New Test. Stud. vol. 45, 1999, pp. 213–229 Copyright © 1999 Cambridge University Press
Printed in the United Kingdom

JAMES AND SCRIPTURE: AN EXERCISE IN INTERTEXTUALITY[1]

WIARD POPKES

Oberförsterkoppel 10, 21521 Aumühle, Germany

The epistle contains three OT quotations as well as several biblical allusions and examples; other sources (such as Ben Sira) are not discernible. James collected excerpt-material from a wide background, not just by oral tradition – hence 'intertextuality'. In a similar way the OT quotations, all combative in nature, seem to have been taken from secondary sources, viz. from Pauline (ch. 2) and 'Petrine' (ch. 4) traditions. Probably James had no direct access to a full OT text or longer parts of it. Nevertheless he uses 'scripture' as an authority and may have had a concept of canon.

James does quote scripture, though not very often. Quotations, explicitly indicated as such by the author, are a part of intertextuality. Then come other aspects of intertextuality,[2] such as references, allusions or paraphrases, sometimes perhaps even midrashim or the like.[3] We find such material in James as well.[4]

[1] Henton and James Lecture, Regent's Park College, Oxford, 18 May 1998.

[2] Cf. Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986) 11ff. Markus Barth applies a fourfold distinction for Hebrews: (a) direct quotations, (b) indirect quotations or allusions, (c) summaries or reflections, and (d) references to names and topics: 'The Old Testament in Hebrews. An Essay in Biblical Hermeneutics', in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* (FS Otto A. Piper; ed. William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder; London: SCM, 1962) 54. In a similar way, P. Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (NIGTC; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1993) 37.

[3] Some would consider the element of *midrash* to characterize James's relation to OT and other texts. Cf. Anthony Hanson, 'Seminar Report. Report on Working Group on "The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle of James" held during the Seminar on "The Use of the Old Testament in the New" at Tübingen in 1977 and Châtenay-Malabry in 1978', *NTS* 25 (1978/79) 526f.: Jas 1.28/Ps 12; 1.8/Gen 4.12; 1.9–11/Isa 40.6f.; 1.13f./Jub 17.6; 1.25/Ps 19.8; 2.1–13/Lev 9 [sic; should be 19]: 11–18; 2.25/div.; 3.6–8/Ps 120.3 and 140.3; 3.17f./Isa 32.15–17, cf. Ps 34.13f. Earlier suggestions along this line are M. Gertner, 'Midrashim in the New Testament', *JSS* 7 (1962) 267–92 (midrash on Hos 10.2, using also Ps 12.1–5); Alfred Blenker, 'Jakobs brevs sammenhaeng', *DTT* 30 (1967) 193–202 (on Job 1–32, 42.7–12). Cf. Wiard Popkes, *Adressaten, Situation und Form des Jakobusbriefes* (SBS 125/126; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986) 14f.

[4] The material is listed in J. Cantinat, *Les Épîtres de Saint Jacques et de Saint Jude* (SB; Paris, 1973) 17–20. Cf. also Ferdinand Hahn and Peter Müller, 'Der Jakobusbrief', *TR* 63 (1998) 1–72, 49ff.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

We observe a number of cross-references to various areas of tradition, in particular to Jewish wisdom literature, not considering for the moment early Christian tradition as found in the Sermon on the Mount,[5] in the Pauline epistles, in 1 Peter and in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[6] Several questions arise in this connection. In which form and by what means did James get access to such tradition? In written form from the original documents? In written form from shorter sayings or sayings-collections? Or in oral form? Did he get it from secondary sources, i.e. would he in fact quote quotations? Does he distinguish between quotable parts of scripture and of other tradition? All of this implies that we may have to approach our topic 'James and scripture' in a way somewhat different from how we would conceive of it in modern terms. Did James have 'a Bible' available at all, or at least parts of it?[7] Or does the simple word 'and' in our topic stand for a much more complicated relationship? We are moving in the overlapping areas of intertextuality and *Traditionsgeschichte*. Our concern is threefold: (1) What is it that James incorporated into his epistle? (2) Where did he get it from? (3) How did he make use of it?

In 1983 Anthony Tyrrell Hanson wrote: 'Nobody as far as I know has devoted an entire work to the use of scripture in James . . ..'[8]

[5] The relation of the Jesus material, in particular Q, to Jewish wisdom literature and their joint impact on James, also in relation to the element of eschatology, has been the focus of several recent investigations. The discussion is found in Hahn and Müller, 'Der Jakobusbrief', 54–7, and in two articles of the *SBL 1996 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars), one by Patrick J. Hartin, '"Who is wise and understanding among you?" (James 3.13). An Analysis of Wisdom, Eschatology and Apocalypticism in the Epistle of James' (483–503), the other by Matt A. Jackson-McCabe, 'A Letter to the Twelve Tribes in the Diaspora: Wisdom and "Apocalyptic" Eschatology in the Letter of James' (504–17). Cf. also the discussion of Hartin's earlier contribution (*James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* [JSNTSup 47; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991]) by Todd C. Penner, *The Epistle of James and Eschatology. Re-reading an Ancient Christian Letter* (JSNTSup 121; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996) 116–20, and the critical comment by Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity. Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996) 2 n. 3. Even more reluctance is expressed by Martin Klein, *'Ein vollkommenes Werk'. Vollkommenheit, Gesetz und Gericht als theologische Themen des Jakobusbriefes* (BWANT 7; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995) 196f.

