great forest. After that, he clarifies the illustration in 3:6a with the newly-asserted ἡ γλῶσσα as a (figurative) fire. Jas 3:6b continues the imagery of fire, fronting the newly-asserted ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας. The three participial phrases at the end of 3:6b are set in apposition to the *world of unrighteousness*, developing the description of the tongue.

The three participial clauses in 3:6b receive saliency through their placement at the end of the clause. These participles are a *right-dislocation*, a delayed appositional reference to an already-established subject. The author indicates the focus on the descriptors: the tongue *stains the whole body, sets on fire the wheel of birth, and is itself set on fire by Gehenna*. The first two reinforce the tongue’s great destructive power. The participle σπιλοῦσα recalls ἄσπιλον (*unstained*) in as a criterion of acceptable piety before God (1:27).

⁷²⁹ As in 1:12. See Davids, *Epistle of James*, 137.

⁷³⁰ Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 63.

The *wheel of birth* (τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως), which may have roots in Orphic philosophy,⁷³¹ probably refers to the “whole course of life.”⁷³² The tongue lights *everything* on fire, much like a small fire kindles an entire forest (3:5).

The third phrase, φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης, is worth detailed examination. It not only stands out by being the end of the saying, but it also follows two active participles with a *passive* one. *Gehenna* refers to the place of God’s punishment for the wicked, often associated with *fire*.⁷³³ Some view *kindled by Gehenna* as a reference to Satan’s influence, since *Gehenna* refers to the realm of Satan and the demons.⁷³⁴ However, Bauckham champions a more compelling view: this phrase refers to *eschatological punishment*. He points out that *Gehenna* in first-century Jewish Christian thought was the place for punishment, and the *fire of Gehenna* was an image of God’s *judgment*. This would render the final two clauses of Jas 3:6 as an eschatological *ius talionis*, with the active φλογίζουσα receiving a just punishment in the passive φλογιζομένη.⁷³⁵ Agreeing with Bauckham, Allison adds that the concept of God punishing a *wicked tongue* was widespread (e.g. *Ps. Sol.* 12:1–4; *Apoc. Pet.* 7:2; *Acts Thom.* 56).⁷³⁶ Furthermore, φλογιζομένη referring to the *result* of the tongue’s evil deeds rather than their source makes sense of the ordering of the phrases in Jas 3:6, rendering them to be a *progression*. As with the lifecycle of sin in 1:15, the emphasis of 3:6 is on the outcome: *eschatological punishment*.

James 3:7–8 continues discussing the destructive power of the tongue, including *controlling it* (see 1:26; 3:1–4). Using mankind’s taming of the animal kingdom as a point of departure, the author states that *no one* can tame the tongue. In 3:8, with the new topic signalled by the already-established τὴν γλῶσσαν before the verb, the greatest saliency is on the newly-asserted and preverbal οὐδεὶς.⁷³⁷ The author adds emphatic detail to the object τὴν γλῶσσαν through the right-dislocation ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστή ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου. The adjective ἀκατάστατος, occurring only in the NT in James, also describes the double-souled

⁷³¹ See the discussion in Ropes, *St. James*, 236–39; Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 160–64.

⁷³² So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 143; Allison, *James*, 539.

⁷³³ Jeremias, “Γέεννα”; Bauer, “Γέεννα.”

⁷³⁴ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 143; Martin, *James*, 116; Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 507.

⁷³⁵ Bauckham, *Fate*, 119–31. He compares James 3:6b to sayings containing a “verbal correspondence between the crime and punishment” (e.g., 1 Cor 3:17; Rev 11:18; Jude 6; Sir 28:1; Jas 2:13a) and where a sinning body part is punished.

⁷³⁶ Allison, *James*, 541–42.

⁷³⁷ Thus, οὐδεὶς is in the P2 position. See Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 50.

man condemned in 1:8. Allison proposes that *poison of death* is a reference to Genesis 3, with the serpent bringing *eschatological death*.⁷³⁸ In any case, the reference to death, especially considering the fire of Gehenna in 3:6 and the eschatological nature of θάνατος in 1:15 and 5:20, probably points to *eschatological death*.

In James 3:9–12, the author shifts to practical matters grounded in eschatological expectation. He condemns not only the wicked use of the tongue but also its *duplicious* use. Using parallel statements in 3:9, the author declares that the tongue is used both to *bless the Lord and father* and *curse men made in God’s image*. In the final clause, the phrase τοὺς καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ is fronted before the participle to highlight the irony and inconsistency between blessing God and cursing those made in God’s image. In 3:10, the author places ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος in the preverbal P2 position, heightening the focus on *the same mouth* being the source of blessing and cursing.

The author condemns duplicious use of speech in James 3:10. The redundant vocative ἀδελφοί μου slows the information rate, placing extra attention on the resolution of the statement, which highlights the previous content through οὕτως. In 3:11–12, the author supports the statement in 3:10b by asking two questions expecting a negative answer. He fronts ἡ πηγή (P1) and ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ὀπῆς (P2) before the verb in 3:11, reinforcing his emphasis on *the same source* producing two opposing outcomes. Consistent with the “be like this and not that” paradigm in James, the author tacitly urges the hearers to choose the better way. Similarly, 3:12a places saliency on a single source; the forward-pointing ἀδελφοί μου highlights the *fig tree*. The additional illustration introduced by οὔτε highlights a salty spring, which cannot also produce sweet water. The vice of duplicity in 3:9–12 fits well with ἀκατάστατος, the condemned description for the evil tongue in 3:8.⁷³⁹

In summary, the apparent pessimism regarding one’s ability to harness the tongue supports the author’s exhortation in 3:1. Since control of the tongue is so difficult, he urges his hearers *not to become teachers*. The author’s concern is that the hearers have a favourable judgment, which leads to the opening exhortation in this section. The author warns about the tongue’s destructive power, but also the eschatological fate of the evil tongue (3:6). The exhortation to choose *single, beneficial* use of the tongue receives further support in 3:9–12. The author condemns the double usage of the tongue, using imagery from nature. The author

⁷³⁸ Allison, *James*, 547–48.

⁷³⁹ So Allison, 546.

writes all of this, as 3:1–2 and 3:6 indicate, so that his hearers would not face the heightened scrutiny reserved for teachers, and thus be *judged favourably in the end*.

7.4 James 3:13–18

James 3:13–18, as discussed in Section 5.5, likely serves as a unit of transition. with numerous connections to previous concepts of James. Also, this unit describes behaviour that characterises wisdom from God (1:5). As a unit of transition, it does not contain newly asserted information; its function is (1) to review the main concepts of the epistle, and (2) to preview key concepts that will follow it. However, even in this transitional unit, we observe elements of *eschatological approval*.

The call to right behaviour in view of *judgment* appears again in James 3:13–18. Like he does in 2:18b, the author challenges the hearers in 3:13 *to demonstrate wisdom through good deeds*. Thus, the concept of *evaluation* occurs in the call for wisdom from above to be shown. This challenge recalls content in 1:21–25 and 2:14–26 that one should be a *doer*, and that *deeds* should accompany faith. Both previous texts include the context of *judgment* and a *favourable future state* for the *doer*. Also, 3:13–18 occurs within the *inclusio* marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12, which frames the intervening content with appeals to *judgment* and *doing* (ποιεῖτε—2:12, ποιητής—4:11).

In the context of the *evaluation* conveyed in James 3:13, the sayings in 3:14–16 discuss the earthly ‘wisdom’ shown through condemned behaviour. The condemnation of certain behaviour 3:14–16 continues the notion of evaluation. In the pattern of “be like this and not like that,” this earthly ‘wisdom’ is the antithesis of wisdom shown through good deeds. In 3:14, the author urges his hearers *not to act* if they have bitter jealousy and *selfish ambition*. The protasis of features ζῆλον πικρόν in Dik’s preverbal P2 position, receiving saliency along with καὶ ἐριθείαν. The apodosis is a warning to refrain from *boasting* and *lying*,⁷⁴⁰ which recalls the content of *slow to speak* in 1:19 and *bridling the tongue* in 1:26 and 3:2. The logic that *boasting and lying* are manifestations of *bitter jealousy* and *selfish ambition* is consistent with the concept that the *unseen* produces what is seen, found in 2:4 (*evil thoughts* produce *favouritism*) and 2:14–26 (*saving faith* produces good deeds). If one has such vices, it is not the *wisdom* referred to in 3:13 (see 3:15), and the resulting deeds are

⁷⁴⁰ Allison adds that the redundant κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας adds emphasis to ψεύδεσθε. See 574.

condemned.⁷⁴¹ The newly-asserted ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν in 3:15 will be the focus of 3:17–18,⁷⁴² but the near-demonstrative αὕτη signals that the current focus is on its antithesis. The contrastive ἀλλά anticipates the focused declaration that this ‘wisdom’ is *earthly, physical, and demonic*.⁷⁴³ The final descriptor, δαιμονιώδης, affirms that this ‘wisdom’ is opposed to God.⁷⁴⁴ Then, the author describes the manifestation of such ‘wisdom’: *jealousy and selfish ambition* bring the newly-asserted ἀκαταστασία and πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα. The redundant ἐκεῖ attracts further attention to these manifestations.⁷⁴⁵ The noun ἀκαταστασία is especially notable considering the condemnation of the ἀκατάστατος *man* and *tongue* in 1:8 and 3:8. The author urges one to eschew this sort of ‘wisdom.’

By first stating what wisdom from above is *not*, the author attracts attention to what this wisdom *is*. After all, the author could have expressed the affirmative statement first, but delayed it until later. James 3:17 describes behaviour that is affirmed considering the *judgment* inherent in 3:13. After the antithesis in James 3:15–16, the preverbal phrase ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία in 3:17 indicates a topic shift. The fronting of ἄνωθεν within the phrase emphasises the difference: this is wisdom *from above*. The newly-asserted πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή occurs in Dik’s salient P2 position. Both πρῶτον and μὲν signal that more descriptors will come after the verb; the adverb ἔπειτα⁷⁴⁶ indicates resumption without contrast. Thus, the newly-asserted descriptors ἀγνή, εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, and ἀνυπόκριτος receive saliency. However, with πρῶτον μὲν, the adjective ἀγνή is singled out from the others. Lockett compellingly proposes that ἀγνή conveys “free from moral pollution,” entailing “total sincerity or devotion.” He points to its LXX use, which describes God’s words (Ps 11:7) and the ways of the righteous (Prov 15:26; 21:18). In the NT, ἀγνός can refer to moral purity (2 Cor 7:11; 11:2; Titus 2:5; 1 John 3:3; Phil 4:8; 1 Tim 5:22; 1 Pet 3:2).⁷⁴⁷ Also, this term is used for cultic purity⁷⁴⁸ (e.g., Lev 23:40;

⁷⁴¹ Johnson sees ζῆλον as a synonym of φθόνος, with which σοφία does not associate in Wis 6:23. See *Letter of James*, 271.

⁷⁴² For a discussion on the temporary focus on ἄνωθεν, see Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 56–57.

⁷⁴³ The adjectives are feminine, suggesting that σοφία is unexpressed.

⁷⁴⁴ The adjective δαιμονιώδης can refer to the source (from demons) or the manner (like demons). For different views, see Louw and Nida, “Δαιμονιώδης”; McCartney, *James*, 204; Stokes, “Devil and Demons,” 157.

⁷⁴⁵ So Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 304.

⁷⁴⁶ Bauer, “Ἐπειτα.”

⁷⁴⁷ Lockett, *Purity*, 128.

⁷⁴⁸ Hoppe, *Hintergrund*, 52.

2 Macc 13:7), recalling the terms used for moral uprightness in 1:27. Lockett’s view harmonises with Ropes’ understanding that the adjectives after ἔπειτα proceed from ἀγνή.⁷⁴⁹ This is consistent with the author’s paradigm that the *unseen* is the source of the *seen*.⁷⁵⁰ The latter adjectives, then, are *manifestations of one’s purity of commitment to God*. These characterise the “good conduct” that shows wisdom indicated in 3:13.

While James 3:18 contains exegetical difficulties, we will present a case that this saying describes *good deeds*. These deeds are the sort that lead to *eschatological approval*.

The phrase καρπός δικαιοσύνης in James 3:18, the “least clear in the sentence,”⁷⁵¹ has an ambiguous referent. The phrase could be a genitive of *source* (i.e., *fruit deriving from righteousness*),⁷⁵² indicating that God (with σπείρεται being a divine passive) sows a reward for those who do righteous acts. However, it could also be an *epexegetical* genitive, indicating *fruit which is righteousness*.⁷⁵³ This interpretation would likely render the unexpressed sower to be those performing the righteous deeds themselves.

The discourse features and context of the saying favour the unexpressed sower being *people*. The conjunction δέ indicates a connection with the previous material. As such, the terms καρπός and εἰρήνη are not newly-asserted, since they occurred in 3:17. Since 3:17 describes people’s deeds that show (see δειξάτω in 3:13) wisdom from above, the most straightforward interpretation of 3:18 also renders the sowers as the same *people*.⁷⁵⁴ There is no indication that someone else’s action is involved. Also, the preverbal placement of ἐν εἰρήνῃ indicates saliency; the author emphasises the *manner* or *instrument*⁷⁵⁵ of the sowing.⁷⁵⁶ The heightened attention to the process suggests that the saying is an *exhortation* to perform this action. Furthermore, the sower being *people* is consistent with godly wisdom being εἰρηνική: the *peaceable* will sow in *peace*.

⁷⁴⁹ Ropes, *St. James*, 249.

⁷⁵⁰ In accordance, Mayor indicates “First the inner characteristic, purity, then the outer, peaceableness, cf. the blessing in Matt. v. 8, 9. It is the pure who attain to the vision of God which constitutes (sic) the highest wisdom.” See Mayor, *St. James*, 130.

⁷⁵¹ Fittingly, McKnight suggests that the whole saying is best interpreted with this phrase as the starting point. McKnight, *Letter of James*, 316.

⁷⁵² Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 109–10.

⁷⁵³ Wallace, 95.

⁷⁵⁴ While *sowing in peace by peacemakers* appears tautologous, another seemingly tautologous statement occurs in 3:13—*showing wisdom in the meekness of wisdom*.

⁷⁵⁵ Adam, *James*, 75.

⁷⁵⁶ So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 155.

Given that its usage in 3:17 most likely refers to (good) *deeds*, καρπός in 3:18 likely refers to *deeds* as well. Its association with *mercy* as well as the adjectives after ἔπειτα conveys the *manifestations of wisdom from above*. *Deeds* are described as καρπός in the LXX, especially in Proverbs (12:14; 18:20; 19:22; 31:16; cf. Mic 7:13; *Apoc. Sedr.* 12:6; *Let. Aris.* 1:232, 260). The frequent use of καρπός referring to *deeds* in Proverbs fits well with our established priority of parallels found in wisdom literature (see Section 2.2.2). Also, the καρπός is used to refer to *actions* in the sayings of Jesus (Matt 3:8, 10; 7:16–20; 12:33; Luke 3:8–9; 6:43–44).

Since δικαιοσύνης is newly asserted and fronted before the verb, it receives greater attention, pointing to a new way of describing καρπός. If (1) the unexpressed sowers are *people* and (2) καρπός in James 3:18 indeed refers to *deeds* as it does in 3:17,⁷⁵⁷ then the genitive δικαιοσύνης is most likely in *apposition*. The term δικαιοσύνη referring to *righteous acts* is attested in the LXX,⁷⁵⁸ intertestamental literature, and the sayings of Jesus (e.g., Gen 18:19; Tob 1:3; Ps 14:2; Isa 56:1; cf. *Sib. Or.* 3:234; *Apoc. Ezra* 3:6; *T. Levi* 13:5; *T. Ash.* 6:4; Matt 3:15; 6:1; Luke 1:74–75). This use of δικαιοσύνη would also be consistent with the instance in 1:20 (righteous acts) and the related noun ὀδκία used to describe the evil use of the tongue in 3:6.

While some instances of καρπός δικαιοσύνης could be genitives of *source* (cf. Heb 12:11; Phil 1:11),⁷⁵⁹ the context and syntax of James 3:18 favour a genitive of *apposition*. The party described as *peacemakers* (τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην) sows the *fruit that is righteousness*. Those who hold this view cite the LXX instances of καρπός δικαιοσύνης that appear to carry this sense (e.g., Prov 11:30; Amos 6:12; Isa 32:17).⁷⁶⁰ The view that καρπός δικαιοσύνης refers to the *fruit that is righteousness* is consistent with the concept that righteousness needs to be demonstrated (Jas 2:20–23). In other words, a godly life is demonstrated by good deeds just like the goodness of a tree is demonstrated by good fruit.⁷⁶¹ These deeds are *righteousness*, according to the author of James.

⁷⁵⁷ So Johnson, *Letter of James*, 274; Varner, *James*, 264.

⁷⁵⁸ Muraoka, “Δικαιοσύνη.”

⁷⁵⁹ As pointed out by Laws, *Epistle of James*, 165–66; Ropes, *St. James*, 250–51. Ropes considers καρπός δικαιοσύνης a *reward* for one’s righteous acts.

⁷⁶⁰ See Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 156; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 155; Allison, *James*, 585; Vlachos, *James*, 126.

⁷⁶¹ For a similar view, see Johnson, *Letter of James*, 275; Varner, *James*, 266.

While eschatological rewards are not explicit in James 3:13–18,⁷⁶² eschatological judgment is likely in the background of this passage. First, the concept of *evaluation* occurs in the call for wisdom from above to be *shown* (3:13–17). Second, the *fruit* in 3:18 carries implications of divine judgment, for righteous deeds are pleasing to God. Indeed, NT instances of καρπός frequently point to behaviour deemed as good or evil (e.g., John 15:16; Gal 5:22; Eph 5:9). In the sayings of Jesus, *fruit* often has eschatological consequences: bad fruit indicates a bad tree, which will be destroyed (Matt 3:8–10; 7:16–20; 12:33–37; Luke 3:8–9; 6:43–44).⁷⁶³ Third, Hoppe correctly points out the eschatological character of the other commands in James (e.g., 1:12, 1:25; 2:13; 4:12; 4:17; 5:7–20).⁷⁶⁴ One would expect that a departure from this pattern would necessitate some expressed qualifications, but none appear in the text. These factors, while not conclusive, point to eschatological judgment and reward in 3:13–18.

As a transitional section, James 3:13–18 reminds its hearers of the previous material in the epistle and previews the concepts following it. As such, unlike the previous material that it reviews, this section does not introduce new information grounded in an appeal to eschatological approval. However, even then, we observe hints of *eschatological approval*. The author challenges those claiming to be wise to demonstrate it through conduct (3:13). Conduct like boasting, lying, instability, and wicked things are not evidence of wisdom from above, but of earthly, natural, and demonic ‘wisdom’ (3:14–16). The author then affirms that wisdom from above is shown by *fruit* like peacemaking, impartiality, and sincerity (3:17). He then designates this *fruit* as *righteousness*—behaviour that will lead to *approval* in divine judgment (3:18). These elements, as we will see, prepare the hearers for 4:1–10.

7.5 James 4:1–10

The affirmation of *wisdom from above* and condemnation of *demonic, earthly* ‘wisdom’ in the transitional unit of 3:13–18 becomes more direct in 4:1–10. The author urges his hearers to repent to receive eschatological favour from God.

⁷⁶² Allison points out that some read eschatological blessing in 3:18, influenced by Matt 5:9 and Gal 6:8. See Allison, *James*, 585. However, our treatment above regarding the unexpressed sower excludes this possibility.

⁷⁶³ Bauckham points to eschatological reward in Jas 3:18 and 1:12. See *Wisdom of James*, 104.

⁷⁶⁴ Hoppe, *Hintergrund*, 68.

In James 4:1–3, the author highlights the *fight*s and *quarrels* among his hearers. The twice-occurring πόθεν and the cataphoric ἐντεῦθεν highlight the *source* of their conflicts. The source, which receives saliency at the end of 4:1, is their *pleasures*.⁷⁶⁵ These pleasures *wage war* within them. The forward-pointing devices place the focus on their desires—the hearers cannot blame anything else, in a sentiment akin to 1:14. After that, the author explains in 4:2–3 that their fighting comes from unmet desires. Whichever way one might punctuate these sayings,⁷⁶⁶ the author connects *outward* behaviour with the *inner state*, remaining consistent with his convention in the epistle.⁷⁶⁷ James 4:3 offers the ultimate reason for their discord: their unmet desires are *selfish*. The newly-asserted modifiers κακῶς and ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν are preverbal in their respective clauses, indicating the author’s focus. The author emphasises their *wrong* manner of asking: their motives *are their pleasures*.

In James 4:4, the author warns: *these actions amount to hostility towards God*. The address μοιχαλίδες (*adulteresses*) departs from the author’s customary familial terms. This newly-asserted address shockingly likens the hearers to women unfaithful to their husbands, recalling the prophets’ imagery of the people unfaithful to God (e.g., Hosea 1–3; Jer 3; 13:27; Isa 1:21; 50:1; 54:1–6; Ezek 16:38; 23:45).⁷⁶⁸ The sayings in Jas 4:4 are parallel:

ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου	ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ	ἐστιν;
...φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου,	ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ	καθίσταται.

These sayings reinforce the message that friendship with the world is *hostility towards God*. The hearers do not display the single-minded allegiance which the author requires.⁷⁶⁹ The question in 4:4a expects a positive answer; they should know this concept. The saying in 4:4b is thus redundant, reinforcing the point. They have betrayed God, thus receiving the designation μοιχαλίδες. In both sayings, the newly-asserted ἔχθρα/ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is fronted in the P2 position; *the focus is on their relationship with God*.⁷⁷⁰

After the scathing condemnation in 4:4, the statements in 4:5–6 serve as a *hinge* to the exhortations in 4:7–12. While 4:5–6a is exegetically difficult because of the unknown source

⁷⁶⁵ Bauer, “Ἡδονή.”

⁷⁶⁶ For differing viewpoints, see Davids, *Epistle of James*, 157–58; Blomberg and Kamell, *James*, 188.

⁷⁶⁷ So Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 576.

⁷⁶⁸ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 160. Davids adds that the Ezekiel and Jeremiah material combines *adultery* with *murder*.

⁷⁶⁹ Davids, “Good God,” 118–19.

⁷⁷⁰ So Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 59.

of the statement in 4:5b,⁷⁷¹ the sayings point to God’s *grace* for the humble in 4:6. James 4:5b–6 exhibits parallelism:

Quotation of Unknown Source	Quotation of Proverbs 3:34
4:5b: πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατώκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν	4:6c: ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται
4:6a: μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν;	4:6d: ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.

