The Righteous Gentile Interjects (James 2:18-19 and Romans 2:14-15)

Abstract: Jas 2:18-19 is at the heart of James' famous (or, to some, infamous) argument about faith and works, but it defies definitive interpretation due to combined difficulties in punctuation and in tracing the literary continuity in James' argument. This essay approaches the problematic passage in the context of James' literary intertextuality with Paul. It suggests that the enigmatic objector in James is one of Paul's righteous gentiles (Rom 2:14-15), who lumps James and his Jewish Christian 'brothers' together in charging them with hypocrisy (cf. Rom 2:17-23). James artfully gives this gentile Christian voice to strengthen his own argument, for an audience already alerted to his rich intertextuality with Paul.

Keywords: James, Romans, Paul, intertextuality, righteous gentiles, allusion, faith and works

Jas 2:18-19:
18a ἀλλ᾽ ἐρεῖ τις· σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις, κἀγὼ ἔργα ἔχω·
18b δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων,
18c κἀγώ σοι δείξω ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου τὴν πίστιν
19a σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός,
19b καλῶς ποιεῖς· καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν.

There are numerous difficulties in translating these verses, which will be explored below, but here is an initial, working translation. I omit speech marks, pending discussion:

18a But someone will say, You have faith, I have works.
18b Show me your faith without works,
18c And I will show you by my works my faith.
19a You believe that God is one;
19b You do well! Even the demons believe that – and shudder.

Introduction

Christoph Burchard neatly summarises the interpretive problems of "Jas 2:18(ff.?)", "Wer sagt zu wem was bis wohin in welchem Ton?"[1] The introductory formula ἀλλ᾽ ἐρεῖ τις introduces an objection. But there begin the difficulties. James' preceding verses engage with another objector in a manner that suggests that far from opening himself to the criticism that this second interlocutor appears to make, James would likely see very much eye-to-eye with his "opponent" of v.18. He writes thus:

> [14] What benefit is it, my brothers, *if someone says that he has faith but he has not works* (ἐὰν πίστιν λέγῃ τις ἔχειν ἔργα δὲ μὴ ἔχῃ;). Surely his faith cannot save him? [15] If a brother or sister is naked and in want of daily bread, [16] but one of you says to them, "Go in peace, be warm and well fed!' but does not give them the bodily necessities, what benefit is it? [17] Thus *even faith, unless it has works, is dead in itself* (καὶ ἡ πίστις, ἐὰν μὴ ἔχῃ ἔργα, νεκρά ἐστιν καθ᾽ ἑαυτήν)"
> (Jas 2:14-17)

The interlocutor of v.14 says, "I have faith" but he has no works; James criticises him. The interlocutor of v.18 is apparently introducing an objection to James. Hence, one expects, "You have works, I have

---

faith", and some scholars have indeed transposed the word order thus, following the Old Latin.[2] But this is not preserved in the Greek manuscripts, which give a much more difficult reading. The objector's objection seems to echo precisely James' argument. This is complicated by the difficulty of how to punctuate it, especially where the objector's words end. What then is the interlocutor's point? And what is James' attitude to him, and his to James? Is their debate intended as intense or ludicrous, is the objector nit-picking or fine-tuning?

Numerous scholarly interpretations have been proposed; Burchard divides them into seven categories, most of which incorporate up to four principal variations on the theme. Here I shall note only the most frequently discussed and strongest contenders.

Three Principal Scholarly Interpretations of James 2:18

The different interpretations of Jas 2:18 often align with different translations, particularly different punctuation. Individual interpreters, however, offer distinct nuances and sometimes revised versions.

INTERPRETATION 1: The Interlocutor Challenges James' faith
TRANSLATION 1: Someone will say, "Do you have faith?"
And I will say, "I have works. Show me your faith without works, and I will show you from my works my faith"[3]

The interlocutor has heard James' challenge to the person who claims faith but has not works, and challenges James as to whether he really has faith. James replies by appeal to his works.
  This retains a logical flow for the passage as a whole, but it is semantically extraordinary to have only three words of direct speech followed immediately by another speaker, with no clearer indication than κἀγώ to indicate that the other speaker has taken over.[4] The primary positions of σύ and κἀγώ in their respective clauses, the brevity of the pithy contrast, and its further development in the next verse, drawing out the same key terms in the contrast (the personal pronouns, and "faith and works"), suggest that the speaker is the same in both clauses.