[6] In addition, from the early second century, *1 Clem* and Hermas; to a lesser degree Barnabas and Ignatius. A comprehensive list is given by Siegfried C. A. Fay, 'Weisheit–Glaube–Praxis. Zur Diskussion um den Jakobusbrief', in *Theologie im Werden* (ed. Josef Hainz; Paderborn: Schöningh, 1992) 397–415, 401. On the relation to 1 Peter, *1 Clem*, etc., cf. the references in Manabu Tsuji, *Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung. Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes* (WUNT 2/93; Tübingen: Mohr, 1997) 1 n. 3.

[7] Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 32ff. on Paul's use of OT books; 33 and 45f. on the absence of quotations from several books, in particular from Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, as well as from Numbers, Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, 2 Kings, Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, 1–2 Chronicles, furthermore all the Apocrypha of the LXX, among them Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sira.

[8] Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The Living Utterances of God. The New Testament Exegesis of the Old* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983) 146.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

His statement is still valid, according to my knowledge. There are several articles and other investigations[9] studying various aspects of Jacobean intertextuality; we shall return to them a little later. As an introduction it may be sufficient to note that a comprehensive study is as yet not available. Such a study should not only list (possible) cross-connections but also ask further questions about the media of transmission and about the needs and intentions at the receiving end, shaping what was available – James's own reader response, as it were.

1. MATERIAL MADE DISCERNIBLE BY THE AUTHOR

Let me use this heading in order to indicate a certain degree of distinction between the author himself and the tradition to which he refers, made visible to his readers by special formulations and/or by the material itself. This will encompass references to 'scripture', to other parts of 'holy tradition' (being quotations by implication), and to biblical examples.

1.1 Three times James mentions ἡ γραφή, twice in the formulation ἡ γραφὴ λέγει or λεγοῦσα (2.23 and 4.5), once κατὰ τὴν γραφήν (2.8). In all three instances a sentence from the OT in fact follows, viz. Lev 19.18 in Jas 2.8, Gen 15.6 in 2.23, and Prov 3.34 in 4.6. It seems that James understands ἡ γραφή as 'a portion of scripture', not necessarily 'scripture as a whole'. In none of the cases does James indicate the biblical location of the quotation. He does not even say 'in the Torah/Law' or the like; two of the quotations originate from the Pentateuch, after all. What he does mention though is 'fulfilling the νόμος βασιλικός' (in 2.8) and 'keeping the entire law' (in 2.10).

1.2 In 2.11 we find the theocentric formulation 'he who said . . . also said'. What follows is the beginning of the second table of the decalogue (Exod 20.13f.; Deut 5.17f.): 'do not commit adultery, do not kill'. James adds a brief explanatory application on transgressing the law. A similar case occurs in 4.11f., where we read: 'We must not judge the *nomos*, for there is one who is the νομοθέτης and the judge'. Unlike 2.11, James does not insert any biblical statement here.

1.3 James makes reference to several personal biblical examples, i.e. figures characterized by great deeds. In 2.21–3 we find Abraham in relation to Isaac, connected with the theme of jus-

[9] Most notably Luke Timothy Johnson, 'The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James', *JBL* 101 (1982) 391–401; *The Letter of James* (AB 37A; New York: Doubleday, 1995) 30–2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tification. Rahab follows in 2.25, called πόρνη. She was justified because she gave guidance to the messengers. In 5.10 'the prophets who spoke in the name of the Lord' are presented as an ὑπόδειγμα (good example); in 5.11 Job's endurance is praised. Finally, Elijah is mentioned (5.17f.). He was an 'ἄνθρωπος ὁμοιοπαθής as we are'; at his prayer no rain fell for three and a half years, until another prayer of his unlocked the skies again. His example serves as an encouragement for prayer. None of these biblical figures receives any introduction by James; Elijah is not even called a prophet or the like. At no time does James provide any indication in which documents the reader may find further information about these godly heroes.

So far the frame of communication seems clear. Evidently James can presuppose enough knowledge and understanding on the part of his readers to keep the references brief. No explanation needs to be given about the 'sacred history', its law-giver and judge, its document(s), quotable as ἡ γραφή, and the grand old partisans, one of them even a woman of questionable status. His readers will appreciate these arguments and experiences from their own religious background. The common basis and its authority are supposed to remove any doubt and misunderstanding.

A closer look at the material reveals some distinctions and emphases: (1) The bulk of the scriptural references occur in Jas 2. (2) The examples from the Bible are found in ch. 2 as well and in the concluding passage of the epistle (5.7–20). (3) James does not indicate anything about his sources apart from 'scripture'. (4) As a matter of fact, the situation in 4.5f. contains a special problem (to which we shall return): a twofold λέγει seems to introduce two quotations, the first of which is completely unknown, however; in addition, the wording lacks clarity.

2. ALLUSIONS

There are a number of indirect references to the Bible, more or less easily recognizable to the better informed reader. James makes no effort, however, to give any hint about their background, i.e. about his sources.

2.1 In some cases the 'biblical flavour' is indicated by the strange character of the formulations, in particular 'into the ears of the Lord Sabaoth' (5.4: Isa 5.9) and 'in a/the day of slaughter' (5.5: Jer 12.3). Other formulations bear a 'conventional', if not sapien-

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tial character: 'the grass has withered' (1.10f.: Isa 40.6f.), 'covers a/the multitude of sins' (5.20: Prov 10.12); likewise 'to care for orphans and widows' (1:27).