The verb ἀντιτάσσεται in 4:6c recalls the *enmity* (ἔχθρα/ἐχθρὸς) in 4:4. The hearers’ problem is reinforced: God *opposes* them. However, the focus of 4:5b–6a and 4:6c–d is on *the final clause* of each. In each saying, the contrast between the final clause and the first clause is accentuated by the conjunction δέ. The quotation of Prov 3:34 relates to the final part of the first saying (4:6a).⁷⁷² In the final part of the quotation, ταπεινοῖς receives focus in the preverbal P2 position. Through this *hinge* of 4:5–6, the author begins to describe the solution to their enmity with God: repent from arrogance and be *humble* (4:7). This virtue is affirmed in the prologue in 1:9 (ταπεινός), with a similar future reversal.

James 4:7–10 contains ten imperatives for the hearers to remedy their enmity with God. The conjunction οὖν (4:7) signals inference from previous assertions.⁷⁷³ The imperative ὑποτάγητε derives from 4:6; since God offers grace to the humble (4:6), the hearers should *submit to God*. Each of the second and third imperatives (4:7b–8a) has a corresponding result: *resist the devil, and he will flee from you. Draw near to God, and he will draw near to you*. The former saying (4:7b), marked by δέ, develops the first as a complementary action: *resist the devil*. The latter saying recalls the cultic expressions of *nearness to God* (e.g., Exod 19:22; Lev 9:7; 21:21; Num 17:5; 2 Chr 29:15; Ezek 40:46). In Zech 1:3 and Mal 3:7,⁷⁷⁴ the Lord offers the opportunity: *return to me, and I will return to you*. Likewise, in James 4, the

⁷⁷¹ Allison writes that “the quoted words are...not close to anything in the Jewish Bible” (*James*, 615). The issues with 4:5 are myriad. First, it is unclear whether τὸ πνεῦμα refers to a *human spirit* or the *Holy Spirit*. Second, τὸ πνεῦμα is ambiguous, being nominative or accusative. Third, the connotation of πρὸς φθόνον is also difficult to determine. For proposals on these issues, see Laws, “Scripture”; Prockter, “James 4.4–6”; Carpenter, “James 4.5”; Bauckham, “Spirit of God.”

⁷⁷² Allison correctly highlights the links between the context of Proverbs 3:34 and James 4:6: jealousy (Jas 4:2, 5; Prov 3:31), quarrelling (Jas 4:1; Prov 3:30), and wisdom (Jas 3:13–18; Prov 3:35).” Allison, *James*, 624.

⁷⁷³ Adam, *James*, 81.

⁷⁷⁴ Also see Tobit 13:6.

promise of having God *near* in the context of *repentance* indicates a favourable relationship: despite their adultery, God will forgive the repentant.⁷⁷⁵

The next several imperatives continue calling for repentance with *cultic* and *ethical terms*. The commands in James 4:8b, each having a new vocative address for the epistle's hearers, use the cultic imagery of *cleansing hands* and *purifying hearts*. This imagery echoes the association of cleanliness with moral uprightness (Isa 1:16; Jer 4:14; Job 22:30; Ps 26:6).⁷⁷⁶ In the same manner as *μοιχαλίδες* (4:4), the vocative addresses *ἁματωλοί* and *δίψυχοι* (cf. 1:8) recharacterize the hearers, emphatically updating⁷⁷⁷ how they view themselves: they are *sinner*s and *double-souled*, in need of repentance.

James 4:9 continues describing *repentance*, this time with the context of divine judgment. The command *ταλαιπωρήσατε* recalls prophetic content of *misery* because of sin (e.g., Joel 1:10; Mic 2:4; Jer 4:13; Hos 10:2). Likewise, *κλαύσατε* in response to sins is also consistent with traditional imagery (e.g., 2 Sam 13:36–37; Ezra 10:6; *Sib. Or.* 8:62; *T. Reu.* 1:10; *T. Jos.* 3:9; *Ascen. Isa.* 2:10). Mourning occurs over revealed sin (e.g., Neh 8:9; Ezra 10:6; 2 Sam 13:36–37). Submitting to God includes repenting and returning to him, as seen in Joel 2:12. Moo points out that the author of James, like Joel, sees imminent judgment (Jas 5:8) and calls for repentance.⁷⁷⁸ In view of divine judgment, the hearers must turn their *laughter into mourning* and *joy to gloom* (Jas 4:9). The phrase *εἰς πένθος*, fronted before the verb for saliency in 4:9, occurs in the LXX when changed circumstances lead to *laughter* being inappropriate (e.g., 2 Sam 19:3; Tobit 2:6; 1 Macc 1:39–40; Prov 14:13; Bar 4:34; Lam 5:15).⁷⁷⁹ In wisdom literature, *laughter* (*γέλως*) describes the fool (Prov 10:23; Eccl 7:3, 6; Wis 5:4; Sir 27:13), one who eschews wisdom. The Gospels recall the same tradition: those who *laugh* now will *mourn* and *weep* later (Luke 6:25; John 16:20). The hearers of James have illegitimate joy: “hypocrisy allows no room for levity.”⁷⁸⁰

James 4:10 is focused in two ways. First, focus occurs in the default position for emphasis at the end of the section. Second, with *ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν* (4:6) as a departure point for 4:7–10, the author uses the verb *ταπεινώθητε* in 4:10 to conclude the

⁷⁷⁵ Davids, “Good God,” 119.

⁷⁷⁶ So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 167.

⁷⁷⁷ See Runge on “Changed Reference” in *Discourse Grammar*, 354–63.

⁷⁷⁸ Moo, *Letter of James*, 195.

⁷⁷⁹ So also Allison, *James*, 631.

⁷⁸⁰ Morgan, *Theology of James*, 106.

series. The genitive κυρίου is anarthrous,⁷⁸¹ possibly indicating a departure from the convention for emphasis. The author concludes by urging his hearers *to be subjected to the Lord*, which will bring the grace described in 4:6.

However, the end of James 4:10 indicates a *specific* grace. The newly-asserted information at the end of 4:10 receives the most attention: a *future exaltation* (ὕψώσει ὑμᾶς). Outside of James 4:10, the only NT instances of ὑψώω in the future tense occur in the Synoptic Gospels,⁷⁸² where the exaltation is eschatological. While the notion of God’s raising of the lowly is familiar (e.g., 1 Sam 2:7; Job 5:11; Jdt 9:11; Ps 137:6; *Let. Aris.* 263), the sayings of Jesus communicate an *eschatological* reversal, epitomised by *whoever humbles himself will be exalted* (Matt 23:12 also Luke 14:11; 18:14). In these instances, *judgment* is in view, as Jesus condemns or affirms certain behaviour. *The final result* is also in view; the ones displaying affirmed behaviour will be exalted. This reversal also recurs in James (1:9–11; 2:5; 5:1–6).⁷⁸³ Also, the contention that the eschatological reading of 4:10 is bolstered by the Beatitudes; the favourable state for the *lowly* is eschatological (Matt 5:5, 10–12; Luke 6:22–23). Likewise, with judgment and reversal in view in James 4:1–12, the author describes a raising in the next age.

In James 4:1–10, the author indicts his hearers, but prescribes a solution to their enmity with God: *they can receive a favourable judgment*. With jarring ways of addressing them, he communicates the direness of the situation—they are enemies of God (4:1–4). Appealing to two quotations (4:5–6), the author offers a solution. Since God gives grace to the humble (4:6), the author presents a string of imperatives (4:7–10) to *repent*. The ending of 4:10 specifies the result of their repentance: *they will receive eschatological exaltation*.

7.6 James 4:11–12

As discussed above, James 4:11–12 *summarises* previous content, *previews* remaining material, and marks the closing of the *inclusio* starting at 2:12–13. With a key role in the epistle, it reinforces the theme of *eschatological approval*.

⁷⁸¹ As attested in uncials. While P¹⁰⁰ contains the article, the anarthrous reading is more difficult.

⁷⁸² For a discussion on the Jesus tradition in Jas 4:10, see Morgan, *Theology of James*, 106; McKnight, *Letter of James*, 357; Deppe, “Jesus in James,” 117.

⁷⁸³ Cf. Allison, who calls James 1:9–11 an “eschatological forecast” and 5:1–6 to be “eschatological interpretation of the present.” Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 199–200.

James 4:11a re-visits the use of speech. The command μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων refers not just to speaking against one another,⁷⁸⁴ but to *slandering* or *defaming*.⁷⁸⁵ Other instances of the verb and its cognates confirm this usage (e.g., Num 12:8; Ps 49:20; 100:5; Mic 3:7; Mal 3:16; 1 Pet 2:1; cf. *1 Clem.* 30:1–3). Jas 4:11 recalls Lev 19:16,⁷⁸⁶ strengthening the connections between 4:11–12 and 2:12–13, the latter of which quotes Lev 19:18. The vocative ἀδελφοί is not new, but the return to this address after μοιχαλίδες, ἁμαρτωλοί, and δίψυχοι attracts attention to this command. The preverbal left-dislocation⁷⁸⁷ of ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ κρίνων brings attention to the newly-asserted κρίνων: *slandering* is placed alongside *judging*. In the last clause of 4:11a, the repetition of the newly-asserted νόμος as the object of both verbs offers saliency: by slandering and judging others, the hearers do thus to the *law*.⁷⁸⁸

In James 4:11b, the author develops the condemnation of 4:11a, signalled by δέ. In a first-class conditional statement, the author explains that *one who judges the law is not a doer but a judge*. The object νόμον is in the preverbal P1 position, receiving prominence before the newly-asserted content in the last clause. Placing the counterpoint (οὐκ εἶ ποιητὴς νόμου, cf. 1:22, 25) before the point (ἀλλὰ κριτῆς), the author uses the former to draw attention to the latter.⁷⁸⁹ The point is that one who slanders a brother *becomes a judge*. This recalls the indictment of those who show favouritism: they become *judges with evil thoughts* (2:4).

James 4:12a affirms that *God* is the only judge. The preverbal position gives saliency to εἶς. This affirmation of God as *one* recalls a familiar confession, also found in Jas 2:9. The newly-asserted νομοθέτης (*lawgiver*)⁷⁹⁰ highlights God as the originator of the law, associated with him as the sole judge. The hearers becoming judges, then, amounts to usurping “God’s throne.”⁷⁹¹

⁷⁸⁴ See Moo, *Letter of James*, 198. Rendering it according to κατα + λαλέω would make one guilty of the “root fallacy.” See Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies*, 28–33.

⁷⁸⁵ Bauer, “Καταλαλέω.”

⁷⁸⁶ This allusion is strengthened by the use of πλησίον in 4:12. See Johnson, “Leviticus 19 in James,” 395.

⁷⁸⁷ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 288–90.

⁷⁸⁸ Frankemölle points out the principle that interpersonal misconduct is misconduct against God. See *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 577.

⁷⁸⁹ See Runge’s /counterpoint/point examples using ἀλλά in *Discourse Grammar*, 93–100.

⁷⁹⁰ Bauer, “Νομοθέτης.”

⁷⁹¹ Kovalishyn, “Salvation in James,” 139. So also Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 623.

The phrase ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι specifies God’s role—*he also has the power to save and destroy*. This right-dislocation gives extra attention to the widely-known attribute of God, indicating the author’s desire for the hearers to consider God *in this specific way*;⁷⁹² he alone saves and destroys. This designation highlights the gravity of usurping God’s role: they violate the one who determines their fate.⁷⁹³

The *salvation* in James 4:12 is most likely *eschatological*. First, as discussed above, the term σῶζω refers to *eternal salvation* when associated with God’s judgment (e.g., Isa 45:17–22; Ezek 34:22; Ps. Sol. 16:5; T. Jud. 24:6; T. Ab. 11:10–12). Allison points out that God is the subject of both σῶζω and ἀπόλλυμι in the LXX.⁷⁹⁴ Jas 4:12 recalls LXX Ps 74:8, where God exercises judgment, lowering one and raising another. It also recalls Deut 32:39, where God is the only one to kill and make alive. God is also the one to put someone to death and carry someone down to Hades (1 Sam 2:6; cf. 2 Kgs 5:7).

Secondly, the usage of σῶζω and ἀπόλλυμι is associated with eschatological judgment and salvation in the sayings of Jesus (Luke 8:12; Matt 5:29–30), which teach an end-time reversal: one who *loses* (ἀπολέσει) his life will *save* (σώσει) it (Mark 8:35; Luke 17:33; Matt 10:39). Not repenting will result in perishing (ἀπολειθε, Luke 13:3, 5).⁷⁹⁵ Probably the closest parallel⁷⁹⁶ to James 4:12a is Matt 10:28 (cf. Luke 12:4–5): God is the only one able to *destroy* (ἀπόλλυμι) someone in Gehenna.

Thirdly, the context of 4:12 sets σῶσαι and ἀπολέσαι in the eschaton. The previous content describes the exaltation of the humble and the opposing of the proud (4:6–10). This context is consistent with the sayings of Jesus (Matt 23:12; Luke 14:11; 18:14). The great reversal appears again later, with the allusion to the *end of life* for arrogant merchants (4:14) and the *destruction* of the rich landowners (5:1–3). The association with divine judgment becomes most explicit with the expectation of the judge (5:7–9).

The final saying in James 4:12 is a rhetorical question: σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον; The newly-asserted πλησίον recharacterizes the *brother* in 4:11, recalling the command to love one’s neighbour in Lev 19:18. This recharacterization strengthens the

⁷⁹² See “thematic highlighting” among right-dislocation constructions in Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 322–23.

⁷⁹³ Frankemölle affirms, based on 4:11–12 that recognition of God as judge is what should shape individual and interpersonal behaviour. See *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 619.

⁷⁹⁴ Albeit never together. Allison, *James*, 638.

⁷⁹⁵ Several manuscripts, including Codex Mosquensis (K), pair σῶσαι and ἀπολέσαι in Luke 9:55–56, referring to the Son of Man.

⁷⁹⁶ So Johnson, *Letter of James*, 294.

connections between 4:11–12 and 2:12–13, which contains a reference to Lev 19:18 in the command in 2:8. The appeal to Leviticus 19 reinforces the notion that one who slanders a brother *breaks the law*. Another right-dislocation (a re-framing nominative at the end of the saying) occurs at the end of the sentence with ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον, focusing on the condemned action of judging one’s neighbour.

The reward for those who follow Jas 4:11a is that the judge will *save* them rather than *destroy* them. The hearers are called to act in expectation of eschatological judgment. This is consistent with 2:12–13, with which 4:11–12 has several connections. Again, this salvation is eschatological, as seen in (1) its context and (2) its similarities with the Greek parallels.

James 4:11–12 closes the *inclusio* began at 2:12–13. The intervening content, as we have seen, is addressed to the epistle’s primary hearers. Through the content within the *inclusio*, the author exhorts the hearers to conform to certain behaviour and speech-ethics, so that they will receive a favourable eschatological judgment.

7.7 Apostrophe: James 4:13–5:6

After the *inclusio*, the two sections of James 4:13–5:6 address those outside the epistle’s audience for the benefit of the hearers. By giving the hearers a glimpse into the other side of the great eschatological reversal,⁷⁹⁷ these texts of apostrophe reinforce the theme of *eschatological approval*.

7.7.1 Arrogant Merchants (4:13–4:17)

James 4:13–17 addresses travelling merchants, with οἱ λέγοντες signalling a change in the audience. The reported speech in 4:13 is condemned because it fails to recognise God. The author chastises the merchants for their presumption of the specific business they will accomplish without submitting to God’s sovereignty. Jas 4:16 will make clear that the author condemns that the planning of one’s future events stems from *arrogance*.⁷⁹⁸

James 4:14 is focused on the concept that death can come at any time. The author repeats αὔριον to directly addresses the saying in 4:13: they do not know about tomorrow. In

⁷⁹⁷ Konradt sees the apostrophe in 4:13–5:6 as developing the notions of (1) God resisting the proud and (2) the eschatological outcome of the worldly life. See *Christliche Existenz*, 159–62. Likewise, Obermüller sees 4:13–5:6 as a *midrash* of Proverbs 3:34. See Obermüller, “Hermeneutische Themen,” 243. Johnson sees these addresses as the negative side of the theme that those who endure are blessed. See *Letter of James*, 312.

⁷⁹⁸ So Moo, *Letter of James*, 202–3.

4:14b, the predicate noun ἀτμίς is placed in Dik’s preverbal P2 position, offering saliency: they are a *vapour*. The right-dislocation πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη, ἔπειτα καὶ ἀφανιζομένη gives further specificity about how to view this designation as ἀτμίς. With the prepositional phrase πρὸς ὀλίγον fronted before the action for temporary focus, the author emphasises the fleeting nature of their lives.

The appeal to the demise of the arrogant merchants evokes the notion of eschatological judgment. Frankemölle connects this vanishing of the merchants to the passing away of the rich in James 1:10–11,⁷⁹⁹ which is set in contrast to the eschatological exaltation of the lowly. Allison rightly points out that the eschatology throughout James serves as the motivation for the ethical exhortations. While some places in James explicitly discuss the eschaton (James 5:7–9), other places, like here in 4:14, discuss the end of physical life. Either way, the appeals “function the same way, because the chief purpose of each is to encourage right behaviour and deter wrong conduct.”⁸⁰⁰ Allison is right that 4:14 is based on eschatological expectation. After all, without eschatological judgment, there is no harm in taking the future for granted without recognising God. In other words, the hearers receive the message that recognising God’s sovereignty will be a criterion for judgment in the end.

The saying in 4:15 describes an alternative to the one in 4:13, introduced by τοῦ λέγειν. While some see an imperatival force in the articular infinitive, this is not apparent.⁸⁰¹ The saying continues the logic from 4:13 with ἀντί,⁸⁰² making explicit what the merchants *did not* say. The condemnation, then, is for their failure to submit the future to God.⁸⁰³

In James 4:16–17, the author condemns the merchants. First, he states *they boast in their arrogance*, and *all such boasting is evil*. After the already-asserted καύχησις, the adjective πονηρά is in the preverbal P2 position, focusing on the evaluation of this boasting as *evil*. Second, while the aphorism starting with οὖν in 4:17 could sum up the content occurring earlier in the epistle, it is tied to 4:13–16 through the ties of ποιέω (4:13, 15, 17)

⁷⁹⁹ Frankemölle, *Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*, 635.

⁸⁰⁰ Allison, *James*, 94.

⁸⁰¹ Wallace designates that the infinitive can be imperatival in rare cases, for which the only examples are Rom 12:15 and Phil 3:16. In all these cases, the infinitive is anarthrous. See *Greek Grammar*, 608.

⁸⁰² So Dibelius, *James*, 233; Adam, *James*, 87. See McKnight’s explanation of the unlikelihood of *ought* being applied to 4:15 in *Letter of James*, 374 n40. Likewise, Moule views this phrase as “instead of your saying.” See Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, 128. Johnson and Mußner agree, favouring “you who are saying...instead of saying.” See Johnson, *Letter of James*, 296; Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 191.

⁸⁰³ See Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 191.

and the contrast between καλόν (4:17) and πονηρά (4:16).⁸⁰⁴ Given the merchants' saying and omission (4:13, 15), Jas 4:17 warns them that ignoring God's sovereignty is *sin*.⁸⁰⁵

Without a call to repentance, the author gives the hearers a view into the condemnation of these merchants. The appeal to the brevity of life (4:14) naturally evokes consideration of the consequences of one's actions. If Dibelius and Konradt are correct that 4:13–17 shows the worldly way of life condemned in 4:4,⁸⁰⁶ these merchants will receive condemnation from the judge they disregard. They will not receive *approval* in the end.

7.7.2 Oppressive Rich (5:1–6)

In the second section of apostrophe, the author addresses the rich who oppress their workers. The hearers receive an account of the rich's *condemnation* as well as their *eschatological punishment*.

After the meta-comment Ἄγε νῦν and the new address οἱ πλούσιοι in James 5:1, the author charges the rich with κλαύσατε, with an adverbial participle ὀλολύζοντες, recalling the call to the hearers in 4:8–9. The basis for weeping is in the phrase ἐπὶ ταῖς ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις; the *miserias coming on them*. Unlike 4:7–10, 5:1–6 does not contain a call to repent nor hope for the situation to change.

James 5:2–6 justifies the imperative κλαύσατε.⁸⁰⁷ First, James 5:2–3a features three parallel sayings. Each saying features an object of wealth fronted before the verb to indicate a new topic, and each indicates that they have depreciated. The riches of the wealthy have spoiled. The imagery of precious metals corroding is especially poignant; since genuine gold and silver do not get eaten away, corrosion indicates that their precious metals are *false*.

Unlike the sayings in James 5:2, the imagery of rusty metals in 5:3 receives development, linked together by καί. First, the rust is a *testimony against* the rich. The newly-asserted phrase εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῶν is fronted before the verb for additional attention. This idiom (εἰς μαρτύριον + dative) often conveys *condemnation* (e.g., Matt 8:4; 10:18; Mark 6:11; Luke 9:5).⁸⁰⁸ Also, there is “denunciatory tone” of the whole section that also points to condemnation.⁸⁰⁹ Ironically, the rich find themselves in another courtroom (see 2:6), but now

⁸⁰⁴ So Popkes, *Jakobus*, 312. I also add the connection of ἐπίστασθε/εἰδότι (4:14, 17).

⁸⁰⁵ So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 174; Moo, *Letter of James*, 207.

⁸⁰⁶ Dibelius, *James*, 230; Konradt, *Christliche Existenz*, 161.

⁸⁰⁷ For a similar scheme to 5:1–6, see Hart and Hart, *Analysis*, 135–42.

⁸⁰⁸ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 300.

⁸⁰⁹ Moo, *Letter of James*, 214.

the tables have turned. Second, *the rust will eat their flesh like fire*. The conjunction καί indicates equal status for the two connected clauses, and that they are a unit.⁸¹⁰ The horrific image of *eating flesh* also appears in Rev 19:18, another eschatological context. The phrase ὡς πῦρ points to God’s punishment, as seen with Gehenna in Jas 3:6. Similar images of God’s condemnation are found in the LXX (e.g., Isa 30:27; Ezek 15:7; Amos 1:12), with the closest parallel being Judith 16:17, describing God’s punishment of his enemies with fire and worms for their flesh. The association of the *fire* adds justification to viewing εἰς μαρτύριον as condemnation. Finally, the image of precious metals with fire may also recall the metallurgic testing described by δοκίμιον in 1:3. As discussed above, δόκιμος (1:12) often describes *genuine* and *refined* precious metals. However, in 5:3 the rich are not refined,⁸¹¹ but consumed by the fire, indicating that they are not δόκιμος.