INTERPRETATION 2: Interlocutor is an Ally of James
TRANSLATION 2: Someone will say, "You have faith, I have works. Show me your faith without works, and I will show you from my works my faith."

[2] O. Pfleiderer, *Primitive Christianity* (4 vols; London: Williams & Norgate, 1911) 4:304 n.1. See discussion in M. Dibelius, *James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976) 157-8.
[3] This takes κἀγώ outside the direct speech, following H. Neitzel, "Eine alte crux interpretum im Jakobusbrief 2,18", *ZNW* 73 (1982) 286-93. Neitzel's reading is favoured by F. Schnider, *Der Jakobusbrief* (RNT; Regensburg: Pustet, 1986) 70-1; M. Konradt, *Christliche Existenz nach dem Jakobusbrief: Eine Studie zu seiner soteriologischen und ethischen Konzeption* (SUNT 22; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998) 219-26, 307-8. The latter's exegesis is fresh and interesting: the interlocutor is not questioning James' faith, but rather he is a dull-witted Christian who has not followed James' argument. James suggested in v.14 that faith can save (cf. 1:21); his interlocutor questions his argument. Konradt's interpretation brilliantly makes sense of the systematic thought of the epistle as a whole, but it does not resolve the semantic problem that direct speech is expected until at least the end of the next clause. Konradt cites Neitzel, but none of Neitzel's comparative quotations has the literary signals to continuity in speaker that are found in James. In addition, the "foolish" interlocutor would have to be theologically rather sharp to catch the potential for inconsistency between Jas 2:14c and the rest of vv.14-17, and semantically one would expect μή ("surely?") to indicate the slant of his question.
[4] Dibelius, *James,* 156; Burchard, *Jakobusbrief,* 120; D.G. McCartney, *James* (BECNT; Grant Rapids: Baker Academic) 158.

The "someone" is not raising an objection to James, but is on his side. James adds the "Someone's" voice to his own to give his own extra weight, or modestly to avoid presenting himself as a perfect example of faith manifest from deeds.[5]

  This explains why the argument of the "someone" is apparently so similar to what went before in Jas 2:14-17. It preserves consistency in James' use of pronouns in vv.18-19. However, scholars object that if James wanted to introduce an ally, he would be more likely to name someone of weight, rather than a vague τις. The introduction of a third party who holds similar views to James is unmotivated in the text. Most importantly of all, however, the formula ἀλλ᾽ ἐρεῖ τις is a common rhetorical trope for introducing an objection;[6] there are no ancient examples of it being used otherwise,[7] and although ἀλλά *can* on occasion yield its usual adversative sense, in this passage of to-and-fro debate the common usage is also the reading that fits the literary architecture of the passage.[8]

INTERPRETATION 3: Interlocutor Separates Faith and Works; James Opposes their Separation
TRANSLATION 3. Somone will say, "You have faith, I have works" [or: "one has faith, another has works"]
[Jas. resumes.] "Show me your faith without works, and I will show you from my works my faith."

The "someone" attributes faith to one person, works to another, and it is precisely in thus dividing them that James finds him at fault. Thus James uses the objection to fine-tune his argument in Jas 2:14-17, which concerned those who claim faith but have not works. He has argued that faith is shown only by works (Jas 2:14-16); he now argues that works also show faith (Jas 2:17-26). The imaginary interlocutor's suggestion that the two could be separated helps develop James' argument that they are inseparable.[9]

  This preserves some logical flow in James' argument. It is appropriate to the diatribe style, in which interventions introduced with ἀλλ᾽ ἐρεῖ τις are often brief and immediately, directly answered by the main author.[10] The distinction between charisms of which faith is one, and various specific practical ministries are others, is made in Paul (1 Cor 12:9). The interlocutor's objection would resonate with this pattern of thinking. However, the general term, ἔργα, is never given as a particular charismatic gift and it is startling to find such a bald, bold division between the two. Grammatically, there is no evidence for σύ… ἐγώ being used as general terms in place of "one ... another", which would usually be expressed as, for example, εἷς … ἕτερος, or ὁ μέν … ὁ δέ. Possibly the interlocutor is turning specifically to the person James criticised in vv.14-16 and addressing him as "you", suggesting generously that that brother has faith, while the interlocutor's gift is works. This zealous approach to brotherly love is then criticised by James.[11] However, the rhetorical trope of the interlocutor normally presupposes an objection to addressed directly to the principal author of the argument; otherwise it would be more natural to say οὗτος rather than σύ.