2.2 Possibly Lev 19 is not only quoted in Jas 2.8 but also alluded to in other instances. According to Luke Timothy Johnson,[10] Lev 19 was a major factor in shaping James's understanding of the law, viz. as 'a set of moral rather than ritual norms'.[11] Johnson observes the following relations[12]: Lev 19.12 to Jas 5.12; 19.13 to 5.4; 19.15 to 2.1, 9; 19.16 to 4.11; l9.17b to 5.20; 19.18a to 5.9; 19.18b to 2.8. Similar to *PsPhokylides* 9–21, we notice a certain cluster effect.[13] Johnson does not disregard the possibility that, at the instances noted above, James may have been influenced by other allusions to the OT as well. Compared with Johnson, Hanson[14] on the one hand limits the parallels with Lev 19 to Jas 2.1–8, but on the other hand adds Lev 19.12 (blasphemy of God's name) for Jas 2.7. He investigates seven further indirect references, four of them with a biblical basis, as he sees it: Jas 1.25 (law of liberty) referring to Ps 19.7; Jas 3.17f. (wisdom from above) to Isa 32.15–17; Jas 4.5f. (God's spirit dwells . . .) to Gen 6.3–7; and Prov 3.34; Jas 5.16–18 (prayer for rain) to 1 Kings 17–18.[15] The other three (2.21–5: Abraham, Rahab; 3.6–8: the tongue as fire; 5.11: Job) are regarded as secondary references mediated through tradition.

It is a matter of detailed assessment how clear these allusions in fact are. Of the alleged references to Lev 19, the connection with Jas 2.1, 9 (πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν) could be the most likely one (besides the 'scripture' 19.18 in Jas 2.8, using the LXX version) – but why does James not refer to it directly? I have some doubts also about Johnson's other cases. But the question is not really about the exact quantity. More important is the actual phenomenon that James's text on the whole is rather full of biblical material.[16] However, this is true also for material from other sources, viz. of the Hellenistic world, as any commentary reveals (cf. e.g. on Jas 3.3ff. or 4.13ff.). With good reasons one may even raise the question: What is really original in James? Such a question is of course

[10] Johnson, ibid. (both works).
[11] Johnson, *Letter*, 31f.
[12] Johnson, 'The Use of Leviticus 19', 399.
[13] Johnson, ibid., 392f.
[14] Hanson, *Utterances*, 147.
[15] Ibid., 147–55.
[16] Cf. e.g. the background of Jas 5.1–6 in the OT prophets.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

appropriate to quite a few writings, but not, it seems to me, in the NT.

3. NON-REFERENCES

The heading draws attention to an important fact of implicit intertextuality. There are sections where James is evidently using Jewish source material, but he does not indicate this in any way. In particular he draws on sapiential documents of the LXX such as Wisdom of Solomon; cf. also material outside the LXX, such as the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*T. 12 Patr.*). The most conspicuous case can be demonstrated by the obvious use of Ben Sira, being such a non-reference.[17] There can be no doubt that Jas 1.2ff. presupposes Sir 2: following the Lord implies πειρασμοί, i.e. temptations, afflictions and tests. The admonition 'not to blame the Lord' for the temptations (Jas 1.13–15) is found similarly in Sir 15.11ff. Again in Jas 1.27–2.1 the parallels become close, viz. the combination of the topics 'God judges impartially', 'affliction of orphans and widows' and 'pure worship' (Sir 35.12ff.). The relations to Ben Sira are not always this close in James, but on the whole they are quite strong. However, the reader is left totally uninformed about the intertextuality. James does not mention his source or sources, let alone regard them as (holy) scripture. Such non-references may be explained by the very fact of a limited canon, similar to Paul's, whose scriptural quotations do not leave the frame of the Hebrew canon as defined by the rabbis after AD 70.[18] However, the little evidence we have does not really permit us to say much about James's canon, if he had any. What we have takes us as far as Genesis, Leviticus and Proverbs, the decalogue, and some OT figures, but no farther; and this is not very much.

The fact of non-references can be evaluated from another area and perspective as well, viz. in relation to early Christian tradition. It might be understandable that James did not want to mention Paul in 2.14–26 if the assumption holds true (as I believe) that he is responding to Pauline tradition. But why does he not introduce some evident parallels to the Sermon on the Mount (cf. Jas 1.22 or 5.12) by 'as the Lord (Jesus Christ) says' or similarly?[19] Such

[17] The most extensive description is found in Hubert Frankemölle, *Der Brief des Jakobus* (ÖTK 17; Gütersloh, 1994) *passim*. For Jas 1.2–12 see also Hermann von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament* (WMANT 64; Neukirchen, 1990) 417f.

[18] Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 33 and 47.

[19] Cf. Klein, *'Ein vollkommenes Werk'*, 196f.: for James the Jesus material had become a part of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

observations bring us back to the question: How did James incorporate source material into his epistle? How does he develop his argumentation? How is he proceeding as an author?

4. SCRIPTURAL TRADITION MEDIATED?

Leaving aside for the moment the explicit references to scripture, we notice the widespread opinion among interpreters that James received his material mainly by way of mediation. Such mediation might have taken place by general use of tradition, mostly in oral form, or more specifically through scriptural exposition.