The final clause in James 5:3 most likely points to the eschaton. While the rendering *you stored up*⁸¹² is fairly straightforward, it is critical to determine the connotation of ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. While *the last days* could refer to the latter stage of physical life (i.e., retirement), the denunciatory tone and the image of flesh-eating fire point to the eschaton. Even more supportive of an eschatological reading is the belief that in the “last days” the Lord brings the consummation of history to the end times (e.g., Ezek 38:16; Hos 3:5; Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1; Jer 49:39; *T. Zeb.* 8:2; *T. Jos.* 19:10).⁸¹³ Christian documents associate ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις with this same period, ushered in by Jesus (e.g., Acts 2:17; 2 Tim 3:1; Heb 1:2; 2 *Clem.* 14:2; *Did.* 16:3). Allison proposes that the “last days” in Jas 5:3 is a roundabout way of describing eschatological judgment, which fits well with the context. He doubts the accuracy of a rendering akin to ‘You have laid up treasure *for* the last days’ (NRSV) since one would expect a singular *day* in that scenario. Since ἡμέραις is plural, it likely refers to a *period* when the end is *near*, especially in light of 5:8.⁸¹⁴ Furthermore, the NT parallels support the rendering of ἐν + *days* being an *era*.

Overall, Jas 5:3 presents a consistent message of condemnation without hope for the rich. Ironically, their stored wealth will not benefit them but will destroy them in the end. The rich should weep (5:1) in anticipation of this impending punishment.

⁸¹⁰ Porter, *Idioms*, 211.

⁸¹¹ So Johnson, *Letter of James*, 300.

⁸¹² Bauer, “Θησαυρίζω.”

⁸¹³ So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 177.

⁸¹⁴ Allison, *James*, 677.

James 5:4–6 gives further support to the rich’s *condemnation*. The condemnation of the rich echoes the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g., Matt 19:23–24; Mark 10:25; Luke 6:24; 12:21; 16:19–31; 18:25). With themes and a tone reminiscent of the prophets, the author of James condemns the rich who withhold fair wages. The attention-getting ἰδοὺ in 5:4 points forward to new and important information.⁸¹⁵ The subject of 5:4a, *the wages of the workers who reap your fields that were withheld by you*, occupies the preverbal P2 position as the point of temporary focus. The second clause (5:4b) specifies the *cries*—they are of the *harvesters*. The preverbal subject αἱ βοαί is probably P1 (already established) in light of κράζει in the previous clause.⁸¹⁶ This time, the focus is on the newly-asserted preverbal εἰς τὰ ὄτα κυρίου σαβαὼθ. The title *Lord of hosts* is often used for God in association with his severe wrath against wickedness in the prophetic literature, especially in Isaiah (e.g., Isa 3:1; 5:7–9, 25; 10:16, 33; 13:4–5; 14:22–24; 19:4–5; 22:12–25; 23:9–11; Jer 26:10). Foster further points out that the judgment in Isaiah often involved an “irrevocable divine decision” with no opportunity for repentance.⁸¹⁷ The hearers of James, oppressed by the rich (2:6), learn about the condemnation in store for the rich who mistreat their workers.

James 5:5 gives more development of the *wealth* of the wicked rich, which condemns them. The cumulative effect of ἐτροφήσατε, ἐσπαταλήσατε, and ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν enhances the point that the rich, while exploiting others, have *indulged themselves*. The final phrase, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σφαγῆς, probably reinforces the notion that they will be punished in the end. Allison sees *day of slaughter* influenced by Jer 12:3,⁸¹⁸ and Davids links it to the tradition of God’s judgment as a day of slaughter for those opposed to him (e.g., Isa 30:24, 33; Jer 46:10; Ezek 39:17; Ps 22:29; Wis. 1:7; Rev 19:17–21).⁸¹⁹ The closest parallels are probably in Enoch, with ἀπὸ ἡμέρας σφαγῆς καὶ ἀπωλείας in the context of the great judgment (*1 En.* 16:1) and the great curse and judgment on those who treasure up gold and silver (*1 En.* 97:8–10; 99:15; *2 En.* 50:5). The tone, context, and parallels of *the day of slaughter* indicate eschatological punishment for these wicked rich.

⁸¹⁵ Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 122–23.

⁸¹⁶ Mußner connects the imagery of crying out to the blood of Abel crying in Gen 4:10 and the blood of the righteous going up in *1 Enoch* 47:1. Their cries bring God to come and intervene. See *Jakobusbrief*, 196.

⁸¹⁷ Foster, *Exemplars*, 141. Also see Moo, *Letter of James*, 216–17.

⁸¹⁸ Allison, *James*, 683.

⁸¹⁹ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 178–79.

While questions abound about James 5:6, the sayings point to the guilt of the rich. First, the referent of τὸν δίκαιον, the victim of murder, is unclear—it could refer to κυρίου σαβᾶθ,⁸²⁰ the unresisting *Jesus*,⁸²¹ the figure of *James*,⁸²² or a *collective* use of the singular noun.⁸²³ Second, is the saying οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν a *statement or a question*? Third, is the subject of ἀντιτάσσεται *God or people*? In any case, the paragraph concludes by affirming the guilt of the rich.

The salient portions of James 5:1–6, in a manner like 4:13–17, convey *condemnation* on the rich who oppress their workers. There is no hope for repentance in this address, and the author explicitly describes the miserable punishment the rich will receive. Through this section of apostrophe, the hearers of James see the other side of eschatological approval—eschatological condemnation. They are encouraged, perhaps even united,⁸²⁴ against those who aspire for wealth and do not recognise God.

The designation of James 4:13–17 and 5:1–6 as *apostrophe* (see Section 5.8) supports the notion of a unifying motif of *eschatological approval*. With the other sections, especially those within the grand *inclusio* of 2:12–13 and 4:11–12, pointing to a favourable eschatological divine judgment, these sections of *apostrophe* reinforce the concept for the hearers in a different way. Through ‘overhearing’ the messages to the arrogant merchants and wicked rich, the hearers gain a view of the other side of the eschatological reversal. If the hearers engage in the actions that are affirmed, they can look forward to a favourable verdict from God in the end.

7.8 James 5:7–20

In the epistle’s two-part ending, the author concludes the main body (James 5:7–11) before a series of concluding exhortations (5:12–20). While these exhortations may address the workers defrauded by the rich in 5:1–6,⁸²⁵ it is more likely that 5:7–20 is meant for a wider audience, with οὖν coming as a conclusion to the main body of the epistle.⁸²⁶ The

⁸²⁰ Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 529–30.

⁸²¹ Mayor, *St. James*, 160.

⁸²² Martin, *James*, 182.

⁸²³ Allison, *James*, 687; Davids, *Epistle of James*, 179–80.

⁸²⁴ So Jackson-McCabe, “Enduring Temptation,” 178–79.

⁸²⁵ So Moo, *Letter of James*, 221; McCartney, *James*, 240; Hart and Hart, *Analysis*, 144; Doriani, *James*, 175.

⁸²⁶ For this view, see Davids, *Epistle of James*, 181; Wall, *Community*, 248.

recurrence of μακαρίζω and ὑπομονή (5:11), key terms in the prologue’s fulcrum saying (1:12), support this view. The *inclusio* created by 1:12 and 5:11⁸²⁷ indicates the importance of the hope that those who *persevere* in loyalty to God will be blessed in the end. Also, the return to the address ἀδελφοί (five times in 5:7–20) also points to a wider audience.

7.8.2 James 5:7–11

James 5:7–11 is focused on the *eschaton*, especially *divine judgment*. First, in 5:7a, the author exhorts his hearers, placing attention on the *coming of the Lord*. The address ἀδελφοί points forward to the salient portion: ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου.⁸²⁸ Thus the command is not a general affirmation of patience; it is qualified by the focused portion: *until the coming of the Lord*. Since the author uses κύριος to refer to both Jesus Christ (Jas 1:1; 2:1) and the Father (3:9; 4:10; 5:4, 10–11), it is not entirely clear which is the referent of τοῦ κυρίου.⁸²⁹ Indeed, the *parousia of the Lord* can refer to God’s arrival (Mal 3:1–3; Zech 14:5) or the second coming of Jesus (Matt 24:27, 37, 39; 1 Cor 15:23; 1 Thess 2:19; *Apoc. Sedr.* 1:1). We receive a clue regarding the subject of the *parousia* in the tone of Jas 5: The mention of *parousia* in Jas 5 is not meant to arouse fear (as it does in Mal 3:1–3 and Zech 14:5), but to *encourage* its hearers. This encouragement weighs in favour of this *parousia* referring to Jesus’ return, which is consistent with the sayings of Jesus (Matt 24).⁸³⁰ While this connotation is not conclusive, the next content supports an eschatological reading of the *parousia*.

With the newly-asserted information in the most salient part of 5:8, the author states that this *parousia* is *near*. The *nearness* of the *parousia* is compatible with the author’s statements about the “ephemeral nature of human life” (1:10–11; 4:14).⁸³¹ The end approaches, and there will be judgment (5:9). As stated above, ἐγγίζω and ἐγγύς are used in

⁸²⁷ Allison suggests that this passage, alerting the hearer to an *inclusio*, signals that the conclusion to the epistle is near. See *James*, 695. Also see Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 69–71.

⁸²⁸ See “Marked Instances of End of Sentence Focus” in Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 34.

⁸²⁹ The self-identification of James as a Christian work (1:1; 2:1) and the usage of *παρουσία* to refer to Christ’s coming elsewhere in the NT (1 Cor 15:23; 1 Thess 2:19; 3:13; 5:23; 2 Thess 2:1; 2 Pet 1:16) points to Jesus as the Messiah who will come to usher in the final age. For a lengthier discussion, see Foster, *Exemplars*, 146–47; Laws, *Epistle of James*, 208.

⁸³⁰ “The *parousia* also meant hope and deliverance for Jesus’ followers.” McKnight, *Letter of James*, 406.

⁸³¹ Allison, *James*, 698.

the sayings of Jesus to refer to the apocalyptic era and the arrival of the kingdom of God (e.g., Matt 4:17; 24:33; Mark 1:15; 13:29; Luke 10:9, 11). Also, the verb ἐγγίζω refers to the day of the Lord's salvation approaching (Isa 5:19; 46:13; 50:8; 51:5; 56:1).

The author associates the parousia with *judgment* (5:9). Again, the focus is on the content at the end of 5:9a, the eschatological event. Not only will the end bring a reversal of the fortune of the rich (5:1–6), the *brothers* must also watch their behaviour (5:9). While he portrays the parousia in an encouraging light in 5:7–8, the author warns his hearers that they should not complain lest they are judged too. The repetition of κριτής soon after μὴ κριθῆτε, the interjection ἰδοῦ, and the preverbal placement of ὁ κριτής πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν all reinforce the focus on the *judgment*. The phrase *at the door* is used in Jesus' sayings (Mark 13:29; Matt 24:33) to refer to the imminence of his second coming.⁸³² The judgment is not quite upon the hearers of James but could come at any moment.

The impending parousia and judgment motivate the epistle's hearers to particular actions,⁸³³ to be rewarded in the end. First, the image of the small farmer in 5:7 illustrates that if the hearers are patient, they will receive an eschatological reward. Considering the illustration, receiving eschatological favour appears to be a foregone conclusion; there is no exhortation to change behaviour, but simply to be patient. This foregone conclusion contrasts the condemnation of the groups addressed in the *apostrophe* sections of 4:13–5:6. Also, the example of the prophets in 5:10 supports the expectation of a reward for the hearers. The hearers are encouraged; despite their suffering, their patience results in blessing. There may be a parallel with the Beatitudes of Jesus (Matt 5:10–12; Luke 6:22–23) where the persecuted who are aligned with God are *blessed*.⁸³⁴ Along with the command to be patient, the author exhorts his hearers to *strengthen their hearts* as they expect the Lord's arrival (James 5:8). A close parallel to 5:8 is LXX Ps 111, which features ἐστήρικται ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ in 111:8. The psalm describes a blessed man who fears the Lord (111:1) and is not afraid in the face of evil (111:6) or his enemies (111:8).

Second, the author urges his hearers to *endure*, shifting the focus to ὑπομονή (5:11), in anticipation of a reward. Consistent with the hope expressed in 1:12, ὑπομείναντας in 5:11

⁸³² Citing these passages, Mußner is convinced that the author of James is thinking of Christ. See *Jakobusbrief*, 204. Johnson, however, citing the use of κριτής in 4:12, warns that this conclusion should be a "cautious one." See *Letter of James*, 317.

⁸³³ As it does elsewhere in the NT (e.g., 1 Pet 4:7; Heb 10:25).

⁸³⁴ Hartin contends that the Q community saw themselves as a community of prophets and shared this hope that is in Jas 5:11. See *James and Q*, 161.

refers to those *persevering until the end*. The “deliberate”⁸³⁵ aorist does not convey the process of enduring, but those who complete their test. With the appeal to τὸ τέλος κυρίου in 5:11 referring to *consummation*, the perseverance in view lasts until a conclusion. This understanding of *perseverance* is supported by the usage of this word family in 4 Maccabees (1:11; 5:23; 9:8, 30; 15:30; 17:4, 12, 17, 23) describing martyrs who persevered *until the end*. The martyrs are said to expect a reward (4 Macc 17:12). Also, the example of Job’s non-eschatological result, the τὸ τέλος κυρίου,⁸³⁶ encourages the hearers to persevere until *their own end*, the *parousia* and *judgment* (5:7–9). If they remain faithful, their τέλος κυρίου will bring an eschatological reward (see 1:12), since he is *full of compassion* and *merciful*. (5:11). This understanding of ὑπομονή would be consistent with its usage in Jesus’ teaching on the end times, a time of trials for those who follow him (Luke 8:13–15; 21:19).⁸³⁷ In fact, scholars frequently connect Jas 5:11 to Matt 5:10–12 and Luke 6:22–23,⁸³⁸ which convey *eschatological reward* for those who endure suffering for the sake of Jesus. Indeed, the hearers of James who have hope in God persevere, and they will be blessed at the end.

Third, the author exhorts his hearers *not to complain against one another*. Like the others, this exhortation does not just affirm a virtue; it is grounded in eschatological expectation. The clause introduced by ἵνα indicates the command’s purpose: *that they would not be judged*. This purpose occurs at the end of the saying and receives the greatest saliency. Indeed, the saying in 5:9b reinforces the focus on eschatological judgment. The exclamation ἰδοῦ brings extra attention⁸³⁹ to the newly-asserted πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἔστηκεν. Both κριτής (in the P1 framing position, since κριθῆτε occurred just before) and the prepositional phrase occur before the verb for saliency; the author emphasises *the imminence of judgment*.

⁸³⁵ Adamson, *Epistle of James*, 192–93. Also see Martin, *James*, 183; Foster, *Exemplars*, 153.

⁸³⁶ Allison delineates different views of the referent of τὸ τέλος κυρίου, including a Christological assertion, the restoration of Job’s life, or the parousia. See Allison, *James*, 719–20. However, the most obvious referent is the end of the book of Job (42:7–12), which indeed portrays the compassion and mercy of the Lord. See Johnson, *Letter of James*, 319–20.

⁸³⁷ Foster (*Significance of Exemplars*, 155) points out other NT instances of ὑπομονή (Rom 5:3; 2 Cor 6:4–8; 2 Thess 1:4; Heb 10:35–36; Rev 13:10; 14:12) are associated with great *trials* and *reward* for the faithful.

⁸³⁸ See, for example, Davids, *Epistle of James*, 186; Martin, *James*, 193; Hartin, *James*, 244.

⁸³⁹ ἰδοῦ is stronger than γάρ here. See Davids, *Epistle of James*, 185.

The stark contrast between the oppressive rich (5:1–6) and the ἀδελφοί (5:7–11) reinforces the author’s concern for *eschatological approval* for his hearers. First, the description of the parousia is only positive. There is no discussion of *punishment* involved in the content regarding the hearers of James. Second, the hearers receive the exhortation that they will be *rewarded* in the eschaton. The illustration of a farmer waiting for rain reinforces the notion that *good* will come later. There is a contrast between the rich, who think they are already blessed (1:9–11; 5:1–6) and the patient, who wait for a better end to come.⁸⁴⁰ Third, the command στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν in 5:8 suggests a contrast with the oppressive rich. While the rich *indulged* their hearts (5:5) and will be condemned, the hearers are to *strengthen* their hearts since the end will bring favour for them.⁸⁴¹

James 5:7–11 is a fitting conclusion to the main body. The eschatological content is the most explicit in this text, along with the expectation of reward. The text emphatically reinforces the message found in the pivotal statement at 1:12—those who endure will receive eschatological favour. As discussed above, 5:11 closes the grand *inclusio* marked by the prologue, with the repetition of μακαρίζω and ὑπομένω. The author brings the hearers back to the concept that those who endure in adherence to God will be judged favourably in the end.⁸⁴²

7.8.3 James 5:12–20

As discussed above, James 5:12–20 signals the ending of the epistle with elements found in the endings of other Greek letters (see Chapter 3). Even here, some of the components that indicate the epistolary closing contain concepts related to *eschatological approval*.⁸⁴³

⁸⁴⁰ So Popkes, *Jakobus*, 323n101.

⁸⁴¹ Mußner also points out a deliberate contrast here. See *Jakobusbrief*, 203. The connection may even be ironic, if στηρίξατε τὰς καρδίας is meant to recall the LXX instances where this phrase conveys physical nourishment (Judg 19:5, 8; Ps 103:15; cf. Gen 27:37; Song 2:5). While the rich feed their hearts for slaughter, the hearers are to nourish their hearts, standing firm until vindication.

⁸⁴² Johnson, considering that 4:13–5:6 shows the negative side of the great reversal, asserts that 5:7–11 discusses the positive side “as sketched in 1:12: those who endure to the end are blessed.” See *Letter of James*, 312.

⁸⁴³ One could even make a case that the strongest references to eschatological judgment in these verses occur in 5:12 and 5:19–20, suggesting an *inclusio* for this unit. However, with the intervening content (5:13–18) held together by the concept of *prayer*, an *inclusio* seems unlikely. Ultimately such an argument does not impact this thesis much, since the function of James 5:12–20, as we have argued, is to signal the end of the letter.

James 5:12 continues the thread of commands grounded in judgment. Just like the exhortations to be humble (5:7–8) and not to complain (5:9), the purpose of the command to refrain from oaths is to *avoid condemnation*. The saying starts with no less than three discourse devices that bring attention to the salient information. First, the phrase *πρὸ πάντων*, a common element in Greek letters, serves as a framing device to point forward to the salient information. Second, the conjunction *δέ* signals anticipation of development from previous content. Third, *ἀδελφοί μου* slows down the information rate to bring additional attention to the following content. The commands in 5:12 continue the theme of speech-ethics in the epistle (e.g., 1:19, 26; 3:1–12; 4:11). Here, the author departs from the typical letter convention: rather than pronouncing an actual oath to conclude the letter,⁸⁴⁴ he commands a *prohibition of oaths* as the counterpoint in a negative-positive command pair. The negative command is reinforced by three items connected by *μήτε*, with the final one being encompassing: *nor any other oath*. Next comes the positive command, which is very close to the saying of Jesus found in 5:34–37:⁸⁴⁵ ἦτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὐ οὐ. While the command itself does not have much elucidation,⁸⁴⁶ its clearly-stated motivation is the most salient part of the saying. This expressed purpose, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν πέσητε, comes at the end of the saying. The appeal to judgment echoes a repeated concept in the epistle (2:12–13; 3:1; 4:12; 5:9). Within this final clause, the phrase ὑπὸ κρίσιν is fronted before the verb to place even more emphasis on *judgment*.

In James 5:13–18, rather than a conventional prayer for the letter’s recipients, the author gives exhortation *about* prayer. The cohesive tie of *prayer* links these sayings together. Some assign eschatological connotations to parts of this text, especially the future verbs *σώσει* and *ἐγερῆ* in 5:15.⁸⁴⁷ However, the physical meaning of these words is clearer. The verb *σώζω* with an accusative participle of *κάμνω* was a conventional way to communicate doctors healing the sick,⁸⁴⁸ and *ἐγείρω* commonly occurs in the accounts of Jesus’ physical healings (e.g., Matt 9:5–7; Mark 5:41; Luke 7:14; John 11:29). Thus, with the context of physical sickness (5:14–15a) in view, a straightforward reading assigns a physical

⁸⁴⁴ Davids, *Epistle of James*, 26, 189.

⁸⁴⁵ For discussions about the relationship of Jas 5:12 to Matt 5:34–37, see Davids, 190; Allison, *James*, 727–29; Hartin, *James and Q*, 188–91.

⁸⁴⁶ Allison writes, “how James understood the prohibition of oaths is unclear... we have no answers.” *James*, 733–34.

⁸⁴⁷ For example, see Pickar, “Anyone Sick,” 172–73; Collins, “James 5: 14-16a,” 84–86.

⁸⁴⁸ Allison, *James*, 765–66.

sense to σώσει and ἐγερῆ. Indeed, Moo rejects the eschatological reading of σώζω in 5:15, since salvation is never the result of prayer in the NT.⁸⁴⁹ The discourse devices provide no further clues, only reinforcing the argument that these verbs refer to physical healing. The fronted ἡ εὐχή frames the verb as an already-established constituent (from 5:14) as a prayer for the sick, and the redundant τὸν κάμνοντα reinforces the physical nature of the illness.⁸⁵⁰ Finally, the example of Elijah in 5:17–18, which supports the power of prayer, involves the physical situation of rain—the focus of 5:17 is on the sheer length of the drought, *three years*.⁸⁵¹

However, the physical nature of the treatment of the sick in James 5:14–15 does not necessarily exclude an eschatological reading of the passage.⁸⁵² First, the context of 5:13–18 is saturated with eschatological content, including the punishment of the rich (5:3), the parousia (5:7–8), and the appeals to judgment (5:9, 12). As we will see below, 5:19–20 also discusses the eschaton. If the material in 5:13–18 is not eschatological, it would be an abrupt departure from the strong eschatological content in Jas 5, only to have another abrupt shift back to it in 5:19–20. Second, the exhortation for the suffering person to pray (5:13a) may be connected to prayer in response to trials in 1:2–5, which has eschatological connotations. Third, the call for a cheerful person to *sing* (5:13b) may be connected to the call to *joy* in response to the *trials* in 1:2.⁸⁵³ Fourth, rendering σώσει in 5:15 as *eschatological* (in addition to being physical) would be consistent with the other usages of σώζω in James (1:21; 2:14; 4:12; and especially 5:20). Johnson points out that while physical healing is clearly in view in 5:15, σώζω has a “familiar ambiguity” in the NT; when associated with πίστις in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 7:50; 17:19; Acts 3:16; 14:9; 15:9; 16:31), it can be associated with entering the faith community.⁸⁵⁴ Hartin likewise proposes “further implication of eschatological salvation.”⁸⁵⁵ Fifth, the promise that the Lord *will raise* (ἐγερῆ) the sick person may on a “deeper level” also refer to the final resurrection in the eschaton.⁸⁵⁶ The association of σώσει

⁸⁴⁹ Moo, *Letter of James*, 243.