A Modified Method: Semantics and Intertextuality

[5] J.B. Adamson, *The Epistle of James* (NICNT; Grant Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976) 124-5, 135-7; D. Lührmann, *Glaube im frühen Christentum* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976) 81; J.B. Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James* (3rd edn.; London: Macmillan, 1913) 99-100.

[6] Dibelius, *James,* 150.

[7] My source is a TLG search.

[8] R.B. Martin, *James* (WBC 48; Waco: Word, 1988) 86.

[9] Buchard, *Jakobusbrief,* 118-19; P. H. Davids, *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1982) 123-4; Dibelius, *James,* 154-8; F.J.A. Hort, *The Epistle of St James* (London: Macmillan, 1909) 60-1; S. Laws, *A Commentary on The Epistle of James* (BNTC; London: Black, 1980) 123-4; J.H. Ropes, *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on the Epistle of St. James* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1916) 208-14, esp. 208-9.

[10] E.g. 1 Cor 15.35 (the only other New Testament occurrence of the expression); Jos. *BJ* 3.367.3; Clem. Rom. 11.26.1.2, 31.1.1; 13.10.5.1, 14.1.1; 17.8.1.1. References found with help from TLG.

[11] Burchard, *Jakobusbrief,* 119.

The interpretations of Jas 2:18 surveyed and analysed above are diverse; each has both merits and problems. Commentators regularly express caution as they suggest an avowedly plausible but far from unproblematic construction. "This solution ... is adopted because it seems to make the best sense in context, not because it is entirely satisfactory", writes Laws, as she offers a version of the third option above; Burchard, who offers a variation on the same, concludes, "Eine Lösung ohne Rest gibt es offenbar nicht". The text is very difficult, and this demands that the present essay echo the hesitation of these scholars in discussing it. I propose, however, a different method, which leads to a slightly different resolution. For grammatical and stylistic reasons given above, I regard either Translation 2 or 3 as the more plausible. For the next step in interpretation, however, my suggestion is to take the intertextuality of this section as a starting point, and proceed from there to appreciating its coherence. I recognise that in biblical criticism it is rarely desirable to give intertexuality a significant role in determining an author's punctuation, syntax and sense. However, this is a case where the punctuation, syntax and sense are a renowned *crux interpretum* and where James' intertexuality is widely recognised as significant to his argument. Furthermore, in literary contexts it is frequently desirable, indeed necessary, to allow intertextuality to shape reception.[12] I shall argue in this essay that this is a plausible and profitable way to approach this particular *crux*.

James' Intertextuality with Paul

The question of James' relationship to Paul has been much debated, and raises theological, literary and historical issues. The theological question of the two saints' respective attitudes to "faith and works" aquired lasting prominence when Luther famously dismissed James' "right strawy epistle", on grounds that it taught justification by works rather than what he saw as the priceless Pauline doctrine of justification by faith.[13] More recently, the literary relationship between James and Paul has also received much attention: a number of scholars have argued that James was familiar with Paul's literary corpus, and that he wrote in the context of reactions to Paul or to Paulinism in a post-Pauline generation, although they differ widely as to whether he was Pauline or anti-Pauline; whether he misunderstood Paul, or wrote to correct a misunderstanding of Paul.[14] Others, however, have continued to argue that James had no literary access to Paul. For some, this means he was engaging with Pauline traditions known in a non-literary form;[15] for others, however, James is simply not interested in Paul, or even did not know his letters.[16] The historical questions of who James was (the Lord's brother, or a pseudepigraphist) and the related question of when he was writing have some bearing on these debates.

The present essay builds its argument by developing the work that others' have already done to show that Paul's text *was* known to James, in literary form. Thus it takes at the outset one side in a debate that has been lively in recent years; to mention two particularly prominent scholars in the discusssion, M. Konradt in 1998 produced a masterly minimalist reading of the Pauline resonances, concluding that James was not interested in Paul; M.M. Mitchell on the other hand conceded "a certain rhetorical force" to the flurry of

---

[12] S. Hinds, *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[13] But for the patristic roots of this question, see P. Bergauer, *Der Jakobusbrief bei Augustinus und die damit verbundenen Probleme der Rechtfertigungslehre* (Vienna: Herder, 1962).