4.1 In general, Martin Dibelius's position is still dominant. He stated that, apart from the OT quotations, James had no direct access to his several other sources, including even Ben Sira.[20] Rather, he got it mediated by 'propaganda, preaching, teaching, instruction of chatechumens or missionaries'. Even Hubert Frankemölle, who regards James as 'a relecture of Jesus Sirach' and who argues that 'at many instances, especially in the prologue, a literary dependence on Ben Sira can be proved',[21] admits that sometimes (as in connection with Jas 4.13ff.and Sir 39.16–35) 'a literary dependence of James on him [scil. Ben Sira]' cannot be proved.[22] So, how much of Ben Sira's text was really at hand for James? The often-used image for the process of reception is that James drew from a 'broad stream', just as others did; this would also explain the parallels with *T. 12 Patr.*, 1 Peter, Hermas, *1 Clem* et al.[23] Such a process of mediation could not be called a literary reception. The most important links happened on a level of general mental reception, not on one of reading full documents. James collected all kinds and parts of information and amalgamated them in his mind, internalizing them to a degree where their origin can no longer be fully disentangled and becomes virtually irrelevant. In this case we would move outside intertextuality proper.[24]

general early Christian paraenesis; he might not be aware of its origin from Jesus any more.

[20] Martin Dibelius, *Der Brief des Jakobus, mit Ergänzungen von Heinrich Greeven, 6. Auflage dieser Auslegung mit einem Literaturverzeichnis und Nachtrag hrsg. von Ferdinand Hahn* (KEK 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 43f.

[21] Frankemölle, *Brief*, 85: James selected from Ben Sira the themes according to the situation of his own addressees; hence numerous areas of life considered in Ben Sira do not appear in James.

[22] Ibid., 641. Hahn and Müller, 'Der Jakobusbrief', 53 argue against a literary dependence of James on Ben Sira.

[23] Dibelius, *Brief*, 43–53; cf. other commentaries such as Franz Mussner, *Der Jakobusbrief* (HTKNT 13/1; Freiburg, 5th edn 1987) 23f.

[24] Cf. also in general the contributions in Gerhard Sellin and François Vouga, eds, *Logos und*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4.2 Hanson argues that James was acquainted not only with the OT but also with contemporary Jewish exegesis which influenced in particular his narrative material.[25] He uses the terms haggada (pp. 147, 148, 149) and midrash (147, 149, 150, 151, 153), also legend (148, 149), allegory (151), loose paraphrase (152) and typology (152). Just as in other NT writings (especially Hebrews), James would depend on secondary tradition rather on the original documents. This includes for Hanson the Rahab story (legend, haggada)[26] as found in the Talmud, *1 Clem* 21.1, 7f. and Heb 11.31 (148f.), the motif of the tongue as fire as in *Vita Adae et Evae* and *Midrash Ps* 120.3 (149), the exegesis of Isa 32.15–17 and Ps 34.13f. in Jas 3.18 with parallels in 1 Peter 3.10–12; Matt 5.8f. and various rabbinic instances (149–51), and 'the traditional picture of Job', because the Job of the OT 'showed himself very far from steadfast' (153f.).[27]

A similar direction is pursued by Peter H. Davids investigating 'The Pseudepigrapha in the Catholic Epistles'.[28] The traditions about Abraham seem to rely on *Jubilees* (pp. 228–30), those about Job on *TestJob* (231f.). In the cases of Rahab (cf. *1 Clem* 10–12; 230f.) and Elijah (cf. 4 Ezra 7; 232f.) Davids argues that there was Jewish tradition available, as also on the role of the devil in Jas 4.7 (233).

4.3 Again, as before in the case of Lev 19, etc., the question is not whether all these suggestions hold true. We are interested in the methodological implications for James. Without doubt James knew intertestamental traditions and Jewish expositions of OT material. But how did he get access to them, and how did he work as an author? The explanation given by Dibelius and others needs to be re-examined in the light of the well-known problem of a lack of coherence in James. His very text speaks against the hypothesis of his having totally amalgamated his sources on the basis of his memory. The text is just not straightforward enough. This can be best demonstrated by the case of Jas 1.2ff, 13ff. and 1.17–2.1. The dependence on Ben Sira accounts for several otherwise surprising textual connections. James did not cover his tracks. This would be

Buchstabe. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Judentum und Christentum der Antike (TANZ 20; Tübingen/Basel: A. Francke, 1997).

[25] Hanson, *Utterances*, 147–55.

[26] Cf. also Hanson, 'Seminar Report', 527.

[27] Hanson also investigates the problem of Jas 4.5f. (*Utterances*, 151–3) and the reference to Elijah in 5.16–18 (154f.).

[28] Peter H. Davids, 'The Pseudepigrapha in the Catholic Epistles', in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans; JSPSS 14, SSEJC 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993) 228–45, on James 228–33.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

different on the level of purely oral tradition. The use of Ben Sira is, however, fragmentary. The same observation is true for all the material incorporated in this epistle; James works with bits and pieces of tradition. Neither does he himself write a broader text with a long-continuing presentation, nor does he follow any source for a longer section.