⁸⁵⁰ See Bauer, “Κάμνω.”

⁸⁵¹ See the discussion of the word order of 5:17 in Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 32.

⁸⁵² For a detailed treatment of the different views on 5:13–18, see Bowden, “An Overview of the Interpretive Approaches to James 5.13–18.”

⁸⁵³ In accordance with these second and third points, Elliott sees parallels between 1:1–12 and 5:13–20 including trials, prayer, life and death, and doubting/wandering. See Elliott, “James in Rhetorical and Social Scientific Perspective,” 72.

⁸⁵⁴ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 332.

⁸⁵⁵ Hartin, *James*, 268.

⁸⁵⁶ Hartin, 269.

and ἐγερεῖ, according to Collins, suggests an eschatological reference, especially if the illness is terminal.⁸⁵⁷ Sixth, the saying in 5:15a appears to promise a *saving* and *raising* as a result of the prayer. Blair points out that since prayer does not *always* heal the sick, this promise would be false unless it refers to the final rescue.⁸⁵⁸ Perhaps Johnson is right that these future-tense verbs in James 5:15 have polyvalence,⁸⁵⁹ carrying both physical and eschatological connotations.⁸⁶⁰

Whether the sickness and its resolution in 5:14–15a are eschatological, the treatment of *sins* in 5:15b–16 points to *divine judgment*. It is possible that the *healing* in 5:16 is associated with the sickness of 5:15a, thus rendering it to be physical. However, only *prayer* and *sins* connect 5:15 to 5:16, not physical sickness.⁸⁶¹ In any case, the forgiveness in 5:15b and healing in 5:16 are likely spiritual. The divine passive⁸⁶² in 5:15b indicates that God forgives if the sick person has committed sins. The healing in 5:16 is less clear, but the lack of mention of a need for physical healing of this new referent (ἀλλήλων) suggests that the healing is for sins and not for physical maladies. While ἰάομαι can refer to physical healing (e.g., Gen 20:17; 1 Sam 6:3; Wis 16:10; *Test. Sol.* 7:6; John 4:47), when associated with *sins* and *lawlessness* it refers to *spiritual healing*,⁸⁶³ namely God’s mercy and forgiveness on the people (e.g., 2 Chr 7:14; Ps 40:5; Isa 6:10; Jer 3:22 Odes 14:41; 1 Peter 2:24).⁸⁶⁴ Since Jas 5:16 features ἰαθῆτε in connecting with sins with no mention of illness, it follows that this *healing* is *spiritual*. The spiritual healing of sin in 5:16 points to God’s forgiveness or

⁸⁵⁷ Collins, “James 5: 14-16a,” 86–87.

⁸⁵⁸ Blair is convinced that 5:14–15 refers to spiritual healing. See Blair, “Spiritual Healing,” 150–51.

⁸⁵⁹ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 333.

⁸⁶⁰ This is the argument of Edwards, who proposes that ἀσθενεῖ and κάμνοντα refers to lack of courage, the anointing symbolises consecration, and the forgiveness is directly connected to sickness. See Edwards, “Reviving Faith,” 109–39. Allison insists that the sense in 5:15 is purely physical, but still assigns an eschatological meaning to σφζω in 5:20. He even concedes that “an exclusive emphasis upon the physical may assume a false dichotomy.” See Allison, *James*, 766.

⁸⁶¹ I argue that these two terms are catchwords, with the two sayings diverging in several ways. See Eng, “Catchwords,” 266–67. Mußner also separates 5:16–18 from 5:13–15, rendering the healing as referring to sins. See Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 225–28.

⁸⁶² Allison, *James*, 768.

⁸⁶³ Bauer, “Ἰάομαι.”

⁸⁶⁴ Moo objects that ἰάομαι in relation to sin in the LXX only occurs in a “word game” when sin is likened to a wound. See Moo, *Letter of James*, 246. However, it is not apparent that all the instances he cites (Deut 30:3; Isa 6:10; 53:5; Jer 3:22) liken sin to physical maladies. Besides, language of healing can exist without any references to physical afflictions, like in 2 Chr 7:14.

withholding of condemnation. In fact, the author's appeal to Elijah's prayer (5:17–18) supports the notion that the sins are being healed in 5:16. After all, if the author was simply illustrating the power of prayer in general, there are more dramatic instances of Elijah praying, including his calling down of fire at Mount Carmel or the raising of the widow's son.⁸⁶⁵ However, the drought described in 1 Kings 17–18 was divine punishment for the people's idolatry. Elijah's prayer for rain, therefore, is a fitting illustration of prayer for *healing from sin*. Thus, the author is concerned with the hearers being forgiven and healed from their sin. This forgiveness and healing naturally point to *eschatological favour*.

James 5:19–20 closes the epistle with another exhortation grounded in eschatological consequences. The conditional frame in 5:19 sets up the command that occurs in 5:20, introducing a situation where a member of the community (τις ἐν ὑμῖν) wanders from the truth. The verb *πλανηθῆ* (5:19) and the noun *πλάνης ὁδοῦ* (5:20) suggest that *ἀλήθεια* in 5:19 refers not just to doctrine, but a practical way of life (see Ps 51:6; Gal 5:7, 1 John 1:6).⁸⁶⁶ The command in 5:20 is for the one returning the wanderer: *he must know*. The preverbal subject *ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ* is already-established content (P1) and points forward to the salient information at the end, the content of the command *to know*. The two elements linked by *καί* at the end of 5:20 are eschatologically oriented. We will discuss each in turn.

The phrase *σώσει ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐκ θανάτου* discusses one's eschatological fate. While it is possible that the *death* refers to the restorer, it more likely refers to the sinner (*ἁμαρτωλόν*).⁸⁶⁷ Allison calls the mention of death "particularly appropriate here," as the hearers consider how to finish their lives.⁸⁶⁸ Death is associated with sin, often as its *result* (e.g., Exod 28:43; Jdt 11:11; Ps 1:6; Prov 2:17–18; Sir 25:24; Isa 53:12; 4 Macc 4:12; *T. Ab.* 10:14; Ps.-Phoc. 134; Rom 5:12–21; 1 Cor 15:21–22; 56; John 3:14–16). Indeed, the prologue of James (1:15) declares that sin leads to *death*. With judgment in view (Jas 2:12; 3:1; 4:12; 5:7–11), the author again discusses a *favourable verdict* for his hearers. Despite Hodges' attempt to construe this phrase as referring only to physical death,⁸⁶⁹ the fact that a sinner would still physically die indicates that *ἐκ θανάτου* goes beyond physical death. This is

⁸⁶⁵ So Laws, *Epistle of James*, 235; Moo, *Letter of James*, 248.

⁸⁶⁶ So Davids, *Epistle of James*, 199; Moo, *Letter of James*, 249.

⁸⁶⁷ This view is consistent with the consensus on this passage. See Allison, *James*, 786.

⁸⁶⁸ Allison, 787.

⁸⁶⁹ Hodges, *James*, 119–20.

supported by Jesus' teaching that physical death precedes a reckoning for either eternal blessing or eternal suffering (Luke 16:19–31; cf. Matt 25:31–46).⁸⁷⁰ Further support comes in *T. Ab.* 13:13 (Long Recension), which describes the patriarch in the place where souls are judged: sinners are sent to punishment, but those whose deeds are approved are to be saved (σώζεσθαι) with the righteous. Also, the author of James specifies that the *soul* (ψυχή) will be saved from death (5:20). The *soul* is a “Hebraism meaning the whole person”⁸⁷¹ and must receive salvation from final death. The ψυχή is the full self, that which lives beyond physical death. The *destruction* conveyed in Jas 4:12 reinforces this notion that *death* in 5:20 goes beyond the physical. Allison points out that the mention of eschatological death is appropriate at the end of James, as Jewish and early Christian literature often have eschatology as the last topic.⁸⁷² Indeed, the author uses σώζω in the context of ψυχή earlier in Jas 1:21, where it also refers to spiritual, eternal salvation.⁸⁷³

To be sure, σώσει most likely refers to the restorer *mediating* divine salvation, since the divine judge is the only one who can save (4:12). In other words, the *saving* is facilitated by a person's action. God is the primary actor, but the one restoring the wanderer is the agent used by God.⁸⁷⁴

The second result of restoring a sinner in James 5:20 is that a *multitude of sins will be covered*. The covering of sin refers to its consequences being avoided, as supported by the frequent usage of καλύπτω when referring to *sin* and *lawlessness* (Neh 3:37; Ps 31:1, 5; 84:3 LXX; Ezek 16:8). The phrase καλύψει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν is also found in 1 Pet 4:8 (cf. 1 Clem. 49:5), which recalls MT Prov 10:12. Johnson proposes that the logic of Jas 5:20, 1 Pet 4:8, and Prov 10:12 favours a “preventative” sense to καλύψει—*suppressing*.⁸⁷⁵ Whether the

⁸⁷⁰ Indeed, early Christian teaching indicates that physical death does not separate the faithful from God (Rom 8:38–39; 14:8; John 11:25; 12:25; Phil 1:20) and that there would be a ‘second death’ for the unfaithful (Rev 2:11; 20:6, 14; 21:8). The language of a soul being saved (σώσει ψυχήν αὐτοῦ) fits well with the Christian tradition of salvation from eschatological death, or a final condemnation. Regarding Jas 5:20, Davids writes, “the tone appears to go beyond physical death and recognize death as an eschatological entity, at least where one dies in sin (cf. 1:15). It is the soul, i.e., the whole person which is liable to death.” See *Epistle of James*, 200.

⁸⁷¹ Hart and Hart, *Analysis*, 164.

⁸⁷² Allison cites Matthew 24–25 and Revelation's placement at the end of the canon. See *James*, 787.

⁸⁷³ So McKnight, *Letter of James*, 457; Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 233.

⁸⁷⁴ For a similar argument, see Hart and Hart, *Analysis*, 164.

⁸⁷⁵ Johnson, *Letter of James*, 339.

verb refers to preventing or making sin invisible,⁸⁷⁶ the result is that there *no penalty* for sin. This accords with the *saving of one's soul from death* earlier in 5:20.

While the redundancy of being *saved from death* and *having sins covered* leads some to hold that James 5:20 describes the *rescuer's* sins,⁸⁷⁷ the benefit most likely refers to the *wanderer*. First, *πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν* fits best with *ἁμαρτωλόν* mentioned in the saying. Second, the objection of the tautologous nature of the same person being *saved* and *having sins covered* is alleviated if it is seen as *parallelism*,⁸⁷⁸ which the author uses in other places (3:12; 4:8, 9).⁸⁷⁹ We cannot exclude “poetic redundancy for emphasis,”⁸⁸⁰ Third, 5:13–18 contains a pattern that the subject *benefits another*, making it more likely that the rescuer benefits the wanderer in 5:20. Fourth, all the references to the *result of the action* in 5:19–20a refer to the same person: the wanderer. It would be inconsistent for the final phrase to refer to a different party. The usages of *αὐτόν/αὐτοῦ* (three times in 5:19–20a) more naturally have the same antecedent.⁸⁸¹ Fifth, the text does not indicate the restorer's sins;⁸⁸² however, the *wanderer* indeed has *sins* that need covering.⁸⁸³

The sayings in James 5:12–20, while signalling the end of the letter, contain elements of eschatological approval. In these final exhortations, the first and last sayings (5:12 and 5:19–20) point to eschatological judgment and the author's concern that the hearers are approved by God in the end.

7.9 James 1:12 as the Thesis Statement of the Epistle

Now that we have made a case for *eschatological approval* being present in every section of the epistle, we now return to a discussion of James 1:12. I have hinted that this

⁸⁷⁶ Allison, *James*, 788.

⁸⁷⁷ See, for example, Dibelius, *James*, 258–59; Laws, *Epistle of James*, 240–41.

⁸⁷⁸ Even with parallelism in view, Jas 5:20 may not be tautologous if both benefits refer to the same person. Burchard suggests a *present* saving from death along with a *future* invisibility of sins. See Burchard, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 216–17.

⁸⁷⁹ Hartin, *James*, 286–87.

⁸⁸⁰ Allison, *James*, 789. Cf. Cargal, *Restoring*, 197; Moo, *Letter of James*, 251.

⁸⁸¹ McKnight, *Letter of James*, 459.

⁸⁸² So Allison, *James*, 787.

⁸⁸³ Mußner rightly points out, “der Rettende selbst ein Gerechter ist und kein Sünder.” See *Jakobusbrief*, 232. However, he still suggests that the righteous one has sins which are covered, citing Ezek 3:20–21. See Mußner, 233. Dibelius (*James*, 258–59) also cites this passage. While Ezek 3:18–21 and other texts (1 Tim 4:16; 2 Clem 15:1) describe salvation for a messenger, they do not mention the *sins* of the one giving the message.

saying has a key role in the epistle (see Sections 4.1, 4.3, 5.1.1, and 6.1.2). In what follows, I will present a case that *James 1:12 serves as the thesis statement for the epistle*. In what follows, we will put together our findings in this study and support this proposal.

First, James 1:12 sums up the message of the introductory prologue. As discussed above, the repeated terms in James 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25 create a double *inclusio* that point to the fulcrum, the saying at 1:12. These sayings call the hearers of James to *persevere* in their faithfulness to God through the present difficulties. Perseverance results in being *blessed*, as the divine judge evaluates each person according to their deeds. Along with the series of binary choices in the rest of Jas 1, the tripartite introduction conveys the encompassing idea of the prologue: that the hearers would receive *eschatological approval*. This concept is epitomised by 1:12: *blessed is the one who endures trial, for after he has been approved, he will receive the crown of life which he promised to those who love him*.

As discussed above, the body of James re-visits the idea of *eschatological approval* introduced in Jas 1:12. James 2:1–13 serves as a bridge, with the salient portions pointing to a concern for a favourable judgment. The *inclusio* marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12 discusses praxis that leads to eschatological favour. The sections of apostrophe in 4:13–5:6 show that the arrogant merchants and wicked rich do not embody the behaviour affirmed in the key statement in James 1:12.

The eschatological content reaches a crescendo at the conclusion to the main body in James 5:7–11, with explicit content about the *parousia* and *judgment*. The final saying in this conclusion (5:11) repeats key terms introduced in the tripartite introduction:


1:2–3	1:12	1:25	5:11
πάσαν χαρὰν	μακάριος	μακάριος	μακαρίζομεν
πειρασμοῖς	πειρασμόν		
ὑπομονήν / ὑπομονή	ὑπομένει	παραμείνας	ὑπομείναντας / ὑπομονήν

While 5:11 does not describe an explicit eschatological reward like the reference to στέφανος in 1:12, its appeal to the character of God (πολύσπλαγχνός, οἰκτίρμων), as discussed above, points to divine favour. Thus, with terms that remind the hearers of the main idea of the introductory prologue in 5:11, the epistle displays a grand *inclusio*.

James 1:12 functions as a thesis statement in two ways by (1) summarising the prologue and (2) epitomising the epistle’s repeated formula: praxis and a favourable

eschatological judgment. Through all the descriptions of the final result of their actions in the epistle, the author reiterates concern for the hearers' *eschatological approval*, which is expressed in 1:12. As they manifest loyalty to God by *persevering* through their difficulties, they can look forward to a favourable verdict in eschatological judgment. With judgment in view, the author urges the readers to choose the better of two paths. Thus, 1:12, which is the thematic centre of the introductory prologue, embodies the motif repeated throughout the epistle. The repetition of keywords at the epistle's conclusion (5:11) complete the *inclusio*, reaffirming the thesis statement.

With Jas 1:12 as a thesis statement, we can add detail to the fish skeleton introduced above (see Section 5.1.1). Again, the head of the fish is the introductory prologue, centred at 1:12. *Eschatological approval* is the backbone of the epistle as a unifying motif. Much of the body is framed by the *inclusio* marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12, urging its hearers to speak and act in submission to the law, in anticipation of eschatological judgment. The sections within this *inclusio* are consistent with the motif of *eschatological approval*, as the author repeatedly urges his hearers to display praxis that results in a favourable judgment.



The conclusion to the main body (5:7–11) contains the most explicit eschatological content, discussing the *parousia* and judgment and re-visiting the key message of the prologue in 5:11.

Even after the conclusion to the epistle's body at Jas 5:11, the final exhortations still contain elements of *eschatological approval*. James 5:12–20, while containing elements that signal the ending of a letter, has exhortations that urge the hearers to avoid condemnation by being truthful and to bring wanderers back so that they can be saved from death. Thus, the text of James constantly displays this repeated motif epitomised by 1:12.

7.10 Summary

After the prologue introduces the theme of *eschatological approval* epitomised by James 1:12, the body and conclusion of James continue this theme. The salient parts of 2:1–13 suggest an emphasis on a favourable result from divine judgment. The large *inclusio* marked by 2:12–13 and 4:11–12 contain different expressions of the theme that adherence to God's ways will result in a favourable verdict in the eschaton, further developing the concept found in 1:12. Even the transitional unit of 3:13–18, while offering a review and preview of the epistle's concepts, has hints of *eschatological approval*.

After a two-part apostrophe (4:13–5:6) showing the other side of eschatological reversal, the hearers are again addressed with the most explicit eschatological content in the epistle (5:7–11). Even the exhortations in 5:12–20, which mark the closing of the epistle, begin and end with explicit exhortations grounded in hope for eschatological approval. Thus, we have made a case that each unit of James, as delineated in Chapter 5, connects with *eschatological approval*, making this a unifying motif in the epistle.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

This study has presented a case that *eschatological approval*, or a *favourable verdict from God in eschatological judgment*, is a unifying motif for James. In what follows, we will discuss the study's primary and secondary contributions to the study of James.

8.1 Eschatological Approval as a Unifying Motif in James

While I do not argue that James has a *logical progression* in its ideas, I have made a case that *eschatological approval* links the major sections together. The studies of *friendship*, *wisdom*, *obedience*, and *perfection* successfully examined motifs that are repeated. This thesis stands alongside those previous studies by arguing for the repeated motif of eschatological approval. However, this study goes a step further than the previous studies by arguing that all the major units in James addressed to its hearers connect to *eschatological approval*. Thus, it has bolstered the growing opposition to assertions that James has no unity of thought, typified by Luther and Dibelius.⁸⁸⁴ The motif of *eschatological approval* runs through the epistle, with the author indicating that following his exhortations will lead to a favourable eschatological verdict. This recurring concern in James is consistent with the eschatological expectation found in a wide range of Jewish and early Christian documents. In what follows, we will recap the content of each chapter.

Part One of this thesis presented an approach for studying *eschatological approval* in James. In Chapter 1, we examined previous studies that present a significant motif or dominant idea in James. These studies highlight themes that run through the epistle, compellingly arguing for their prominence. However, an examination of the studies highlighted a void in the study of James: a motif in James that is unifying.⁸⁸⁵ Some of the studied themes are *too narrow* to be unifying, presenting words or concepts that are absent from significant portions of James. Others are *too broad*, presenting *testing* or a similar concept as the central concept in James. However, *testing* can be narrowed to *eschatological approval* and still encompass the content of the epistle.

In Chapter 2, I presented a method for building a case that eschatological approval is a unifying concept in James. First, I examined *macrostructures*, using the approach of

⁸⁸⁴ Dibelius does admit that a “Christian ethos” is present in James, as well as the theme of the poor and rich, but does not recognise any concept that holds the epistle together. See *James*, 39–50.

⁸⁸⁵ Even though some have tried. See Chapter 1.

discourse analysis to examine larger units. This examination included the identification of *cohesion* and the use of *inclusio* in the epistle. The examination of macrostructures also included *situational features* that help determine the relative importance of each unit: the identification of James as an epistle, its primary hearers as diaspora Jews, and the background of eschatological expectation. Second, I examined *microstructures*, including the analysis of *discourse devices* including word order, information structuring devices, and framing signals. These features marking certain words or phrases for saliency. After discourse devices, this study examined particular words where necessary by consulting lexicons, the context in James, and other Greek documents.

Part Two included the examination of the macrostructures of James using the method discussed above. Chapter 3 discussed the designation of James as an epistle, supported by an examination of the opening and closing of the document.

In Chapter 4, I presented evidence that 1:1–27 serves as the introductory prologue of the epistle. After identifying 1:1–27 as a distinct literary unit, I discussed the introductory nature of James 1. Anticipating objections, I responded to the views that the introduction to James ends at a place other than 1:27.

Chapter 5 is a detailed treatment of the structure of James 2–5. This chapter accomplished two major tasks. First, examining the use of *inclusio* in James 2–5, I defended the idea that the author frames the content of the epistle. The use of *inclusio* impacts how one sees the subunits of James together in Chapter 7. Second, I made a case for the segmentation of James into units, examining both thematic and lexemic cohesive ties. I presented evidence for 4:13–5:6 serving as apostrophe, with content addressed to groups outside the epistle’s primary audience. This segmentation set the foundation for an examination of the salient parts of each, which is described in Chapter 7.

Part Three is focused on the examination of *eschatological approval* in each of the units of James. In Chapter 6, I made a case that the main idea of the introductory prologue is *eschatological approval*. Examining discourse devices in 1:2–4, 1:12, and 1:25, I argued that the focus of each saying is the *favourable result* of divine judgment. Next, the binary choices in the rest of James 1 reveal a consistent pattern of exhortation to *choose the better of two ways* in the introductory prologue. The focal point of each of these exhortations is often its *final result*. The cumulative weight of the prologue points to *eschatological consequences* for the binary choices.