So which form of intertextuality should we assume then?[29] It seems to me that James worked just as we would have done in his time (i.e. before the age of photocopying, computers, databanks, etc., even without concordances), producing a text which makes references to traditions which are important for us and for the addressees. In addition, access to books (including sacred literature) was difficult and scarce in ancient times. Some of the material would be taken from general acquaintance with the matter, some from secondary sources, some (with luck) from original documents. Collecting and recording material is important. Collections may have been made by predecessors, e.g. florilegia of relevant quotations. Written excerpts usually serve as a repository for the author, preferably filed in some kind of a *Zettelkasten*.[30] Let us assume for the time being that James prepared himself in a similar way. This hypothesis provides a model of intertextuality combining written and oral aspects; its place is somewhere between the assumption that James had 'the Bible' and other documents directly available, and the theory that James received most of the extra-testamental material in non-written form. The hypothesis encompasses also the question of James's access to the OT.

Our model of intertextuality would equally explain James's method of incorporating early Christian material. James would have taken notes from various traditions, written or oral, primary or secondary. He would have assembled them in his file. All these notes, excerpts and clippings, as it were, would then be used in generating his own text. The very issue of intertextuality is the production of a new text in relation both to former texts and to the recipients. The manifold and complicated relations between James

[29] Cf. my considerations in Wiard Popkes, 'The Composition of James and Intertextuality: An Exercise in Methodology', *ST* 51 (1997) 91–112, 97f.

[30] Something like a 'book of common places'. Cf. Albrecht Dihle, *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit* (München: C. H. Beck, 1989) 201 on Plutarch. This might imply that James should be regarded more as someone educated according to Hellenistic customs, rather than to the Jewish (rabbinic) system of learning with its emphasis on orality and memory. After all, James writes good Greek; and, even more so, his letter does not touch on most of the salient Jewish topics, such as Israel, Jews, temple, sabbath, circumcision, ritual laws, etc.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

and his sources, in his preparation to reach his readers, might be best explained by our hypothesis of something like a Jacobean *Zettelkasten*.

4.4 The narrative material is more easily retraceable to more or less popular expositions of the OT. But does this imply that James actually knew and used books like *Jubilees*? It is at least uncertain,[31] nor is such an assumption necessary. The narrative material is hardly appropriate to argue for or against intertextuality. It can be used, however, to find out how much (or little) knowledge of '(holy) scripture' James really had. This brings us back to our main issue, i.e. 'James and scripture'. We recorded earlier a few references and some allusions to scripture in James, together with a number of possible adaptations, in particular sapiential and prophetic elements. So James is certainly 'biblical'; but this does not answer the question how well he knew 'his Bible'. Did he read the OT or longer parts of it in full, in the original (probably the LXX)? This is often taken for granted by commentators. Perhaps, however, our hypothesis of intertextuality is applicable also in this area. Is it possible that James received his OT material (as described above by 'material made discernible' and 'allusions') by way of mediation as well? In this case we would be confronted by secondary source material. Let us check therefore the data in chapters 2, 4 and 5.

5. THE SCRIPTURAL MATERIAL IN JAS 2

Besides Rom 4.1ff. and Gal 3.6ff., Jas 2.21ff. is the only instance in all the early Christian[32] literature that we know where the topic of Abraham's justification occurs, together with the quotation of Gen 15.6.[33] The Jacobean formulation is an antithesis – most likely against the Pauline tradition, misinterpreted by some would-be Paulinists. In my regard this is still the best explanation of the relationship: James presupposes Paul or a tradition coming from Paul.[34] Surprisingly, James does not mention Paul's second key

[31] Cf. the careful and cautious assessment by Davids, 'Pseudepigrapha', 230.

[32] 1 Macc 2.52 also cites Gen 15.6, connected with Abraham's faithfulness in temptation (ἐν πειρασμῷ εὑρέθη πιστός). Further examples of steadfastness in oppression follow, similar to Heb 11.

[33] Cf. Ferdinand Hahn, 'Genesis 15,6 im Neuen Testament', in *Probleme biblischer Theologie* (FS Gerhard von Rad; ed. H. W. Wolff; München: Kaiser, 1971) 90–107. On the LXX version of biblical quotations in Paul's letters, cf. Andreas Lindemann, 'Die Schrift als Tradition. Beobachtungen zu den biblischen Zitaten im Ersten Korintherbrief', in *Schrift und Tradition* (FS Josef Ernst; ed. K. Backhaus and F. G. Untergaßmair; Paderborn: Schöningh, 1996) 199–225. Heb 10.38 quotes Hab 2.4, but not with reference to Abraham; Gen 15.6 is not quoted in Hebrews.

[34] On the relation of Jas 2 to 1 Macc 2.52; *LibAnt* 32.1–4, cf. Klaus Berger, 'Abraham I. Im

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

quotation, viz. Hab 2.4. Paul has the two together in Gal 3.6 and 11; in Romans they are disconnected: Hab 2.4 in 1.17, and Gen 15.6 in 4.3, 9. Since there are no apparent reasons for James to disregard Hab 2.4, it is more probable that his tradition somehow goes back to Romans, not to Galatians. Heb 10.38 has Hab 2.4 (but not connected with Abraham), and 11.17–19 praises Abraham's faithfulness even in the test of offering Isaac. Furthermore, Heb 11.31 mentions Rahab's faithfulness in the case of the messengers. The two elements 'Isaac' and 'Rahab' are common to James and Hebrews, while both are missing in Paul. Is then James more dependent on Hebrews than on Paul, or perhaps on traditions common to all?[35] But there is a notable difference. The two elements belong to widely known narrative material;[36] James is indeed familiar with such aspects of sacred history and some important persons.[37] What connects him with Paul, though, is a scriptural quotation in relation to Abraham and his faith (which is not found in Hebrews) used in direct antithesis. The antithesis would lose its counterpart without the earlier use of that very portion of scripture. We conclude, therefore, that James knew some biblical story material, but that Gen 15.6 connects him with Paul. Did he get it from Pauline tradition, i.e. not directly from his Bible? This is well possible, as also the rest of the material in James suggests.