In Chapter 7, I examined *eschatological approval* in James 2–5. With 2:1–13 as a bridge to the rest of the epistle, its concluding sayings (2:12–13), along with 4:11–12, mark a grand *inclusio*. These texts frame the intervening content with the repeated concepts of *speaking, doing, the law, and eschatological judgment*. In James 2:14–26, the author calls his hearers to a faith that has deeds, so they will be approved in the end. James 3:1–12, which is devoted to the tongue, is introduced by *an appeal to judgment*, with the call to avoid the greater scrutiny that teachers receive (3:1). The transition unit of 3:13–18 affirms wisdom that results in righteousness, which will lead to approval. In 4:1–10, the author warns that quarrelling amounts to hostility towards God, calling for submission to God, which leads to eschatological reward. The sayings in 4:11–12 close the *inclusio* that begins at 2:12–13, calling the hearers to remember the judge when they act and speak. Two sections of *apostrophe* in 4:13–5:6 describe the other side of eschatological reversal: the condemnation of arrogant merchants and oppressive rich. By arguing for these sections functioning as *apostrophe*, I built a case that the author reinforces his concern for eschatological approval for his hearers by describing the condemnation of those outside the audience. Finally, the two-part conclusion in 5:7–20 contains the most explicit eschatological content. In 5:7–11, the author urges his hearers to have patience for the parousia, which comes with judgment. James 5:7–11 re-iterates key concepts of the prologue, most notably that *faithful endurance* leads to *blessing*. Even the final sayings in 5:12–20, which signal a letter-closing, contain elements of *eschatological approval* in the appeal to judgment (5:12), spiritual healing (5:16–18), and salvation (5:19–20).

8.2 The Secondary Contributions of this Study

In the process of arguing for a unifying motif in James, this study has contributed to some other debates regarding the epistle of James. In what follows, we will discuss the secondary contributions of this work.

First, this work has furthered the study of the often-overlooked *inclusio* marked by James 2:12–13 and 4:11–12. These two texts frame the intervening content with the common appeals to *speaking* and *acting* following the *law*, in expectation of *judgment*. The *inclusio*, highlighted by Taylor,⁸⁸⁶ strengthens the argument that a unifying motif runs through the epistle, since it represents the portion of the document identified as the main body. Since the

⁸⁸⁶ Taylor, *Text-Linguistic*, 64–65.

inclusio ends at 4:12, it also suggests a distinction between its intervening content and the sections categorised here as *apostrophe* in 4:13–5:6.

Second, this study also identifies a connection between the often-discussed section about *faith and deeds* in James 2:14–26 and the content occurring before and after it. A stumbling block to establishing a unifying motif is the difficulty of identifying an element shared by 2:14–26 with (1) the sections immediately surrounding it, and (2) the rest of the epistle. Thematic studies of James appear to omit either this passage or the content before and after it. Lockett’s study on *purity*, for example, leaves Jas 2 untreated. Hartin’s examination of *perfection* examines 2:14–26 but not 2:1–13 and 3:1–12. These omissions raise the question of whether there is a concept that connects 2:14–26 to its surrounding content. The hope of a favourable eschatological verdict, as this study has argued, links these units together. In other words, *eschatological approval* links the call to identify with the poor in 2:1–13, the treatise on faith and deeds in 2:14–26, and the call to pure use of the tongue in 3:1–12. In fact, through examining each of the major sections of James, this study makes a case that they all point to the author’s concern for eschatological favour.

Also, this study has bolstered two arguments regarding the introduction of the epistle. First, this study has contributed to the discussion of the *extent of the introduction to James*. While scholars differ about where the introductory content ends, the cohesive ties examined in Part Two suggest that all of James 1 is a distinct unit. We have also discussed the introductory nature of the second half of the opening chapter of the epistle. James 1:13–27 features elements which do not occur in the first half of Jas 1, but occur again later in the epistle. Thus, the introductory content extends to the end of James 1. This work, then, has bolstered the “growing consensus”⁸⁸⁷ that James’ major concerns are introduced in its opening chapter.

Also, this study has furthered the discussion of the introductory prologue of James by proposing that it has a *main idea* which pervades the rest of the epistle. In other words, this work has taken the directive role of Jas 1 a step further by contending for an *encompassing concept* in the prologue itself. An examination of (1) the key repeated terms marking the double *inclusio* and (2) the binary choices throughout the prologue points to a constant concern for a favourable eschatological verdict. This concern is epitomised by the key saying

⁸⁸⁷ Guthrie and Taylor, “Structure,” 688.

in 1:12, that those who persevere in obedience to God will be judged in the end, ultimately receiving *eschatological approval*.

Bibliography

- Adam, A. K. M. *James: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013.
- Adams, Marilyn McCord. "Faith and Works or, How James Is a Lutheran!" *ExpTim* 117 (2006): 462–464.
- Adamson, James B. *The Epistle of James*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- . *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. ICC. New York: T&T Clark, 2013.
- . *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- . *Testament of Abraham*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003.
- . "The Fiction of James and Its 'Sitz Im Leben.'" *RB* 108 (2001): 529–70.
- . *The Sermon on the Mount: Inspiring the Moral Imagination*. Companions to the New Testament. New York: Crossroad, 1999.
- Atkinson, Kenneth. *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon: Pseudepigrapha*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 2001.
- Avemarie, Friedrich. "Die Werke des Gesetzes im Spiegel des Jakobusbriefs: A Very Old Perspective on Paul." *ZTK* 98 (2001): 282–309.
- Baasland, Ernst. "Der Jakobusbrief als Neutestamentliche Weisheitsschrift." *ST* 36 (January 1982): 119–39.
- . "Literarische Form, Thematik und geschichtliche Einordnung des Jakobusbriefes." Edited by Wolfgang Haase. *ANRW*, II, 25, no. 5 (1988): 3646–84.
- Balz, Horst Robert, and Wolfgang Schrage. *Die "Katholischen" Briefe: die Briefe des Jakobus, Petrus, Johannes und Judas*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.
- Barclay, John M. G. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Barr, James. *Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Bateman, Herbert W. *Interpreting the General Letters: An Exegetical Handbook*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2013.
- Batten, Alicia J. *Friendship and Benefaction in James*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 15. Dorset: Deo, 2010.
- . "God in the Letter of James: Patron or Benefactor?" *NTS* 50.2 (2004): 257–72.

- . *What Are They Saying about the Letter of James?* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009.
- Batten, Alicia J., and John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *James, First and Second Peter, and Early Jesus Traditions*. LNTS 478. New York: T&T Clark, 2014.
- Bauckham, Richard. *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- . “The Delay of the Parousia.” *TynBul* 31 (1980): 3–36.
- . *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “The Spirit of God in Us Loathes Envy (James 4:5).” In *The Jewish World Around the New Testament: Collected Essays I*, 421–32. WUNT 233. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Edited by Frederick William Danker. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Beale, G. K., William A. Ross, and Daniel J. Brendsel. *An Interpretive Lexicon of New Testament Greek: Analysis of Prepositions, Adverbs, Particles, Relative Pronouns, and Conjunctions*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.
- Bertram, Georg, and Friedrich Hauck. “Μακάριος, Μακαρίζω, Μακαρισμός.” In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain (Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49)*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Black, David Alan. *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.
- Black, David Alan, Katherine Barnwell, and Stephen Levinsohn, eds. *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 1993.
- Blair, Hugh J. “Spiritual Healing: An Inquiry.” *EvQ* 30 (1958): 147–51.
- Blass, F., and A. DeBrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *Neither Poverty nor Riches: A Biblical Theology of Possessions*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000.
- Blomberg, Craig L., and Mariam J. Kamell. *James*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.

- Boggan, C. W. "Wealth in the Epistle of James." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1983.
- Botha, J. Eugene. "Simple Salvation, but Not of Straw . . . Jacobean Soteriology." In *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt, 389–408. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- . "Soteriology Under Construction: The Case of James." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 17 (2006): 100–118.
- Bowden, Andrew M. "An Overview of the Interpretive Approaches to James 5.13–18." *CurBR* 13 (October 1, 2014): 67–81.
- Bray, Gerald L., ed. *James, 1-2 Peter, 1-3 John, Jude*. Vol. XI of *Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2000.
- Brosend, William F., II. *James & Jude*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Brown, Sherri. "Prophetic Endurance and Eschatological Restoration: Exhortation and Conclusion in the Epistle of James." *ExpTim* 130, no. 12 (September 1, 2019): 530–40.
- Bruce, F. F. *Peter, Stephen, James, and John: Studies in Non-Pauline Diversity in the Early Church*. Bath: Kingsley Books, 2017.
- Bryson, Harold T. "What Is Your Life? James 4:13-17." *TTE* 34 (1986): 60–62.
- Burchard, Christoph. *Der Jakobusbrief*. HNT 15. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- . "Zu Jakobus 2, 14-26." *ZNW* 71, no. 1–2 (1980): 27–45.
- Butler, H. E., trans. *Quintilian: Institutio Oratoria: Books I - III*. LCL 124. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Byron, John. "Living in the Shadow of Cain: Echoes of a Developing Tradition in James 5:1-6." *NovT* 48 (2006): 261–74.
- Callow, Kathleen. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- Callow, Kathleen, and John C. Callow. "Text as Purposive Communication: A Meaning-Based Analysis." In *Discourse Description: Diverse Linguistic Analyses of a Fund-Raising Text*, edited by William C. Mann and Sandra A. Thompson, 5–37. *Pragmatics & Beyond* 16. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1992.
- Camp, Ashby L. "Another View on the Structure of James." *ResQ* 36, no. 2 (1994): 111–19.
- Campbell, Constantine R. *Verbal Aspect and Non-Indicative Verbs: Further Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

- Campbell, D. Keith. "Lament in James and Its Significance for the Church." *JETS* 60.1 (2017): 125.
- Cargal, Timothy B. *Restoring the Diaspora: Discursive Structure and Purpose in the Epistle of James*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 1993.
- Carpenter, Craig B. "James 4.5 Reconsidered." *NTS* 47 (April 2001): 189–205.
- Carr, Arthur. *The General Epistle of St. James, with Notes and Introduction*. Edited by J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899.
- Carson, D. A. *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- . "James." In *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, edited by D. A. Carson and G. K. Beale. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Chester, Andrew. *Future Hope and Present Reality: Volume I: Eschatology and Transformation in the Hebrew Bible*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Chester, Andrew, and Ralph P. Martin. *The Theology of the Letters of James, Peter, and Jude*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Cheung, Luke L. *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of James*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003.
- Cheung, Luke L., and Andrew B. Spurgeon. *James: A Pastoral and Contextual Commentary*. Asia Bible Commentary. Carlisle: Langham Global Library, 2018.
- Chilton, Bruce D., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity*. NovTSup 115. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Cladder, H. J. "Die Anlage des Jakobusbriefes." *ZKT* 28, no. 1 (1904): 37–57.
- Collins, C. John. "James 5:14–16a: What is the Anointing For?" *Presb* 23 (1997): 79–91.
- Collins, Raymond C. "Beatitudes." In *Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Conybeare, F. C., and St. George Stock. *A Grammar of Septuagint Greek*. Boston: Ginn, 1905.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "The Message of James." *SJT* 18 (1965): 182–93, 338–45.
- Cranford, Lorin L. "An Exposition of James 2." *SwJT* 29, no. 1 (1986): 19–30.
- Crotty, Robert B. "Identifying the Poor in the Letter of James." *Colloq* 27.1 (1995): 11–21.
- . "The Literary Structure of the Letter of James." *ABR* 40 (1992): 45–57.
- Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus: Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Translated by D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1902.

- Dana, H. E., and Julius R. Mantey. *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. New York: Macmillan, 1993.
- Dauids, Peter H. *The Epistle of James*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1982.
- . “The Good God and the Reigning Lord: Theology of the Epistle of James.” In *Reading the Epistle of James: A Resource for Students*, edited by Eric F. Mason and Darian R. Lockett, 117–28. RBS 94. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019.
- . “The Meaning of ΑΠΕΙΡΑΣΤΟΣ in James i. 13.” *NTS* 24.03 (1978): 386.
- Davidson, Robert. “The Imagery of Isaiah 40:6–8 in Tradition and Interpretation.” In *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, edited by Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon, 37–56. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Dean, Margaret E. “The Grammar of Sound in Greek Texts: Towards a Method of Mapping the Echoes of Speech in Writing.” *ABR* 44 (1996): 53–70.
- DeGraaf, David. “Some Doubts About Doubt: The New Testament Use of ΔΙΑΚΡΙΝΩ.” *JETS* 48, no. 4 (2005): 733–55.
- Deppe, Dean B. “The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James.” Ph.D. diss., Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam, 1989.
- deSilva, David A. “Jews in the Diaspora.” In *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*, edited by Joel B. Green and Lee Martin McDonald, 272–90. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Der Brief des Jakobus*. 6th ed. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- . *James*. Translated by Michael A. Williams. 11th ed. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Dik, Simon C. *The Theory of Functional Grammar, Part 1: The Structure of the Clause*. Edited by Kees Hengeveld. 2nd ed. Functional Grammar Series 20. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- Dooley, Robert A., and Stephen H. Levinsohn. *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts*. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- Dorani, Daniel M. *James*. REC. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2007.
- Edgar, David Hutchinson. *Has God Not Chosen the Poor? The Social Setting of the Epistle of James*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- . “The Use of the Love-Command and the Shema’ in the Epistle of James.” *PIBA* 23 (2000): 9–20.
- Edwards, Dennis R. “Reviving Faith: An Eschatological Understanding of James 5:13-20.” Ph.D. diss., Catholic University of America, 2003.

- Egger, Wilhelm. *How to Read the New Testament: An Introduction to Linguistic and Historico-Critical Methodology*. Edited by Hendrikus Boers. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Elliott, John H. “The Epistle of James in Rhetorical and Social Scientific Perspective: Holiness-Wholeness and Patterns of Replication.” *BTB* 23 (1993): 71–81.
- Elliott-Binns, L. E. “James I. 18: Creation or Redemption?” *NTS* 3 (January 1957): 148–61.
- . “James I. 21 and Ezekiel XVI. 36: An Odd Coincidence.” *ExpTim* 66 (1955): 273.
- Ellis, Nicholas. *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing: Cosmic Trials and Biblical Interpretation in the Epistle of James and Other Jewish Literature*. WUNT 2/396. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Eng, Daniel K. “The Role of Semitic Catchwords in Interpreting the Epistle of James.” *TynBul* 70 (2019): 245–67.
- Epictetus, *The Works of Epictetus: His Discourses, in Four Books, the Enchiridion, and Fragments*, ed. Thomas Wentworth Higginson. Medford, MA: Thomas Nelson, 1890.
- Exler, Francis Xavier J. “The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography.” PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1923.
- Fallon, F., trans. “Eupolemus.” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 2: Expansions of the “Old Testament” and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Firbas, Jan. “From Comparative Word-Order Studies.” *BRNO Studies in English* 4 (1964): 111–26.
- Forbes, P.B.R. “The Structure of the Epistle of James.” *EvQ* 44.3 (1972): 147–53.
- Foster, Robert J. *The Significance of Exemplars for the Interpretation of the Letter of James*. WUNT 2/376. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- France, R. T. “The Church and the Kingdom of God: Some Hermeneutical Issues.” In *Biblical Interpretation and the Church: Text and Context*, edited by D. A. Carson, 30–44. Exeter: Paternoster, 1984.
- Francis, Fred O. “The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and I John.” *ZNW* 61 (1970): 110–125.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. “Das semantische Netz des Jakobusbriefes: Zur Einheit eines umstrittenen Briefes.” *BZ* 34 (1990): 161–97.
- . *Der Brief des Jakobus: Kapitel 1*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994.
- . *Der Brief des Jakobus: Kapitel 2-5*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1994.

- Fresch, Christopher James. "Discourse Markers in the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek with Special Reference to the Twelve." PhD diss., University of Cambridge, 2015.
- Fry, Euan. "The Testing of Faith: A Study of the Structure of the Book of James." *BT* 29 (October 1978): 427–35.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *The Love Command in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1973.
- Gignac, Francis Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, Volume I: Phonology*. Milano: Cisalpino-La Goliardica, 1976.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees: A New Translation, with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976.
- Gowler, David. *James Through the Centuries*. Chichester, West Sussex, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Green, Joel B., and Lee Martin McDonald, eds. *The World of the New Testament: Cultural, Social, and Historical Contexts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Guelich, Robert A. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding*. Waco, TX: Word, 1982.
- Gunawan, Chandra. "The Concept of Faith in The Letter of James in Light of The Wisdom Tradition." *Jurnal Amanat Agung* 11.2 (2015): 255–295.
- Gurry, Peter J., and Tommy Wasserman. "Textual Criticism and the Editio Critica Maior of James." In *Reading the Epistle of James: A Resource for Students*, edited by Eric F. Mason and Darian R. Lockett, 209–29. RBS 94. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019.
- Guthrie, George H. "James." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary, Hebrews–Revelation*, edited by Tremper Longman and David E. Garland, Revised., 197–274. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006.
- . *The Structure of Hebrews: A Text-Linguistic Analysis*. Leiden: Brill Academic Publishers, 1994.
- Guthrie, George H., and Mark E. Taylor. "The Structure of James." *CBQ* 68 (October 2006): 681–705.
- Hahn, Ferdinand, and Peter Müller. "Der Jakobusbrief." *TRu* 63 (1998): 1–73.
- Halliday, M. A. K., and Ruqaiya Hasan. *Cohesion in English*. English Language Series 9. London: Longman, 1976.
- Harner, Philip B. *What Are They Saying about the Catholic Epistles?* Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2004.
- Harris, Murray J. *Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

- Hart, George, and Helen Hart. *A Semantic and Structural Analysis of James*. Dallas: SIL International, 2001.
- Hartin, Patrick J. *A Spirituality of Perfection: Faith in Action in the Letter of James*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- . “Call to Be Perfect through Suffering (James 1,2-4). The Concept of Perfection in the Epistle of James and the Sermon on the Mount.” *Bib* 77.4 (1996): 477–92.
- . “The Letter of James: Faith Leads to Action (The Indicative Leads to the Imperative).” *WW* 35.3 (2015): 222–30.
- . *James*. SP 14. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- . *James and the “Q” Sayings of Jesus*. JSNTSup 47. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991.
- . “‘Who Is Wise and Understanding Among You’ (James 3:13)? An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology and Apocalypticism in the Epistle of James.” *HvTSt* 53 (1997): 969–99.
- Heckert, Jacob K. *Discourse Function of Conjoiners in the Pastoral Epistles*. Dallas: SIL International, 1996.
- Heide, Gale Z. “The Soteriology of James 2:14.” *GTJ* 12 (1992): 69–97.
- Heil, John Paul. *The Letter of James: Worship to Live By*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2012.
- Hengel, Martin. “Der Jakobsbrief als antipaulinische Polemik.” Pages 248–78 in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for His 60th Birthday*. Edited by Gerald F. Hawthorne and Otto Betz. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- . *Paulus und Jakobus: Kleine Schriften III*. WUNT 141. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Hiebert, D. Edmond. *The Epistle of James: Tests of a Living Faith*. Chicago: Moody, 1979.
- . “The Unifying Theme of the Epistle of James.” *BSac* 135 (July 1978): 221–31.
- Hodges, Zane C. *The Epistle of James: Proven Character Through Testing*. Edited by Robert N. Wilkin and Arthur L. Farstad. Irving, TX: Grace Evangelical Society, 1994.
- Hoppe, Rudolf. *Der theologische Hintergrund des Jakobusbriefes*. Würzburg: Echter, 1977.
- Horsley, G. H. R., ed. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1979*. Vol. 4. Marrickville, NSW: Southwood Press, 1987.
- Hort, F. J. A. *The Epistle of St. James*. London: MacMillan, 1909.

- Howell, Timothy D. *The Matthean Beatitudes in Their Jewish Origins: A Literary and Speech Act Analysis*. StBibLit 144. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.
- Huther, Johann Eduard. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the General Epistles of James and John*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1882.
- Isaac, E. "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch: A New Translation and Introduction." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha Volume 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, edited by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Isaacs, Marie E. "Suffering in the Lives of Christians: James 1:2-19a." *RevExp* 97.2 (2000): 183–93.
- Jackson-McCabe, Matt. "A Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora: Wisdom and 'Apocalyptic' Eschatology in the Letter of James," 504–17. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "Enduring Temptation: The Structure and Coherence of the Letter of James." *JSNT* 37, no. 2 (2014): 161–84.
- . *Logos and Law in the Letter of James: The Law of Nature, the Law of Moses and the Law of Freedom*. NovTSup 100. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . "The Messiah Jesus in the Mythic World of James." *JBL* 122.4 (2003): 701–30.
- Jensen, William B., ed. *The Leyden and Stockholm Papyri: Greco-Egyptian Chemical Documents from the Early 4th Century AD*. Translated by Earle Radcliffe Caley. Cincinnati: University of Cincinnati, 2008.
- Jobes, Karen H. *Letters to the Church: A Survey of Hebrews and the General Epistles*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "ἄδης." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- . "Γέννα." In *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- . "Friendship with the World/Friendship with God: A Study of Discipleship in James." In *Discipleship in the New Testament*, edited by Fernando F. Segovia, 166–83. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- . "James 3:13-4:10 and the Topos Περί Φθόνου." *NovT* 25, no. 4 (1983): 327–47.
- . *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 37A. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

- . “The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James.” *JBL* 101 (September 1982): 391–401.
- Kaiser, Ursula Ulrike. “‘Receive the Innate Word That Is Able to Save You’ (Jas 1:21b): Soteriology in the Epistle of James.” In *Sōtēria: Salvation in Early Christianity and Antiquity*, edited by David S. du Toit, Christine Gerber, and Christiane Zimmermann, 460–75. NovTSup 175. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Kamell, Mariam J. “The Soteriology of James in Light of Earlier Jewish Wisdom Literature and the Gospel of Matthew.” PhD diss., University of St Andrews, 2010.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *New Testament Questions of Today*. London: SCM, 1969.
- Keck, Leander E. “Poor Among the Saints in the New Testament.” *ZNW* 56 (1965): 100–129.
- Kistemaker, Simon J. “The Theological Message of James.” *JETS* 29 (1986): 55–61.
- Klawans, Jonathan. “The Prohibition of Oaths and Contra-Scriptural Halakhot: A Response to John P. Meier.” *Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus* 6.1 (2008): 33–58.
- Klein, Martin. *Ein vollkommenes Werk: Vollkommenheit, Gesetz und Gericht als theologische Themen des Jakobusbriefes*. BWANT. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995.
- Klein, Thorsten. *Bewährung in Anfechtung der Jakobusbrief und der Erste Petrusbrief als christliche Diaspora-Briefe*. Tübingen: Francke, 2011.
- Kittel, Gerhard. “Der geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes.” *ZNW* 41 (1942): 71–105.
- Kloppenborg, John S. “Diaspora Discourse: The Construction of Ethos in James.” *NTS* 53.02 (2007): 242.
- Knowling, R. J. *The Epistle of St James*. 3rd ed. Westminster Bible Commentaries. London: Methuen, 1911.
- Konradt, Matthias. *Christliche Existenz nach dem Jakobusbrief: eine Studie zu seiner soteriologischen und ethischen Konzeption*. SUNT 22. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., Benjamin L. Merkle, and Robert L. Plummer. *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Study of the Grammar and Syntax of the New Testament*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016.
- Kovalishyn, Mariam Kamell. “James and Apocalyptic Wisdom.” Pages 293–306 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought*. Edited by Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017.
- . “Salvation in James: Saved by Gift to Become Merciful.” In *Reading the Epistle of James: A Resource for Students*, edited by Eric F. Mason and Darian R. Lockett, 129–44. RBS 94. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019.
- Kraft, Robert, ed. *The Testament of Job According to the SV Text*. SBLTTS 5. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974.