Jas 2.8–11 refers to Lev 19.18 (not to 19.15, which would be the contextually more appropriate quotation!)[38] and to parts of the decalogue. The combination is remarkable. The only other instance which makes Lev 19.18 the 'crown of the law', as it were, used separately (i.e. not as a part of the twofold commandment of love, as in Mark 12.28–34; Matt 22.36–40; Luke 10.25–8; *Did* 1.2), placed before the second table of the decalogue and connected with

Frühjudentum und Neuen Testament', *TRE*, I (372–82) 374; Roman Heiligenthal, *Werke als Zeichen. Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung der menschlichen Taten im Frühjudentum, Neuen Testament und Frühchristentum* (WUNT 2/9; Tübingen: Mohr, 1983) 51f.; Penner, *Epistle*, 65f. However, 1 Macc 2 does not refer to salvation; 'faith' is human trustful persistence; in James and Paul it is a debated question of soteriology.

[35] 'Common tradition' for Paul and James in using Abraham as an example is preferred, e.g., by Penner, *Epistle*, 63–70. On Abraham, cf. M. L. Soards, 'The Early Christian Interpretation of Abraham and the Place of James within that Context'; *IBS* 9 (1987) 18–26; J. S. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy* (Louisville, KY: Westminster, 1991).

[36] On Rahab, cf. the literature on Matt 1: Richard Bauckham, 'Tamar's Ancestry and Rahab's Marriage: Two Problems in the Matthean Genealogy', *NovT* 37 (1995) 313–29; John Nolland, 'The Four (Five) Women and Other Annotations in Matthew's Genealogy', *NTS* 43 (1997) 527–39.

[37] On certain details in the Rahab story, both found only in James and in *1 Clem* 12.4, cf. Franklin W. Young, 'The Relation of *1 Clement* to the Epistle of James'; *JBL* 67 (1948) 339–45.

[38] This is a surprising fact, speaking against direct access to Leviticus. Warnings against partiality towards the poor are found also elsewhere in Jewish tradition and need not be traced back to Lev 19 by allusion (contra Johnson, 'The Use of Leviticus 19').

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the motif of 'keeping all the law', is Rom 13.8–10.[39] Matthew does not provide enough witness to the contrary. It is true that 'love your neighbour' stands alone in 5.43; in Matt 19.18f. the commandment is even connected with the second table of the decalogue – but it is integrated into it, not in disjunction. Again, there is an exclusive scriptural connection between James and Paul. Possibly James quoted scripture from a secondary source here, too.

Jas 2 contains two extraordinary syntagmata: 2.8 calls the statement of Lev 19.18 βασιλικὸς νόμος, and in 2.12 (as already in 1.25) we find the unique formulation νόμος τῆς ἐλευθερίας.[40] Both are used in such a way that James seems to presume that his readers will understand what he means. They would be familiar with the special status of the commandment, which is probably identical with the 'law of liberty'. There are reasons to trace 'law of liberty' back to Pauline tradition as well.[41] If this is correct, Jas 2.8ff. would be an argument with Pauline tradition just as 2.14–26. In both cases James would take up scriptural material from the side which he criticizes. It can be argued, I think, that the decisive source of scripture in Jas 2 was Pauline tradition, concentrating on a few key formulations. From his general knowledge of sacred persons (similar to Heb 11) James would have added some colourful details (the offering of Isaac, the immoral Rahab). It is not necessary for Jas 2 to assume direct access to and interpretation of the original scripture.

6. THE PROBLEM OF JAS 4.5F.

The third reference to scripture is given in 4.5f., an old *crux interpretum*.[42] The textual tradition is unequivocal. A thoroughgoing conjecture was suggested way back in 1828 by Friedrich Lücke, recorded in August Rudolph Gebser's commentary on James.[43] He would rearrange the sentences as follows: vv. 5b, 5a, 6b, 6a, omitting the second διὸ λέγει, thus arriving at one quotation instead of two; v. 6a would be a commentary on the quotation. Such a solution

[39] Gal 5.14 is much shorter. Cf. Popkes, *Adressaten*, 116ff. The combination of 'love your neighbour' and the second decalogue table is unattested before the NT (ibid., n. 352).

[40] Cf. my article 'The Law of Liberty' (Jas 1.25; 2.12) in *Festschrift Günter Wagner* (Bern etc.: P. Lang, 1994) 131–42.

[41] Cf. ibid.; Klein, *'Ein vollkommenes Werk'*, 68 and 137ff.

[42] For a fuller discussion I refer to my article 'The Composition of James and Intertextuality'.

[43] August Rudolph Gebser, *Der Brief des Jakobus, mit genauer Berücksichtigung der alten griechischen und lateinischen Ausleger . . .* (Berlin, 1828). The only modern author who mentions this is Dibelius, *Brief*, 269 n. 1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

makes some sense, but is without any textual basis, of course. Nevertheless it might help us to trace back the generation of the text.