- Kroll, Woodrow. *James: Living Your Faith*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2007.
- Krüger, René. *Der Jakobusbrief als prophetische Kritik der Reichen: Eine exegetische Untersuchung aus lateinamerikanischer Perspektive*. Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel 12. Münster: Lit, 2005.
- Kuhn, Karl Georg. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, edited by Krister Stendahl, 94–113. London: SCM, 1958.
- Laato, Timo. "Justification According to James: A Comparison with Paul." *TJ* 18.1 (1997): 43–84.
- Lambrecht, Knud. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus, and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Lange, Johann Peter, and J. J. van Oosterzee. *The Epistle General of James*. Translated by Jacob Isidor Mombert. 2nd ed. New York: Scribner, 1867.
- Laws, Sophie S. *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. BNTC. London: Black, 1980.
- . "Does Scripture Speak in Vain? A Reconsideration of James IV. 5." *NTS* 20 (January 1974): 210–15.
- . "The Doctrinal Basis for the Ethics of James." In *SE*, 7:299–305. Papers Presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies Held at Oxford, 1973. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. "A Discourse Study of Constituent Order and the Article in Philippians." In *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 60–74. JSNTSup 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- . *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- . *Self-Instruction Materials on Non-Narrative Discourse Analysis*. Dallas: SIL International, 2015.
- Lewis, Floyd. "The Conversation of a Christian: James 1:26; 3:1-12." *TTE* 34 (1986): 43–47.
- Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon: With a Revised Supplement*. Edited by Sir Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Lips, Hermann von. *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament*. WMANT 64. München: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- Llewelyn, S. R. "The Prescript of James." *NovT* 39 (October 1997): 385–93.
- Lockett, Darian. *An Introduction to the Catholic Epistles*. London: T&T Clark, 2012.

- . *Letters from the Pillar Apostles: The Formation of the Catholic Epistles as a Canonical Collection*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2017.
- . *Purity and Worldview in the Epistle of James*. LNTS 366. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- . “The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and 4QInstruction.” *TynBul* 56 (2005): 131–48.
- Lodge, John G. “James and Paul at Cross-Purposes? James 2, 22.” *Bib* 62.2 (1981): 195–213.
- Longacre, Robert E. *The Grammar of Discourse*. Topics in Language and Linguistics. New York: Plenum, 1983.
- Louw, J. P. *Semantics of New Testament Greek*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Louw, Johannes, and Eugene A. Nida, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1999.
- Luck, Ulrich. “Die Theologie des Jakobusbriefes.” *ZTK* 81.1 (1984): 1–30.
- Luraghi, Silvia. *On the Meaning of Prepositions and Cases: The Expression of Semantic Roles in Ancient Greek*. Studies in Language Companion Series 67. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2003.
- Luther, Martin. “Prefaces to the New Testament.” In *Word and Sacrament I*, edited by E. Theodore Bachman, translated by Charles M. Jacobs, Vol. 35. Luther’s Works. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, 1960.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. JSJSup 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Moral Exhortation: A Greco-Roman Sourcebook*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Malina, Bruce J., and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 2002.
- Marcus, Joel. “Entering into the Kingly Power of God.” *JBL* 107 (1988): 663–75.
- . “‘The Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora’ (James 1.1).” *NTS* 60.04 (2014): 433–47.
- Martin, Ralph P. *James*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word, 1988.
- Mathewson, David, and Elodie Ballantine Emig. *Intermediate Greek Grammar: Syntax for Students of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.
- May, Jonathan G. “Covenant Loyalty and the Goodness of God: A Study in the Theology of James.” PhD diss., University of Glasgow, 2002.
- Maynard-Reid, Pedrito U. *Poverty and Wealth in James*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.

- Mayor, Joseph B. *The Epistle of St. James: The Greek Text with Introduction Notes and Comments*. 3rd ed. London: MacMillan, 1910.
- McCartney, Dan G. *James*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- . “The Wisdom of James the Just.” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 4.3 (2000): 52–64.
- McKnight, Edgar V., and Christopher Lee Church. *Hebrews-James*. SHBC. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2004.
- McKnight, Scot. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2005.
- . *The Letter of James*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Metzner, Rainer. “Der Lehrer Jakobus: Überlegungen zur Verfasserfrage des Jakobusbriefes.” *ZNW* 104.2 (2013): 238–67.
- Meyer, Arnold. *Das Rätsel des Jakobusbriefes*. BZNW 10. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930.
- Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 25B. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987.
- Mongstad-Kvammen, Ingeborg. *Toward a Postcolonial Reading of the Epistle of James: James 2:1-13 in Its Roman Imperial Context*. BibInt 119. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Montanari, Franco. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Letter of James: Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985.
- . *The Letter of James*. PilNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Moore, Arthur L. *The Parousia in the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1966.
- Morales, Nelson R. *Poor and Rich in James: A Relevance Theory Approach to James’s Use of the Old Testament*. BBRSup 20. University Park: Eisenbrauns, 2018.
- Morgan, Christopher W. *A Theology of James: Wisdom for God’s People*. Explorations in Biblical Theology. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2010.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Mounce, William D. *The Morphology of Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Revised. Louvain: Peeters, 2009.

- . *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
- Mußner, Franz. *Der Jakobusbrief*. HThKNT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1987.
- Myllykoski, Matti. “James the Just in History and Tradition: Perspectives of Past and Present Scholarship (Part I).” *CurBR* 5 (2006): 73–122.
- Ng, Esther Yue L. “Father-God Language and Old Testament Allusions in James.” *TynBul* 54 (2003): 41–54.
- Nida, Eugene A., and J. P. Louw. *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. RBS 25. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. “Der erinnerte Jesus bei Jakobus: Ein Beitrag zur Einleitung in einen umstrittenen Brief.” Pages 307–29 in *Spurensuche zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament: eine Festschrift im Dialog mit Udo Schnelle*. FRLANT 271. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.
- . “Der Jakobusbrief im Licht frühjüdischer Diasporabriefe.” *NTS* 44 (1998): 420.
- . “Jakobus und Paulus über das Innere des Menschen und den Ursprung seiner ethischen Entscheidungen.” *NTS* 62 (2016): 1–30.
- Nystrom, David P. *James*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Obermüller, Rudolf. “Hermeneutische Themen im Jakobusbrief.” *Bib* 53, no. 2 (1972): 234–44.
- O’Brien, Peter T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. NovTSup 49. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Matthew*. ZECNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- . *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Revised. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006.
- Painter, John. *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1997.
- Parunak, H. Van Dyke. “Transitional Techniques in the Bible.” *JBL* 102, no. 4 (December 1983): 525–48.
- Penner, Todd C. *The Epistle of James and Eschatology: Re-Reading an Ancient Christian Letter*. JSNTSup 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Pennington, Jonathan T. *The Sermon on the Mount and Human Flourishing: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017.
- Perdue, Leo G. “Paraenesis and the Epistle of James.” *ZNW* 72 (1981): 241–56.
- Perkins, David W. “The Wisdom We Need: James 1:5-8, 3:13-18.” *TTE* 34 (1986): 17–25.

- Perrin, Norman. *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*. NTL. London: SCM, 1963.
- Pickar, Charles H. "Is Anyone Sick Among You?" *CBQ* 7 (April 1945): 165–74.
- Plummer, Alfred. *The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude*. The Expositor's Bible. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.
- Plumptre, E. H. *The General Epistle of St. James, with Notes and Introduction*. The Cambridge Bible for Schools. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1878.
- Popkes, Wiard. *Adressaten, Situation und Form des Jakobusbriefes*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986.
- . *Der Brief des Jakobus*. THKNT 14. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2001.
- . "James and Scripture: An Exercise in Intertextuality." *NTS* 45.2 (1999): 213–229.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Studies: An Introductory Survey." In *Discourse Analysis and New Testament*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, 14–35. JSNTSup 113. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- . *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Biblical Languages: Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- . "Is 'dipsuchos' (James 1,8; 4,8) a 'Christian' Word?" *Bib* 71 (1990): 469–98.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Chris S. Stevens. "Doubting BDAG on Doubt: A Lexical Examination of Δικαίω and Its Theological Ramifications." *Filología Neotestamentaria* 30 (2017): 43–70.
- Prockter, Lewis J. "James 4.4–6: Midrash on Noah." *NTS* 35 (October 1989): 625–27.
- Prothro, James B. "The Strange Case of Δικαίω in the Septuagint and Paul: The Oddity and Origins of Paul's Talk of 'Justification.'" *ZNW* 107 (2016): 48–69.
- Quarles, Charles L. *Sermon on the Mount: Restoring Christ's Message to the Modern Church*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2011.
- Rakestraw, Robert V. "Does James Contradict the Pauline Soteriology?" *CTR* 1 (1986): 31–50.
- Raymond E. Brown. *New Testament Essays*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1965.
- Reed, Jeffrey T. "Cohesive Ties in 1 Timothy: In Defense of the Epistle's Unity." *Neot* 26 (1992): 131–47.
- . "The Cohesiveness of Discourse: Towards a Model of Linguistic Criteria for Analyzing New Testament Discourse." In *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, edited by Jeffrey T. Reed and Stanley E. Porter, 28–46. JSNTSup 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

- Reed, Jeffrey T., and Stanley E. Porter, eds. *Discourse Analysis and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*. JSNTSup 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Reicke, Bo. *The Epistles of James, Peter, and Jude*. AB. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1964.
- Rhee, Helen. *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty, and Early Christian Formation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Richardson, Kurt Anders. *James*. NAC 36. Nashville: B&H, 1997.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Doran, 1919.
- Ropes, James Hardy. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916.
- Rowland, Christopher. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK, 1982.
- Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2010.
- . ed. *Discourse Studies and Biblical Interpretation: A Festschrift in Honor of Stephen H. Levinsohn*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012.
- Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Scheppers, Frank. *The Colon Hypothesis: Word Order, Discourse Segmentation and Discourse Coherence in Ancient Greek*. Brussels: VUB Press, 2011.
- Schnider, Franz. *Der Jakobusbrief*. RNT 20. Regensburg: Verlag F. Pustet, 1987.
- Schreiner, Thomas R., and Ardel B. Caneday. *The Race Set Before Us: A Biblical Theology of Perseverance and Assurance*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2001.
- Seneca, *Moral Essays: Volume 1*. ed. John W. Basore. Medford, MA: Heinemann, 1928.
- Silva, Moises. *Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Sim, David C. *Apocalyptic Eschatology in the Gospel of Matthew*. SNTSMS 88. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. “Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament.” *JSNT* 2, no. 8 (May 1, 1980): 24–45.
- Snyrnan, A. H. “Discourse Analysis: A Semantic Discourse Analysis of the Letter to Philemon.” In *Text and Interpretation: New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament*, edited by P. J. Hartin and J. H. Petzer, 83–99. NTTS 15. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- Spitaler, Peter. “James 1:5-8: A Dispute with God.” *CBQ* 71, no. 3 (July 2009): 560–79.

- . “Διακρίνεσθαι in Mt. 21:21, Mk. 11:23, Acts 10:20, Rom. 4:20, 14:23, Jas. 1:6, and Jude 22—the ‘Semantic Shift’ That Went Unnoticed by Patristic Authors.” *NovT* 49, no. 1 (2007): 1–39.
- Spitta, Friedrich. *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des urchristentums: Zweiter Band: Der Brief des Jakobus*. Studien zum Hirten des Hermas. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893.
- Stein, Robert H. “‘Saved by Faith [Alone]’ in Paul Versus ‘Not Saved by Faith Alone’ in James.” *The Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 4.3 (2000): 4–19.
- Stringfellow, William. *Count It All Joy*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1999.
- Stokes, Ryan E. “The Devil and Demons in the Epistle of James.” In *Reading the Epistle of James: A Resource for Students*, edited by Eric F. Mason and Darian R. Lockett, 145–60. RBS 94. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. LEC 5. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Sunukjian, Donald R. *Invitation to James: Persevering Through Trials to Win the Crown*. Wooster, OH: Weaver Book Company, 2014.
- Tamez, Elsa. “James: A Circular Letter for Immigrants.” Translated by Gloria Kinsler. *RevExp* 108.3 (2011): 369–80.
- . *The Scandalous Message of James: Faith without Works Is Dead*. New York: Crossroad, 2002.
- Tan, Kim Huat. “James and the Shema.” *TTJ* 15 (2007): 113–28.
- Taylor, Mark Edward. *A Text-Linguistic Investigation into the Discourse Structure of James*. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- . “Recent Scholarship on the Structure of James.” *CurBR* 3.1 (2004): 86–115.
- Terry, Ralph Bruce. “Some Aspects of the Discourse Structure of the Book of James.” *JOTT* 5 (1992): 106–25.
- Thielman, Frank S. “James: The Wisdom of the Undivided Life.” Pages 496–511 in *Theology of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Zondervan, 2005.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. *Life after Death: A New Approach to the Last Things*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Thucydides, *Thucydides Translated into English; with Introduction, Marginal Analysis, Notes, and Indices, ed. Benjamin Jowett, vol. 1*. Medford, MA: Clarendon, 1881.
- Thurén, Lauri. “Risky Rhetoric in James?” *NovT* 37 (1995): 262–84.
- Titrud, Kermit. “The Function of Καί in the Greek New Testament and an Application to 2 Peter.” In *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse*

- Analysis*, edited by David Alan Black, Katherine Barnwell, and Stephen Levinsohn, 240–70. Nashville: B&H Academic, 1993.
- Townsend, Michael J. *The Epistle of James*. London: Epworth Press, 1994.
- Tsuji, Manabu. *Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung: eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- van de Sandt, Huub. “James 4,1-4 in the Light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition 3,1-6.” *Bib* 88 (2007): 38–63.
- Varner, William C. *James: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Lexington, KY: Fontes, 2017.
- . *The Book of James—A New Perspective*. Woodlands, TX: Kress Biblical Resources, 2010.
- . “The Main Theme and Structure of James.” *MSJ* 22, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 115–29.
- Verseput, Donald J. “James 1:17 and the Jewish Morning Prayers.” *NovT* 39, no. 2 (1997): 177–91.
- Vlachos, Chris A. *James. Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2013.
- Wachob, Wesley Hiram. “The Apocalyptic Intertexture of the Epistle of James.” In *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse in the New Testament*, edited by Duane F. Watson, 165–86. SBLSS 14. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2002.
- . *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*. SNTSMS 106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Walker, Donald Dale. *Paul’s Offer of Leniency (2 Cor 10:1): Populist Ideology and Rhetoric in a Pauline Letter Fragment*. WUNT 152. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Wall, Robert W. *Community of the Wise: The Letter of James*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1997.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Warrington, Keith. “Some Observations on James 5:13–18.” *JEPTA* 8 (1989): 160–72.
- Watson, Duane F. “James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation.” *NTS* 39.01 (1993): 94.
- Weima, Jeffrey A. D. *Paul the Ancient Letter Writer: An Introduction to Epistolary Analysis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Wendland, Ernst R. “‘Let No One Disregard You!’ (Titus 2:15): Church Discipline and the Construction of Discourse in a Personal, ‘Pastoral’ Epistle.” In *Discourse Analysis*

- and the New Testament: Approaches and Results*, edited by Jeffrey T. Reed and Stanley E. Porter, 334–51. JSNTSup 170. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Weren, Wim J. C. “The Ideal Community According to Matthew, James, and the Didache.” In *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings*, edited by Hubertus Waltherus Maria van de Sandt and Jürgen Zangenberg, 177–200. SBLSymS 45. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SCS 39. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- White, John Lee. *Light from Ancient Letters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- . *The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter*. Missoula, MT: SBL Press, 1972.
- Williams, H. H. Drake, III. “Of Rags and Riches: The Benefits of Hearing Jeremiah 9:23-24 within James 1:9-11.” *TynBul* 53 (2002): 273–282.
- Wilson, Walter T. “Sin as Sex and Sex with Sin: The Anthropology of James 1:12-15.” *HTR* 95.02 (2002).
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Letters and Homilies for Jewish Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Hebrews, James and Jude*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2007.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm H. “Der Jakobusbrief im Licht der Rhetorik und Textpragmatik.” *LB* 43 (1978): 5–66.
- Wypadlo, Adrian. *Viel vermag das inständige Gebet eines Gerechten*. Würzburg: Echter, 2006.
- Zmijewski, Josef, and A. Fuchs. “Christliche ‘Vollkommenheit’: Erwägungen zur Theologie Des Jakobusbriefes.” *SNTSU* 5 (1980): 50–78.
- Zuck, Roy B., and Darrell L. Bock, eds. *A Biblical Theology of the New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1994.

Appendix: The Role of Semitic Catchwords in Interpreting the Epistle of James

Eng, Daniel K. “The Role of Semitic Catchwords in Interpreting the Epistle of James.”
Tyndale Bulletin 70 (2019): 245–67.

Reproduced with Permission.

THE ROLE OF SEMITIC CATCHWORDS IN INTERPRETING THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

Daniel K. Eng
(DanielKEng@gmail.com)

Summary

This article examines the arrangement of the Epistle of James in light of Semitic documents that display catchword association. James shows evidence of being a compilation, with adjacent sections frequently connected by a common cognate. After identifying patterns of catchword association in the Hebrew Bible, LXX, and Qumran, the article identifies instances of catchword association in the Epistle of James. Finally, some conclusions are drawn for James, including recommendations about the study of its genre, provenance, structure, and interpretation.¹

1. Introduction


This article examines the interpretation of the Epistle of James in light of Semitic documents that display catchword association. James shows evidence of having adjacent sections frequently connected by a common cognate, called a catchword, or *Stichwort*. While not necessarily displaying logical progression, the epistle shows consistency with an intentional Semitic custom of connecting material by catchword. After identifying patterns of catchword association in Jewish documents, we will examine similar arrangements in James and

¹ Earlier versions of this article were presented at the Oxford-Cambridge Biblical Studies Conference, the British New Testament Conference, and the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, all in 2018. The author would like to thank those who gave helpful advice and feedback, especially K. Lawson Younger Jr., C. Hassell Bullock, J. LaRae Ferguson, David A. deSilva, Darian Lockett, Andrew Yee, and Jonathan Robinson.

offer recommendations on how the identification of catchword association impacts the interpretation of the epistle.

For the purposes of this study, the phrase ‘catchword association’ refers to the adjacent placing of distinct sections of text, linked by a common lexeme.² In his 1983 article,³ H. Van Dyke Parunak offers a delineation of various methods of structuring a biblical document that largely trace back to continental scholar David Müller.⁴ Müller pointed to a structuring technique called *concatenation*, which refers to the ‘recurrence of similar features at the end of one structural unit and the beginning of the next’.⁵ Parunak goes on to define different categories of linguistic similarities that can occur between two units linked by concatenation.⁶ For the present study we will focus on common lexemes that occur in consecutive sections, with the most compelling cases being what Parunak calls *lexical similarity*, a common lexeme occurring at the adjoining ends of both sections.

Concatenation based on lexical similarity can be diagrammed in this way, with the boxes representing units of text and the dots representing a particular repeated lexeme:



² This is distinct from the phenomenon which Shamir Yona and Ariel Ram Pasternak call *anadiplosis*, a word or group of words appearing at the end of a given stich, verset, or verse repeated at the beginning of the following stich, verset, or verse. The authors also call this device *concatenation*. They demonstrate that anadiplosis occurs within the same section of section or even the same verse, such as עֲזָרָי at the end of Ps. 121:1 and beginning of Ps. 121:2, or the repetition of בְּצֶלֶם in consecutive clauses in Gen. 1:27. See Shamir Yona and Ariel Ram Pasternak, ‘Concatenation in Ancient Near East Literature, Hebrew Scripture and Rabbinic Literature’, *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 22 (2019): 46-92.

³ H. Van Dyke Parunak, ‘Transitional Techniques in the Bible’, *JBL* 102 (1983): 525. Parunak reports on this school of thought to supplement the American and British lineage that looked for patterns like *alternation* and *chiasm*.

⁴ David Heinrich Müller, *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form, die Grundgesetze der ursemitischen Poesie, erschlossen und nachgewiesen in Bibel, Keilinschriften und Koran und in ihren Wirkungen erkannt in den Chören der griechischen Tragödie* (Wien: A. Hölder, 1896).

⁵ Parunak, ‘Transitional Techniques in the Bible’, 526.

⁶ These are *phonological*, *morphological*, *lexical*, *syntactic*, and *logical*. Parunak, ‘Transitional Techniques in the Bible’, 528.

This study brings the Epistle of James into comparison with Semitic documents that display catchword association for three reasons. First, the epistle is addressed to the twelve tribes in the Diaspora, as stated in James 1:1. There is nothing in the text that refutes the view that the audience of the epistle is ethnically Jewish⁷ and familiar with catchwords as a literary device. Second, while James contains easily delineable sections, the document as a whole has proven to be a challenge to outline. A glance at commentaries offers many different outlines to James, seemingly as many as there are commentators. As we will see below, Semitic documents often contain easily decipherable sections that do not necessarily progress in logic from one section of text to the next. Third, catchword association in James has been observed by a number of scholars, as there are lexemes that are repeated across adjacent sections of James, which we will examine below. This study aims to make two contributions to biblical studies: (1) a delineation of the usage of catchwords in Semitic documents across different genres; and (2) examining the content of James in light of these documents.

2. Examining Semitic Documents

In each example from Semitic documents below, we will examine how a common lexeme occurs in two adjacent sections of text, linking the two sections together. Scholars have identified a myriad of catchword associations. While some are more compelling than others, this article will present prominent instances across different genres.

Principle	Brief description
1	Disparity of the sections
2	Scarcity of the catchword in the entire document
3	More than one catchword connecting the two sections
4	Catchwords occurring at the end of one section and the beginning of the next
5	Catchwords in both Hebrew and Greek
6	Catchword is not related to the main topic
7	Catchword is used in different ways in the two sections

⁷ Luke Timothy Johnson, *Brother of Jesus, Friend of God: Studies in the Letter of James* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004): 37; Craig L. Blomberg and Mariam J. Kamell, *James* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008): 28.

This study will employ *seven principles* in identifying instances of catchword association, delineated in the table above. First, the more *disparate* the sections are, the more likely it is the case that they are adjacent based on a common lexeme or cognate. Second, the *rarer* the catchword(s) is in the *entire* document, the more likely it is being used to connect sections of text within the document. Third, catchword association is more likely to be the case if there is *more than one word* connecting the two sections. Fourth, catchword association can take different forms. Most notably, the catchword or catchwords in view often occur close to the end of the previous section, closer to the beginning of the next section, or both. The technique of catchwords specifically occurring at the *adjoining ends of consecutive sections* is the specific arrangement Müller categorises as *concatenatio* and Parunak calls ‘the link’.⁸ Fifth, catchword association is even more remarkable if it occurs in *both Hebrew and Greek*, for this suggests the plausibility that the translators were aware of such connections and kept them in their translation. Instances of this arrangement in both languages will be highlighted below. Sixth, catchword association is more convincing if the repeated word is *not related to the main topic of discussion* in one or both of the texts. Seventh, catchword association is also more compelling if the repeated word is *used in different ways* in the two texts. With these principles in mind, we will examine some instances of catchword association below.

2.1 *Leviticus*

Leviticus 17 shows evidence that it is linked to the previous material through catchwords. The disparity between the Holiness Code in Leviticus (starting in ch. 17) and the material directly preceding has contributed to suggestions that Leviticus is a compilation of pre-existing material.⁹ Often said to be of a different source from the priestly material in Leviticus 1–16,¹⁰ there is a transition from cultic

⁸ Parunak, ‘Transitional Techniques in the Bible’, 530-31.

⁹ There are other factors that lead scholars to suggest that Leviticus is an arrangement of pre-existing material. See Lloyd R. Bailey, *Leviticus–Numbers* (SHBC; Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys, 2005): 23-25. Sometimes the Holiness Code is demarcated as chapters 17–27. See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 3B; New York: Doubleday, 2000): viii; Gordon Wenham, *Exploring the Old Testament: The Pentateuch* (London: SPCK, 2003): 95.

¹⁰ Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 3A; New York: Doubleday, 1991): 61.

practice to ethical content at Leviticus 17.¹¹ The Holiness Code, which is often punctuated by the calls to *be holy as YHWH is holy*, is linked to the previous chapter by the term **כִּפֹּר**, the act of *atonement*. This is found in Leviticus 17:11 and also occurs throughout chapter 16 (16:6,10,11,16,17,18,20,24,27,30,32,33,34). Jacob Milgrom views Leviticus 17 as a chiasm, centred at 17:10-12.¹² The term for *atonement*, then, would connect this centre to the previous chapter. The disparate nature of Leviticus 16 and 17 (Principle 1) and the fact that the connection occurs in both Hebrew and Greek (Principle 5) together suggest that these passages are connected by catchword.

Even more compelling evidence that Leviticus 16 and 17 are connected by catchword is found with the term **שָׂעִיר** (*goat*), which is not the main topic of Leviticus 16 or 17 (Principle 6). Chapter 17 begins with commands regarding the slaughter and consumption of meat.¹³ Umberto Cassuto points out that these commands that begin the Holiness Code come right after the material about the Day of Atonement with the connection of *goats*. In the first command, animals for sacrifice are to be slaughtered in the correct place, and the people are not to sacrifice to the *goat demons*, or *satyrs* (Principle 7). The term **שָׂעִיר** in the Holiness Code connects to the repeated instances of the *goats* of sacrifice for the Day of Atonement (16:5,7,8,9,10,15,18,20,21, 22,26,27).¹⁴ Parunak refers to this connection of a repeated keyword in one unit and the extreme of an adjoining unit as ‘the linked keyword’,¹⁵ a subset of the larger category of concatenation.

2.2 Numbers

Numbers 5 contains a series of passages that appear disparate (Principle 1). After commands to put out those who are unclean (5:1-4), instructions about restitution for sin are given (5:5-10), and then instructions about wives suspected of unfaithfulness (5:11-29). The section regarding the suspected wife is ‘attracted’ to the section about restitution for sin through a catch phrase.¹⁶ While the root **מעל** occurs

¹¹ Bailey, *Leviticus–Numbers*, 197.

¹² Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1449.

¹³ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1449.

¹⁴ Umberto Cassuto, ‘The Sequence and Arrangement of Biblical Sections’ in *Biblical and Oriental Studies, Volume 1: Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes; tr. from Hebrew and Italian, 1973): 2-3.

¹⁵ Parunak, ‘Transitional Techniques in the Bible’, 532.

¹⁶ Cassuto, ‘The Sequence and Arrangement of Biblical Sections’, 4.

often in Numbers, its *doubling* in the form of a cognate accusative occurs only three times (Principle 2), in these very instances in Numbers 5:

Numbers 5:6 Speak to the Israelites: When a man or a woman wrongs another, **breaking faith** with the LORD, that person incurs guilt, (NRSV)

דִּבֶּר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אִישׁ אִוְ-אִשָּׁה כִּי יַעֲשֶׂוּ מִכֶּל-חֲטָאת הָאָדָם
לְמַעַל מַעַל בֵּיהוָה וְאִשָּׁמָה הַנִּפְשׁ הֵהוּא:

Numbers 5:12 Speak to the Israelites and say to them: If any man's wife goes astray and is **unfaithful** to him,

דִּבֶּר אֶל-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵהֶם אִישׁ אִישׁ כִּי-תִשָּׂטֵה אִשְׁתּוֹ
וּמַעֲלָה בּוֹ מַעַל:

Numbers 5:27b ... if she has defiled herself and **has been unfaithful** to her husband ...

אִם-נִטְמָמָהּ וְתַמְעַל מַעַל בְּאִשָּׁה

Notably, the Old Greek of Numbers 5:6 and 5:12 also displays the *concatenation* identified by Müller (Principle 5), as they are the only places in numbers that contain the corresponding term παραοράω (Principle 2).¹⁷

2.3 Psalms

Franz Delitzsch advises that the ‘principle of homogeneity’ is a Semitic custom that often governs the grouping of the psalms.¹⁸ More recently, Erich Zenger championing *Psalterexegese*, the study of the psalms as a unity rather than as individual psalms (*Psalmenexegese*), demonstrates how *Stichwortbeziehung* connects consecutive psalms.¹⁹ Space allows for only several examples in the Psalter here. Zenger demonstrates the concatenation of the *name* of YHWH at the end of Psalm 7 and beginning of Psalm 8 (7:18 and 8:2) as well as the end of Psalm 8 and the beginning of Psalm 9 (8:10 and 9:3). Delitzsch likewise shows the

¹⁷ The subjunctive is doubled with the participle in 5:6 (παριδὼν παριδῆ) but 5:12 uses the related term ὑπεροράω in the participle. Neither occurs in 5:27.

¹⁸ Franz Delitzsch, *A Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls; tr. from German, 1883): 26.

¹⁹ Erich Zenger, ‘Psalmenexegese und Psalterexegese: Eine Forschungsskizze’ in *The Composition of the Book of Psalms*, ed. Erich Zenger (BETL, 238; Leuven: Peeters, 2010): 31-34.

link between Psalm 9:10 with 10:1, with the phrase **לְעֵתוֹת בְּצָרָה**, *in times of trouble*.²⁰ These pairings demonstrate Principles 1, 3, and 5. Amos Hakham highlights the placement of Psalm 25 based on the verb **נָשָׂא** (*lift*) in 25:1, which occurs six times in Psalm 24 (24:4,5,7,9) used in different ways (Principle 7). Hakham also sees the connections between Psalms 25 and 26 based on the inflected form **בְּטַחְתִּי** (*I trust*, 25:2 and 26:1) and **תָּם** (*integrity*, 25:21 and 26:1; Principles 3, 4).²¹ Delitzsch also points out that Psalms 34 and 35 are placed together, being the only Psalms in which the ‘angel of the LORD’ is mentioned (Ps. 34:8; 35:5-6; Principles 1, 2, 3).²² Notably, these are the only two psalms that contain the phrase *ἄγγελος κυρίου* in the LXX (Principles 2, 4). He also links Psalms 55 and 56 based on a connection of the root **יֹנָה** (55:7 and 56:1).²³ This connection is particularly compelling because of (1) the rarity of this root in the Psalter (only occurring one other time, 68:14), and (2) the fact that it is used in different ways, describing a *dove* in 55:7 and a proper name in 56:1 (Principles 2, 7). Michael G. McKelvey links Psalm 90:10 and 91:5 through the root **עוּף** (*to fly*), of which the verbal form only occurs four times in the Psalter (Principle 2).²⁴ This connection of catchword association is also particularly compelling, as McKelvey correctly points out that they are used in different contexts: the ‘brevity of life’ in 90:10 and the protection from flying arrows in 91:5 (Principle 1, 6). He also connects Psalms 90 and 91 through the terms **אֶלֶף** (*thousand*, 90:4; 91:7) and **מְעוֹן** (*dwelling place*, 90:1; 91:9), both of which are rare in the Psalter and are used in different contexts in these consecutive psalms (Principles 2, 7).²⁵ David M. Howard Jr notes the concatenation between the end of Psalm 96 and the beginning of Psalm 97, linked through the phrases **יְהוָה מְלִךְ** (*YHWH reigns*, 96:10; 97:1) and **תִּגְלַח הָאָרֶץ** (*let the earth rejoice*, 96:11; 97:1). He further points out that the two psalms are linked through other key words, especially the only

²⁰ Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 27. Note that Pss. 9 and 10 are listed as one psalm in the LXX, with 10:1 in the MT being 9:22 in the LXX.

²¹ Amos Hakham, *The Bible: Psalms with the Jerusalem Commentary* (Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook, 2003), 1: xxxiv.

²² Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 26.

²³ Delitzsch, *Psalms*, 26.

²⁴ The other two instances are Ps. 18:11 and Ps. 55:7.

²⁵ Michael G. McKelvey, *Moses, David and the High Kingship of Yahweh: A Canonical Study of Book IV of the Psalter* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias, 2014): 47-48.

occurrences of אֱלֹהִים (worthless idols, 96:5; 97:7) in the Psalter (Principle 2).²⁶ Michael K. Snearly notes the concatenation between Psalms 108–100 through the noun יָמִין (right hand, 108:7; 109:6,31; 110:1,5). He makes an even stronger case for concatenation through the root ראש (head or beginning), which is used in different contexts (Principle 7) in consecutive Psalms (108:9; 109:25; 110:6,7; 111:10).²⁷

2.4 Proverbs

While there is no consensus on subunits within the book of Proverbs, the arrangements show evidence of deliberate placement, especially with the usage of catchword association.²⁸ Ted Hildebrandt, arguing against the view that Proverbs is ‘thrown together willy-nilly’, makes a case for pairs of proverbs linked together through different means, including catchwords.²⁹ He demonstrates how Proverbs 26:4-5 are connected by ‘multi-catchword cohesion’, with the repeated combination of תַּעַן בְּסִיל (answer a fool) and כְּאִוֵּלָתוֹ (according to his folly, Principle 3).³⁰ The cohesion also occurs in the LXX (Principle 6) with ἀποκρίνου ἄφρονι (answer a fool) and τὴν ἀφροσύνην (folly). He further points out the multi-catchword cohesion in Proverbs 15:8-9, with the repeated terms תּוֹעֵבַת יְהוָה (abomination to YHWH) and the root רשע (wicked) in both sayings (Principle 3).³¹ The association also occurs in the LXX, with βδέλυγμα κυρίῳ (abomination to the Lord) and ἀσεβής (ungodly, Principle 6). There is also multi-catchword connection in Proverbs 26:20-21 with the words אֵשׁ and עֵצִים (fire and trees; also πῦρ and ξύλον in the LXX, Principles 3, 5) used in different contexts. In addition to multi-catchword parallels, Hildebrandt goes on to list more lower-frequency catchwords (such as gold in 25:11-12 and fruit in 18:20-21) in consecutive proverbs to argue against coincidental placement (Principle 2).³²

²⁶ David M. Howard Jr, *The Structure of Psalms 93–100* (BJSUCSD, 5; Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1997): 142-43.

²⁷ Michael K. Snearly, *The Return of the King: Messianic Expectation in Book V of the Psalter* (LHBOTS, 624; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015): 118.

²⁸ For a helpful summary of the issues involved in determining subunits in Proverbs, see Roland E. Murphy, *Proverbs* (WBC, 22; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000): 64-69.

²⁹ Theodore A. Hildebrandt, ‘Proverbial Pairs: Compositional Units in Proverbs 10–29’, *JBL* 107 (1988): 207-24.

³⁰ Hildebrandt, ‘Proverbial Pairs’, 210.

³¹ Hildebrandt, ‘Proverbial Pairs’, 212.

³² Hildebrandt, ‘Proverbial Pairs’, 219.

Ruth Scoralick also demonstrates catchword connections in Proverbs. She counts 63 proverb-couplets connected by catchwords in Proverbs 10–15 alone, demonstrating how the sayings in these chapters are compiled as a collection. She supports her conclusion by pointing out that catchword association occurs much more rarely in Proverbs 16–22. For example, Scoralick connects Proverbs 10:2 and 10:3 through the roots **עשר** (*wicked*) and **קדש** (*righteous*). The same two roots connect Proverbs 10:6 and 10:7, of which the LXX also contains the corresponding catchwords **δίκαιος** and **ἀσεβής** (Principle 5). Scoralick finds twenty cases in Proverbs 10–15 with *more than one* catchword (Principle 3) connecting sayings, and even points out that the four verses of this collection (15:29–32) are linked by the root **שמע** (*hear*).³³ She demonstrates the double-connections between LXX Proverbs 15:27a (which is not in the MT) and 15:28 by the *Stichwortverbindungen* of the terms **πίστις** and **κακόν**, and 15:32 and 15:33 through **παιδεία** and **αυτοῦ/η** (Principle 3). In addition, the five consecutive sayings of LXX Proverbs 15:28–29b all contain words with the **δικ-** root (**δικαίων**, **δικαιοσύνης**, **αδικίας**, **δίκαια**), which do not occur in the differently ordered MT.³⁴

2.5 Sirach

Like Proverbs, the Greek text of Sirach displays catchwords, linking individual proverbs based on association of words. For example, Sirach 3:1–16 contains a list of sayings concerned with duties towards one's parents. George Nickelsburg points out that four consecutive proverbs in Sirach 3 address *honouring* one's *father* connected by catchword association (Principle 3):³⁵

Sirach 3:3 He who honours a father will atone for sins

ὁ τιμῶν πατέρα ἐξιλάσεται ἁμαρτίας ...

Sirach 3:5a He who honours a father will be gladdened by children ...

ὁ τιμῶν πατέρα εὐφρανθήσεται ὑπὸ τέκνων ...

³³ Ruth Scoralick, *Einzelspruch und Sammlung: Komposition im Buch der Sprichwörter Kapitel 10–15* (BZAW, 232; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995): 127–29.

³⁴ Scoralick, *Einzelspruch und Sammlung*, 60.

³⁵ George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2nd edn; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005): 55.

Sirach 3:6a He who glorifies a father will prolong his days ...

ὁ δοξάζων πατέρα μακροημερεύσει ...

Sirach 3:8 By deed and word honour your father so that a blessing from him might come upon you.

ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ **τίμα** τὸν **πατέρα** σου ἵνα ἐπέλθῃ σοι εὐλογία παρ' αὐτοῦ

After that, according to Nickelsburg, the saying in 3:8 is then associated with 3:9 with the catchwords 'father' and 'blessing':³⁶

Sirach 3:9a For a father's blessing supports children's houses ...

εὐλογία γὰρ **πατρὸς** στηρίζει οἴκους τέκνων ...

Notably, Luke Cheung points out that the theme of honouring one's father occurs in Sirach 3:1-16 and rarely again (Principle 2), while in Proverbs there are over twenty such sayings, but they are scattered.³⁷ This observation supports the notion that these sayings in Sirach are indeed connected by catchword association.

2.6 Ezekiel

In an essay entitled 'The Arrangement of the Book of Ezekiel', Cassuto demonstrates how the order of sections of Ezekiel is determined based on association of words.³⁸ For example, he demonstrates that 3:22-27 is connected to the next section based on the *cords* being placed on the prophet in 3:25 and 4:8. Notably, the Old Greek contains the same catch phrase as well (Principle 5). Ezekiel 5, addressed to Jerusalem, and Ezekiel 6, addressed to the mountains of Israel, are connected based on the same phrase, *I will bring the sword upon you*, occurring in 5:17 and 6:3 (Principle 3).³⁹

Cassuto proceeds to demonstrate more catchword association throughout Ezekiel. Another notable example occurs towards the end of Ezekiel. Ezekiel 36:16-38, which describes the Lord cleansing his people and restoring the land, is connected to the seemingly disparate

³⁶ Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 55.

³⁷ Luke L. Cheung, *The Genre, Composition and Hermeneutics of James* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2003): 25.

³⁸ I have edited some instances for better presentation here. See Umberto Cassuto, 'The Arrangement of the Book of Ezekiel' in *Biblical and Oriental Studies, Volume 1: Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes; tr. from Hebrew and Italian, 1973): 227-40.

³⁹ Cassuto, 'The Arrangement of the Book of Ezekiel', 230.

vision of the field of dry bones in Ezekiel 17 through the combination of the verb נתן (*give*) and the noun רוּחַ (*spirit*) in 36:27a, 37:6b, and 37:14a (Principles 1, 3). Note that the LXX shows this catchphrase as well, with δώσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου (Principle 5).

2.7 Ruth

The placement of Ruth in the canon shows evidence of catchword association. Several studies have shown that Ruth, which was originally grouped with the Writings and not the Former Prophets in the MT, has Hebrew lexemic connections with the end of Judges and the beginning of 1 Samuel. These observations have led to scholars maintaining that Ruth is meant to be read in connection with Judges and 1 Samuel, which is reflected in the ordering of Ruth between the two documents in the Greek tradition.

Ruth has considerable lexemic connections with the final section of Judges (19–21). R. G. Boling proposes that Ruth was appended to the final episode in Judges, with ‘many points of relationship’ between the two documents.⁴⁰ Edward F. Campbell points out that both Judges 19:23 and Ruth 1:13 use אַל as an independent negative (*no*), two of only six OT occurrences (Principles 2, 4). He also points out that the distinct ‘idiom’ of eating and drinking so that one’s *heart* (לֵב) would ‘be good’ (the root יטב) occurs in the account of the Levite in Judges 19 and also in Ruth 3:7 (Principle 3).⁴¹ Timothy J. Stone also argues that Ruth should be read in connection with Judges, demonstrating a number of lexemic connections between Ruth 1 and Judges 17–21. The most obvious connection is the phrase indicating the setting of Ruth: בְּיָמֵי שֹׁפֵט הַשְּׁפָטִים (*in the days when the judges were judging*, Ruth 1:1; Principles 1, 3). In addition, the exact phrase בֵּית לָחֶם יְהוּדָה (*Bethlehem of Judah*), a geographical locator that occurs twice in Ruth 1–2, occurs repeatedly in the final section of Judges (17:8,9; 19:1,2,8; Principles 3, 4). Finally, Stone highlights a number of scholars who note that both Judges 21:23 and Ruth 1:4 use the root נשא to express *taking up a wife* rather than the much more common לקח (Principles 2,

⁴⁰ Robert G. Boling, *Judges: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary* (AB, 6A; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975): 276.

⁴¹ Edward F. Campbell, ed., *Ruth: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary* (AB, 7; Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1975): 35. Campbell cites Judg. 19:6 and 22 for one’s *heart* being *good*, but it also occurs in 19:9. Stone points out that the cluster of *eat* (אכל), *drink* (שתה), *heart* (לב), and *merry* (יטב) only occurs in Judg. 19:6,21–22, and Ruth 3:7.

4). He notes that לקח is used commonly for this idiom in Judges (14:3; 15:6; 19:1; 21:22) and the switch from לקח in 21:22 to נשא in 21:23 is 'odd', along with the switch back from נשא in Ruth 1:4 to לקח in 4:13. He deems the function of נשא in Judges 21:23 and Ruth 1:4 as 'connective' as 'catchwords'.⁴²

There are also lexemic links between Ruth and Samuel that suggest that Ruth is meant to be a bridge between Judges and Samuel. The genealogy at the conclusion of Ruth ends with *David*, whose succession to the throne is chronicled in the books of Samuel (Principle 4),⁴³ and the term *Ephrathite* and *Bethlehem of Judah* feature at Ruth 1:2 and 1 Samuel 17:12 (Principles 2, 4). But the 'decisive' catchphrase, according to Stone,⁴⁴ is the 'identical' grammatical form of the phrases in Ruth 4:15 and 1 Samuel 1:18 (Principles 2, 4):⁴⁵

Ruth 4:15 She is better than seven sons. טוֹבָה לְךָ מִשֶּׁבַע בָּנִים

1 Sam. 1:8 I am better than ten sons. אֲנֹכִי טוֹב לְךָ מֵעֲשָׂרָה בָנִים

Stone considers this pairing to be a catchphrase connecting Ruth and Samuel at the seams.⁴⁶

If the composition of Ruth is indeed dated after Judges and 1 Samuel, its catchword and catchphrase connections with the two documents suggest that Ruth is meant to be read between them, an ordering that is reflected in the Greek tradition. It follows that Ruth was either originally composed or edited to have these rarely occurring terms and phrases in order to be read in the context of Judges and Samuel.

2.8 The Book of the Twelve

It has been observed that the Book of the Twelve holds a *specific order* using different literary devices, including catchwords. For example, the

⁴² Timothy J. Stone, *The Compilational History of the Megilloth: Canon, Contoured Intertextuality and Meaning in the Writings* (FAT, 59; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013): 120-22. Stone points out that the Old Greek 'flattens the Hebrew', using λαμβάνω in Judges and Ruth for taking wives.

⁴³ So Tod Linafelt, 'Ruth' in *Berit Olam: Studies in Hebrew Narrative & Poetry*, ed. David W. Cotter (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1999): xx-xxi.

⁴⁴ Stone, *Compilational History*, 125.

⁴⁵ Daniel I. Block, *Judges, Ruth: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (NAC, 6; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999): 729 n82.