As it stands, the text is full of problems. Evidently v. 5a wants to introduce a quotation; it is better to understand ἡ γραφή as 'piece of scripture' rather than as 'scripture as such'.[44] The alleged quotation in vv. 5b–6a is without any basis, however.[45] We do find the words 'the spirit which he made to dwell in us' in *Herm. Man.* 3.1 (= 28.1) and *Sim* 5.6, 5 (= 59.1), but nothing more and not as a word of scripture. The question of the subject in v. 5b is unclear: God or the spirit? In any case, which is the sense? Nowhere else in the Bible is ἐπιποθεῖν used for God;[46] in connection with the semantically negative πρὸς φθόνον[47] the sentence becomes even stranger.[48] Πρὸς φθόνον ('to/for envy') does not mean 'jealously'. The translation 'Jealously God [as subject] wants the spirit [object] back which he made to dwell in us'[49] cannot be maintained; in addition it is contextually doubtful. If 'spirit' is the subject, the sentence would blame the addressees that they misused the God-given spirit for wrong purposes, viz. envy.[50] Such an interpretation would make more sense in the context, but it has to face the problem of changing subjects. Again, there is no such statement to be quoted. Some regard vv. 5b and 6a as two independent rhetorical questions: 'Or do you think that scripture speaks to no effect? Does the spirit which he made to dwell in us long enviously?'[51] The problems with this interpretation are: changing subjects, a comprehensive meaning of ἡ γραφή, and a (missing) μή which would be expected for a negative answer.[52] Furthermore, what do we make of v. 6a? Some

[44] Contrary to Johnson, *Letter*, 230f., 280.

[45] Not even as a hexameter (cf. Frankemölle, *Brief*, 602f.). Ps 41.2 LXX is an insufficient basis.

[46] Sophie Laws, *A Commentary on The Epistle of James* (BNTC; London: Black, 1980) 177. The word does not mean 'to oppose' – against Ralph P. Martin, *James* (WBC 48; Waco, TX: Word, 1988) 140f.

[47] Laws, *Commentary*, 177.

[48] Matthias Konradt, *Christliche Existenz nach dem Jakobusbrief. Eine Studie zu seiner soteriologischen und ethischen Konzeption* (SUNT 22; Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) 81–4 argues that, due to the context, only God (not the spirit) can be the subject of the sentence. Rightly he states that the negative πρὸς φθόνον remains an insurmountable problem. But he does not see another solution. He relates 'spirit' to the holy spirit given to Christians at baptism; because of the insecure basis we cannot establish a pneumatology on 4.5.

[49] So many translations: e.g. RSV; Dibelius, *Brief*; Frankemölle, *Brief*, 572, 602; Franz Schnider, *Der Jakobusbrief* (RNT; Regensburg: Pustet, 1986).

[50] Sophie Laws, 'Does Scripture Speak in Vain? A Reconsideration of James IV.5', *NTS* 20 (1973/74) 210–15; James Adamson, *The Epistle of James* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) 170–2; Johnson, *Letter*, 282.

[51] Laws, *Commentary*, 167; Johnson, *Letter*; Penner, *Epistle*, 152.

[52] Johnson, *Letter*, 282 notes this problem but decides to disregard it.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

regard it as an introductory midrash to v. 6b.[53] But can such an enigmatic brief statement be called a midrash?[54] The really surprising fact is that, following all these rather obscure words, James brings a clear-cut quotation from Prov 3.34. It fits well into the context, which warns against wanting to be friends of God and of the world at the same time. Vv. 5b–6a could be left out without any loss of meaning; the rest (vv. 4, 5a, 6b, 7ff.) would make good sense.

Where did get James the quotation from Prov 3.34 from? There are remarkable parallels between Jas 4 and 1 Pet 5. Both admonish to resist the devil (ἀντίστητε) and to be humble (ταπεινώθητε) before God who will raise them up (ὑψοῦν).[55] Unlike Peter, who intends to strengthen afflicted Christians, James wants to lead his recipients to repentance. In both cases Prov 3.34 provides the scriptural basis.[56] Usually commentators explain the parallels as 'drawing from the same sources'. In my view it is even possible that James knew 1 Peter and took his notes from there. But even if the two had a common source, the conclusion is the same: James got this quotation by way of mediation, just as in the case of chapter 2.

The hypothesis of a Jacobean *Zettelkasten* might even explain the odd wording in vv. 5b–6a. Text critics will notice a homoioteleuton in vv. 6a and b: δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. This normally indicates a slip of the eye. Let us try to imagine how this might have occurred. In 4.1–4 James was bombarding his readers with questions and criticisms; in 4.7–10 a series of imperatives shows the consequences. The scriptural basis (Prov 3.34) seems to have been connected with what follows in v. 7ff.; from there it got into his file. What about vv. 5b–6a then? V. 5b could be the result of a misplaced item in the file; contents-wise it would better fit the topic of 'wanting to have' in 4.2f.[57] James would have inserted it here, but too late in fact, mixing it up with the end of Prov 3.34, before he got to the full quotation; this would explain the homoioteleuton. Perhaps the words μείζονα and διὸ λέγει are attempts to improve the text. In any case, we would have to assume that James did not handle his material with the greatest care; he was not even quite

[53] E.g. Dibelius, *Brief*, 264ff. (his translation: 268); Frankemölle, *Brief*, 605; Penner, *Epistle*, 153.

[54] Furthermore, the δέ is not an ἀλλά – against Johnson, *Letter*, 282. None of the other early Christian citations of Prov 3.34 (1 Pet 5.5; *1 Clem* 30.2; Ign. *Eph*. 5.3) add any such comment.