⁴⁶ Stone, *Compilational History*, 125.

ending of Hosea and the beginning of Joel share a number of catchwords (Principle 4), suggesting a deliberate attempt to ‘strengthen the tie’ between them.⁴⁷ Hosea 14:8 contains the roots **יָשַׁב** (*live*), **יַיִן** (*wine*), **יָנַף** (*vine*), and **יָדַג** (*grain*), which occur in Joel 1:2, 1:5, 1:7, and 1:10, respectively.⁴⁸

James Nogalski demonstrates, with his own wooden translations, the occurrence of catchwords linking the writings of the Book of the Twelve together.⁴⁹ In addition to the connections between Hosea and Joel above, Nogalski displays the connections between each writing. Nogalski points to these catchwords connecting each writing to the next as a reading ‘logic’ for the Book of the Twelve.⁵⁰ He ultimately argues from the evidence of the catchwords that the final form of the Book of the Twelve is a *connected whole* stitched together through slight alterations in a redaction process. For example, he concludes that Joel and Obadiah were both formed from existing material to fit in between Hosea and Amos, and after Amos, respectively.⁵¹

MT	LXX
Hosea	Hosea
Joel	Amos
Amos	Micah
Obadiah	Joel
Jonah	Obadiah
Micah	Jonah
Nahum	Nahum
Habakkuk	Habakkuk
Zephaniah	Zephaniah
Haggai	Haggai
Zechariah	Zechariah
Malachi	Malachi

⁴⁷ Bo H. Lim, ‘Which Version of the Twelve Prophets Should Christians Read? A Case for Reading the LXX Twelve Prophets’, *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 7 (2013): 23.

⁴⁸ **יָנַף** (*vine*) occurs again in Joel 1:12.

⁴⁹ James Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW, 217; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993): 20-57. Nogalski demonstrates catchwords linking the writings with the exception of the endings of Jonah and Zechariah. He attributes the omission of catchwords in these two documents to the growth of the Book of the Twelve. Nogalski does, however, demonstrate catchwords in the hymn of Jon. 2:3ff with Mic. 1:1ff, and the conclusion of Proto-Zechariah (8:9ff) with Mal. 1:1ff.

⁵⁰ Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve*, 57.

⁵¹ James Nogalski, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW, 218; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993): 276-77.

The LXX, which displays a different order of the twelve prophets, as shown in the table above, also appears to have catchwords connecting them. For example, Hosea and Amos are the only two writings that have the phrase ἐν γαστρὶ (*pregnant*), and they occur at the end of Hosea (14:1) and the beginning of Amos (1:3,13; Principles 2, 4). Micah ends (7:20) with an appeal to God who spoke to the *fathers* in the former *days* (πατήρ, ἡμέρα) and Joel begins with a call to remember the *days* of their *fathers* (Joel 1:2; Principles 2, 4).

The phenomenon of catchword association occurring in the Book of the Twelve supports the notion that these pre-existing documents are being stitched together. While it is beyond the scope of this article to speculate on whether the documents were altered to create the links, the fact that catchwords can be detected in the different sequences of the Hebrew and Greek demonstrates intentionality.

2.9 Qumran

The practice of *gezerah shawah* is one possible purpose of juxtaposing disparate texts using common lexemes. This midrashic method, which continued to be used after the writing of James, associates two verses from the Hebrew Bible by comparing similar words that occur in each. With this association, one verse is used to interpret or clarify the other.⁵² Documents uncovered at Qumran have been identified as using this method, as they offer expositions of existing Old Testament passages.

4Q174, or *Florilegium*, is a midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1–2. In fragment 1, 1:10-12, the document quotes 2 Samuel 7:11-14, followed by Amos 9:11. The two sayings are connected by the phrase *and I will raise* (והקימותי, Principle 3). Notably, the quotation of Amos 9:11 here diverges from the MT, which uses the imperfect יקים. This difference, according to Friedrich Avemarie, provides the ‘strongest clue for a conscious lexemic association behind the two quotations’. It is unclear whether the variant originated with the author of *Florilegium*, but it is evident that these disparate sayings are intentionally placed together as the document draws this concept of

⁵² Michael Chernick, ‘Internal Restraints on Gezerah Shawah’s Application’, *JQR* 80 (1990): 253.

‘raising up’ from these texts.⁵³ Notably, the two quoted verses use the same Greek term in the LXX: ἀναστήσω (Principle 5).

Manuscript A of the Damascus Document, or CD, offers a midrash on two separate passages in Amos in column 7, Amos 5:26-27, and Amos 9:11, with a clarifying statement in between. All three sentences are connected through the term for *booths* (סוכת, the construct form of סוכה):

‘And I will expel your king’s booth ...’

(line 14b, quotation of Amos 5:26f) והגליתי את סכות מלככם
The books of the Torah are the ‘booth of the king,’

ספרי התורה הם סוכת המלך

as he said, ‘I will raise up the fallen booth of David.’

(line 16a, quotation of Amos 9:11).⁵⁴

כאשר אמר והקימותי את סוכת דוד הנופלת

George Brooke points out that סכות in line 14b, which is the name of the king *Sakkuth* in Amos 5:26, is taken as סוכת or *booth* (construct) in the Damascus Document (Principle 7).⁵⁵ Again, the quotation of Amos 5:26-27 differs from the MT. It contains elements from both verses in a different order (והגליתי from 5:27 and סכות מלככם from 5:26). In addition, the MT describes an exile *further beyond* Damascus, while the Damascus Document describes an exile *to* Damascus (Principle 6).

In the War Scroll (1QM), the author places citations of Deuteronomy 7:21 and 20:2-5 together. They are linked by the root קרב (Principle 7):⁵⁶

... you (are) **in our midst**, O great and terrifying God (Deut. 7:21)

1QM 10:1b אתה בקרבנו אל גדול ונורא

⁵³ Friedrich Avemarie, ‘Interpreting Scripture Through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles’ in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez (Leiden: Brill, 2009): 88-89.

⁵⁴ Translations by Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, ‘Damascus Document (CD)’ in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995): 26-27.

⁵⁵ George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup, 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985): 307.

⁵⁶ Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, 293.

... saying, 'When you draw near for battle, the priest shall take position and address the people' (Deut. 20:2-3)

1QM 10:2b לאמור בקרבכם למלחמה ועמד הכוהן ודבר אל העם

saying, 'Hear, Israel, you are **drawing near** today for a battle against your enemies. (Deut. 20:3)

1QM 10:3a: לאמור שמעה ישראל אתמה קרבים היום למלחמה על אויביכמה⁵⁷

The practice of *gezerah shawah* demonstrates that association of texts using common lexemes was a common Semitic method of interpretation. In each of these instances from Qumran, quotations from different places are placed together, linked by common catchword or catchphrase. While explanations of the deviations from the MT are beyond the scope of this article, these instances show that pre-existing material is placed together according to common lexemes. They also suggest one purpose of associating texts using this method: using one text to interpret another.

3. Catchwords in James

Now that we have examined how catchwords are used in Semitic documents, we turn our attention to the Epistle of James, where catchwords often appear to link adjacent units together. Assisting our examination is the fact that James is easily divided into sections, as demonstrated by consensus regarding their delineation. For example, scholars largely designate 1:2-4, 1:5-8, and 1:9-11 as detectible sections.⁵⁸

The document starts with an epistolary greeting (1:1) that ends with the infinitive χαίρειν (*greetings*). After the greeting, the first

⁵⁷ Translations by Jean Duhaime, 'War Scroll (1QM; 1Q33; 4Q491-496 = 4QM1-6; 4Q497)' in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995): 116-17.

⁵⁸ See, for example, Dale C. Allison Jr, *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (ICC; New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013): 79; Scot McKnight, *The Letter of James* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011): viii; Robert W. Wall, *Community of the Wise: The Letter of James* (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity, 1997): 47-57; Franz Mußner, *Der Jakobusbrief* (HThKNT; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1987): vii; Patrick J. Hartin, *James* (SP, 14; Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003): 64.

exhortation (1:2) features the noun *χαράν* (*joy*, Principle 7). The exhortation concludes in 1:4 with a catchword *λείπω* that links to the next section (Principle 4):⁵⁹

James 1:4b so that you may be mature and complete, **lacking** in nothing. (NRSV)

... ἵνα ἦτε τέλειοι καὶ ὀλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ **λειπόμενοι**.

James 1:5a If any of you is **lacking** in wisdom ... (NRSV)

Εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν **λείπεται** σοφίας ...

Probably the starkest instance of catchword association in James is between 1:12 and 1:13, connected by the cognates *πειρασμός* (*trial*, 1:12) and *πειράζω* (*tempt*, 1:13). Scholars are not at a consensus regarding how 1:12 fits with the rest of the material in James 1.⁶⁰ However, the catchword connects 1:12 and 1:13:

James 1:12a Blessed is anyone who endures **temptation** ... (NRSV)

Μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει **πειρασμόν** ...

James 1:13 No one, when **tempted**, should say, ‘I am being **tempted** by God’; for God cannot be **tempted** by evil and he himself **tempts** no one.

μηδεὶς **πειραζόμενος** λεγέτω ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ **πειράζομαι**. ὁ γὰρ θεὸς **ἀπειραστός** ἐστὶν κακῶν, **πειράζει** δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα.

Two factors make the placement of 1:12 particularly complex. First, there is an unmistakable connection of 1:12 with the opening exhortation in 1:2-4, with the repetition of *πειρασμός*, *δοκίμιον/δόκιμος*, and *ὑπομονή*. This leads many scholars to view *πειρασμός* in

⁵⁹ Notably, the chain-saying of 1:2-4 links one clause to the next using catchwords, but not across sections as discussed in this article: *πειρασμός* → *δοκίμιον* → *ὑπομονή* → *τέλειος*.

⁶⁰ Some see Jas 1:12 as connected to the content preceding it. See Dan G. McCartney, *James* (BECNT Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009): 100; McKnight, *Letter of James*, 106. Others view Jas 1:12 as connected with the material that follows, with the term *πειρασμός* linked with its cognate *πειράζω* in 1:13-14. See Mußner, *Jakobusbrief*, 84-86; Allison, *James*, 225. Still others consider 1:12 to be an isolated statement with no connection to the content that precedes or follows. See Martin Dibelius, *James*, ed. Helmut Koester (11th ed.; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress; tr. from German, 1976): 88; Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James* (PiNNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000): 69; Matthias Konradt, *Christliche Existenz nach dem Jakobusbrief: eine Studie zu seiner soteriologischen und ethischen Konzeption* (SUNT, 22; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998): 21.

1:12 functioning the same way as it does in 1:2, with the traditional rendering of *trial*,⁶¹ or difficulty from an external source. Second, the usage of *πειράζω* in 1:13-14a connotes a *temptation* from within, as 1:14b-15 confirm. Thus, this situation begs the question, is there a semantic shift occurring between 1:12 and 1:13 (Principle 7)?⁶² We will return to this question below.

Another instance of catchword association occurs between 1:21 and 1:22, with the term *λόγος* (*word*). James 1:21 completes a thought begun by 1:19-20, evidenced by the conjunction *διό*. The next verse appears to begin a new section about being a *doer* of the word, with *λόγος* connecting the two sections.

Chapter 1 of James concludes with two aphorisms that many view as a bridge to chapter 2. These two sapiential sayings are linked by the only two instances term *θρησκεία* (*religion*, Principle 2), which occur at the adjoining ends (Principle 4):

James 1:26 If any think they are religious, and do not bridle their tongues but deceive their hearts, their **religion** is worthless. (NRSV)
 Εἴ τις δοκεῖ θρησκὸς εἶναι μὴ χαλιναγωγῶν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ἀπατῶν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, τούτου μάταιος ἡ **θρησκεία**.

James 1:27 **Religion** that is pure and undefiled before God, the Father, is this: to care for orphans and widows in their distress, and to keep oneself unstained by the world. (NRSV)

θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτῆ ἐστίν, ἐπισκεπτεσθαι ὀρφανούς καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου.

After James 1, catchword association appears in other places in the document. The author of James follows a treatise prohibiting partiality (2:1-12) with two sayings that appear to only have a loose connection. The last command of the treatise ends with *κρίνεσθαι* (*to be judged*), while both sayings in Jas 2:13 feature forms of *κρίσις* (*judgement*, Principle 3). They are also connected to each other by the term *ἔλεος* (*mercy*). The connection between 2:13a and 2:13b is particularly

⁶¹ NIV, ESV, NASB, CSB, GNB, NRSV, Weymouth.

⁶² Nicholas Ellis argues that a semantic shift has been perceived because of a desire to clarify roles for God, Satan, and humanity. See Nicholas Ellis, *The Hermeneutics of Divine Testing: Cosmic Trials and Biblical Interpretation in the Epistle of James and Other Jewish Literature* (WUNT 2, 396; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015): 13-14.

remarkable, as 2:13b appears to be a standalone saying without any logical connection to the content preceding it (Principle 1).

In James 3, the author again follows up the last part of a treatise (3:13-17) with an aphorism that may only be loosely connected (3:18) via the Greek root for *peace* (Principle 1):

James 3:17 But the wisdom from above is first pure, then **peaceable**, gentle, willing to yield, full of mercy and good fruits, without a trace of partiality or hypocrisy.

ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν σοφία πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή ἐστίν, ἔπειτα **εἰρηνική**, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος.

James 3:18 And a harvest of righteousness is sown in **peace** for those who make **peace** (NRSV).

καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν **εἰρήνῃ** σπείρεται τοῖς ποιούσιν **εἰρήνην**.

There is a possible usage of catchword association at James 5:12, which features *judgement* (κρίσιν) after the exhortation about *being judged* (ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε) and the *judge* (κριτής) in 5:9. The exhortation in 5:12 appears disparate from 5:9-11, especially as one considers that 5:11 echoes the *blessedness* of one who *perseveres* introduced in the opening portion of the epistle (1:12). This would make 5:11 to be a fitting conclusion to the body of James. Furthermore, the disparity of 5:9-11 and 5:12 is bolstered by the fact that the command in 5:12 begins with *πρὸ πάντων*, a common element in Greek letter endings.⁶³ The injunction to let your ‘yes’ be yes and your ‘no’ be no in the latter half of 5:12 is in the Jesus tradition, as it occurs in the sayings of Jesus at the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5:37). The use of the Jesus tradition bolsters the case that at least this part of this command is pre-existing (Principle 1). While Jesus’ command continues with a clause which warns that disobedience will result in association with the *evil one* (Matt. 5:37b), the command in James contains a different clause, one that appeals to *judgement* (Jas 5:12b). This difference highlights the possibility that the author or compiler of James has amended the saying

⁶³ See Francis Xavier J. Exler, ‘The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter: A Study in Greek Epistolography’ (Ph.D. dissertation, Catholic University of America, 1923): 113-14.

to create a connection between κριθῆτε (*you may be judged*) and κριτής (*judge*) in 5:9 and κρίσιν (*judgement*) in 5:12.

The final sayings of James (5:13-20) contains a series of exhortations that seem difficult to group together. Scholars are split on whether the *healing* conveyed in James 5:16 is connected to the *sick person* in 5:14-15,⁶⁴ thus pointing to the possibility that ἰαθῆτε refers to *physical* healing as well as the *spiritual* connection with sins in 5:16. However, given the author's penchant for catchwords in the rest of the document, one can view 5:14-15 and 5:16 as *disparate*, connected only by the catchwords ἁμαρτίας (*sin*) and εὐχή (*prayer*, Principle 3). We will explore the implications of this designation below.

4. Implications for the Study of James

What implications can we draw for James as we identify catchword associations in light of similar constructions Semitic documents? Here are four proposals.

First, the identification of catchwords alone cannot categorise James into one *genre* of literature. This conclusion stands against the contention of Dibelius that James falls into the genre of *paraenesis*. The only identifiable characteristic of *paraenesis* identified by Dibelius in the categorisation of James is the usage of catchwords.⁶⁵ The survey above demonstrates that literature from other genres shows catchwords as well. Thus, one needs more support than catchwords alone to place James into the genre of *paraenesis*.⁶⁶

Second, catchword association in James may be an indication of its *provenance*. The usage of catchwords may point to some of the content of James being pre-existing material. Documents surveyed that contain pre-existing material above include Leviticus, Sirach, Judges, Samuel, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The notion that James is made up of pre-existing material is not new ground, as scholars have already suggested that at least some of James is traditional material, without using Semitic

⁶⁴ For a clear delineation of the different views on these verses, see Chris A. Vlachos, *James* (Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament; Nashville: B&H Academic, 2013): 186-89.

⁶⁵ See Dibelius, *James*, 5-6.

⁶⁶ McCartney questions Dibelius' conclusion, pointing to 'the paucity of evidence for paraenesis as a generic form as opposed to a rhetorical device'. See McCartney, *James*, 284 n8.

catchwords to support it.⁶⁷ However, the Semitic documents that display catchword association offer further support to this conclusion, as they highlight the possibility that the author could have stitched together pre-existing material, sometimes by catchword.

Third, the association by catchwords in James shows that the epistle can *be purposefully assembled* even if the individual sections do not show a logical progression. Even with its clearly delineated sections, James has proven difficult to outline into larger sections and subsections. Martin Luther lamented that the author of James ‘throws things together so chaotically ... and tossed them off on paper’.⁶⁸ Martin Dibelius likewise asserts that James is atomistic and largely has ‘no continuity of thought whatsoever’.⁶⁹ However, James displays similar elements with Semitic documents such as Proverbs, Sirach, and Ezekiel, each of which show intentionality without a having logical progression. The fact that many of these documents surveyed above predate Hellenization highlights the possibility that James can be intentionally arranged without necessarily reflecting logical progression. Thus, attempts to decipher an outline of progressive logic for all of James, especially ones that follow Graeco-Roman patterns of rhetoric,⁷⁰ may be misguided.

Indeed, those who have attempted to demonstrate a logical structure in James have come up with many different outlines, which suggests the futility of the task itself. Proposals have been made from scholars using different methods of determining structure in James, including a

⁶⁷ Davids, for example, proposes a two-stage hypothesis for James, the first being a series of homilies and the second a compilation into an epistle by a later redactor. See Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1982): 12-13. For a similar view, see Ralph P. Martin, *James* (WBC; Waco, Texas: Word, 1988): lxxvii. Also, see Richard Bauckham, *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage* (London: Routledge, 1999): 108-11; Mark E. Taylor, ‘Recent Scholarship on the Structure of James’, *CurBR* 3 (2004): 89.

⁶⁸ Martin Luther, ‘Prefaces to the New Testament’ in *Word and Sacrament I*, ed. E. Theodore Bachman, vol. 35 of *Luther’s Works*, ed. Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg, tr. from German, 1960): 397.

⁶⁹ Dibelius’ evaluation of the structure of James is based on his perception that paraenesis lacks continuity. Dibelius, *James*, 5-6.

⁷⁰ For example, see Wilhelm H. Wuellner, ‘Der Jakobusbrief im Licht der Rhetorik und Textpragmatik’, *LB* 43 (1978): 5-66; Duane F. Watson, ‘James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation’, *NTS* 39.01 (1993): 94; Hubert Frankemölle, ‘Das semantische Netz des Jakobusbriefes: Zur Einheit eines umstrittenen Briefes’, *BZ* 34 (1990): 161-97.

chiastic arrangement,⁷¹ a grand inclusio,⁷² or a repeated pattern.⁷³ These and other approaches have produced vastly differing results without a consensus. Regarding this lack of consensus, Richard Bauckham quips, ‘one suspects that something must be wrong with the goal that is being attempted’.⁷⁴

Fourth, the prominence of catchword association in James 1 relieves the exegete from the task of harmonising adjacent sections of text. The most palpable example of this principle is the disparate usage of the noun *πειρασμός* (*trial*) in James 1:12 and the verb *πειράζω* (*tempt*) in 1:13-14. While the NRSV renders them respectively as *temptation* and *tempt*, the verb in 1:12 appears to refer to a *trial* or external difficulty, especially in light of the other repeated words between 1:2-3 and 1:12. With the Semitic instances in view, one can be content with different connotations of the same cognate in adjacent sections of text (Principle 7). Thus, the traditionally disparate renderings of *trial* and *tempted* in James 1 can be kept without reservation, as 1:12 and 1:13 do not have to be semantically linked. Notably, Codex Alexandrinus, with its *ekthesis* paragraph markers, indicates that James 1:12 should stand on its own, as both James 1:12 and 1:13 start with *ekthesis* markers.

Another example of the relief from the need for harmonisation across passages is the connection between 5:14-15 and 5:16, highlighted above. The examination of catchword association supports the possibility that these passages are connected only by the association of *prayer* and *sins*. Upon further examination, there are several other reasons to consider 5:14-15 and 5:16 to be disparate sections (Principle 1). First, 5:16 does not reflect the pattern displayed in three scenarios outlined in 5:13-14: a protasis featuring *τις* and an apodosis which includes a third person imperative. Second, the explicit connection between 5:14-15 and 5:16 is not *healing* but *prayer*, with which the example of Elijah is consistent. Third, 5:15 and 5:16 diverge in other

⁷¹ H. I. Cladder, ‘Die Anlage des Jakobusbriefes’, *ZKT* 28.1 (1904): 37-57; James M. Reese, ‘The Exegete as Sage: Hearing the Message of James’, *BTB* 12 (1982): 82-85; Robert B. Crotty, ‘The Literary Structure of the Letter of James’, *ABR* 40 (1992): 45-57.

⁷² Timothy B. Cargal, *Restoring the Diaspora: Discursive Structure and Purpose in the Epistle of James* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1993); Todd C. Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology: Re-Reading an Ancient Christian Letter* (JSNTSup, 121; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

⁷³ Fred O. Francis, ‘The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and I John’, *ZNW* 61 (1970): 118.

⁷⁴ Bauckham, *Wisdom of James*, 61.

ways: the former has a *specific* command with *aorist* imperatives for a *single* person, while the latter has a *general* command with *present* imperatives for a *group*. Fourth, the term ιαθητε in 5:16 most likely refers to spiritual healing from sin rather than physical healing. There is no indication that the parties in 5:16 need physical healing, and every instance of ιαομαι associated with *sins* and *lawlessness* in the LXX and intertestamental literature refers to spiritual healing, namely God's mercy and forgiveness on the people (Deut. 30:3; 2 Chr. 7:14; 30:20; Ps. 40:5; 106:20; Isa. 6:10; 53:5; 57:17; Jer. 3:22; Odes 14:41; cf. 1 Pet. 2:24). Thus, the existence of catchwords in James can make the exegete content determining the *healing* in 5:16 to be referring only to *spiritual* healing of the sins being confessed; it is not connected to the *physical* ailments of 5:14-15. Again, Codex Alexandrinus notably begins a new paragraph with an *ekthesis* marker and a large space between 5:15 and 5:16, indicating the scribe's view that this verse is a disparate thought.

The comparison of James with Semitic documents that display catchword association opens up new avenues of enquiry regarding the structure, provenance, and interpretation of this epistle. In addition, it calls into question other avenues of enquiry, particularly those which attempt to find progressive logic in the entirety of James.