[55] Also ὑποτάγητε is parallel, but with a different object.

[56] Both use the same Greek wording, different from the LXX: ὁ θεός instead of κύριος.

[57] Cf. also Luke Timothy Johnson, 'James 3:13–4:10 and the *TOPOS* ΠΕΡΙ ΦΘΟΝΟΥ', *NovT* 25 (1983) 327–47.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

clear about what actually belonged to 'scripture'.

I am the first to admit that these considerations are a *coup de force*, originating from sheer despair about these verses. Can we really imagine that James got it so wrong? But the question is not whether such an odd text came into being; rather we must ask: how did it happen? To concentrate on 'scripture': should James not have realized that v. 5b is not found in scripture? But why should he? Even in Paul's letters there are quotations of unknown or uncertain source.[58] It was very difficult if not impossible in ancient times to check references. We just have to take into consideration that James did not know better. This has a threefold corollary: (1) Not only was James's access to scripture limited, but so was his knowledge. What he quotes is second-hand material; (2) James did not distinguish between a true quotation and an alleged one; (3) James shows little care in handling his sources. He uses his file without paying much attention to the sources as sources, i.e. as documentary material, and without trying to integrate his sources into a smooth text of his own. James uses his source material piece-wise.

7. THE BIBLICAL EXAMPLES IN JAS 5

In 5.10 James mentions the suffering and endurance of 'the prophets who spoke in the name of the Lord'. This is a formulation as general as it could be. The information about Job in 5.11 is not very elucidating. Surprisingly enough, this is the only instance in the NT where Job is mentioned by name (he does not even appear in Heb 11). Neglecting the question of Job's steadfastness,[59] three puzzling formulations remain: (1) In what sense did the recipients 'hear'?; (2) How did they 'see'?; and (3) What did they see? What does τὸ τέλος κυρίου mean?[60] Which 'end', outcome'? Who is the κύριος? What kind of genitive ('of the lord') do we have? We leave these questions unanswered and proceed to the conclusion that the information given here does not tell us much about James's knowledge of the Bible. The entire formulation, including the aspect ὑπομονή, indicates general and secondary knowledge.

Elijah is presented as a man of prayer (5.17f.). He was a very

[58] Koch, *Schrift*, 35–42 discusses 1 Cor 1.31/2 Cor 10.17; 1 Cor 2.9; 9.10b.

[59] Cf. on this Cees Haas, 'Job's Perseverance in the Testament of Job', in *Studies on the Testament of Job* (ed. Michael A. Knibb and Pieter van der Horst; SNTSMS 66; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1989) 117–54.

[60] Commentators usually refer to *TBenj* 4.1 and Tobit 2.12, 14 (e.g. Mussner, *Der Jakobusbrief*, 207). But this does not explain very much.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

popular figure in Judaism and in early Christianity,[61] as a man of God endowed with miraculous power, as an eschatological figure, and as a firm, unshakable fighter for the Lord (as also in Rom 11.2–4). Well known was the story (which James records) of his closing and re-opening the gates of rain, including the post-biblical note 'for three and a half years', found also in Luke 4.25f.[62] Obviously James received his information from secondary sources again, not from direct access to 1 Kings 17–18.

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS

8.1 James can hardly be called an OT exegete. He may call himself a 'teacher' (διδάσκαλος: 3.1f.); but he is not really a 'teacher of the Bible'. His knowledge of the Bible is second-hand. This pertains to his quotations as well as to the allusions and examples.

8.2 Nevertheless he has a concept of 'scripture'. Scripture indicates special authority, usable in controversial argumentation. By implication we may also speak of a concept of canon,[63] not forgetting the limited scope of available material. The canonical border seems to be similar to what we observe in Paul. Although using apocryphal material, James does not call it scripture.

8.3 James makes combative use of scripture where he so calls it. The major part is devoted to the refutation of a tradition that claims to be Pauline. Hence it is no surprise that most of the material is found in Jas 2. James's source of scripture here seems to be this very tradition. The use of Prov 3.34 in Jas 4 is combative in itself, directed against wrong opinions and attitudes as well. This time James got the scriptural information from a tradition much on the same line as his own.

8.4 The allusions and examples demonstrate that James had more biblical and intertestamental information at his disposal than he indicates explicitly, mostly sapiential and prophetic. Much of it seems to have come from general tradition, including expositions or even excerpts of the OT.[64] The sporadic use made by

[61] Cf. e.g. Jan Lambrecht; *EWNT* 2.285–90.

[62] Material in Strack-Billerbeck 3.761.

[63] Cf. in general Mogens Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* (JSOTSup 206; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996) in particular 25ff.; Hans Hübner, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Band 1 Prolegomena* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990) 37ff.; he uses the formula 'Vetus Testamentum in Novo receptum' (which is also the title of Mogens Müller's ch. 6; cf. also 142f.).

[64] E.g. on Lev 19. The chapter was used in Jewish elementary instruction, as was the decalogue. Cf. Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr, *Gesetz und Paränese. Katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur* (WUNT 2/28; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press

James does not allow us to say more about the form and process of transmission.

8.5 Evidently James collected quite a bit of material by taking notes from various sources, Jewish, Christian and secular. Possibly he used something like a file. In any case, James was well prepared for writing his epistle, working under conditions so different from what we have and enjoy.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688598002136 Published online by Cambridge University Press