[14] E. Lohse, "Glaube und Werke: zur Theologie des Jakobusbriefes" *ZNW* 48 (1957) 1-22; G. Lüdemann, *Paulus, der Heidenapostel. Band II: Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) 194-205; M.M. Mitchell, "The Letter of James as a Document of Paulinism?" in *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James* (eds. R.L. Webb and J.S. Kloppenborg; LNTS 342; London/New York: T&T Clark) 75-98; D.R. Nienhuis, *Not By Paul Alone: The Formation of the Catholic epistle Collection and the Christian Canon* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007) 113-17; K. Syreeni, "James and the Pauline Legacy: Power Play in Corinth?" in *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity. Essays in Honour of Heikki Räisänen* (eds. I. Dunderberg, C.M. Tuckett and K. Syreeni; NovTSup 103; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 397-437.

[15] J.B. Adamson, *James: The Man and his Message* (Grant Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989) 225; Laws, *Commentary,* 15-18.

[16] R. Bauckham, *James: Wisdom of James, Disciple of Jesus the Sage* (New Testament Readings; London/New York: Routledge, 1999) 127-30; Konradt, *Christliche Existenz,* 246, 308.

studies that plead for reading James "on his own terms" but insisted that "'to read James on his own terms' *must include grappling with Paul if Paul was one of those terms.*"[17] The present essay lacks space to enter into the full length and breadth of the debate, but I shall present grounds for my working assumption of literary intertextuality, and then allow the shape and extent of literary relationships that emerge on this basis to speak for themselves.[18]

The argument for the hypothesis of a literary relationship between James and Paul begins from the cumulative effect of intertextual resonance with Paul. "Cumulative" cases are often open to assault on the grounds that many bad arguments do not add up to one good one, nor do many weak resonances add up to a case for significant intertextual relationship. However, between James and Paul there are many resonances, some of which are weak, others are strong, and many are somewhere in between. The cumulative effect of these is that in reading James, an audience familiar with Paul constantly feels him peering over their shoulders.[19] This is manifest in the early reception of James' epistle, which emphasises its relationship to Paul: the first explicit quotations of James are found in Origen's *Commentary on the Romans*; Chrysostom, Pelagius and Augustine discuss (and harmonise) James' relationship to Paul's teaching on "faith and works".[20]

The Pauline shadow in the text demands that the modern reader consider the historical likelihood of a literary relationship. The evidence pointing to a late date for the emergence and use of the epistle enhances its plausibility. There are no historical markers or signs of a *Sitz-im-Leben* to closely determine the date of the epistle. However, it is first clearly attested in Origen at the start of the third century; it is very plausible that Clement of Alexandria also knew James as scripture, although the evidence comes from Eusebius rather than from Clement's extant work.[21] It bears the signs of a pseudepigraphical document, since it is late attested, displays sophisticated literary Greek, and makes nothing of the historical character of James as leader of the Jerusalem church or brother of the Lord.[22] Paul's letters are known to have circulated widely from an early date, and to have been authoritative across a broad theological, geographical and social range of Christian communities in the early church. Hence if James

---

[17] Konradt, *Christliche Existenz,* 308; Mitchell, "Document of Paulinism?" 73.

[18] Searching for the "shape" of literary relationships assumes a large degree of literary unity and coherence in James. This has not been found by all scholars; Dibelius' commentary influentially argued that James was a disorderly collection of isolated paraenetical segments; however, in recent decades many scholars have shown that despite James' literary *poikilia,* inner diversity and range*,* there is structure and development of ideas. On this basis, the present essay too develops its argument. For a summary of relevant debate: T.C. Penner, "The Epistle of James in Current Research" *CurBS* 7 (1999) 272-5.

[19] Widely discussed resonances, diverse in character and in degree of verbal or theological overlap, include: Jas 1:1 cf. Rom 1:1; Tit 1:1 (also 2 Pt 1:1; Jud 1:1); Jas 1:2-4 cf. Rom 5:3-5 (also 1 Pt 1:6-7); Jas 1:15 cf. Rom 7:5; Jas 1:22-23 cf. Rom 2:13; Jas 2:1 (κυρίος τῆς δόξης, cf. 1 Cor 2:8); Jas 2:1, 9 (προσωπολημψία cf. Rom 2:11); Jas 2:5 cf. 1 Cor 1:27-8; 2:9; 6:9; Jas 2:9, 11 (παραβάται, cf. Rom 2:25, 27); Jas 2:12 cf. Rom 14:4; Jas 2:19 cf. Rom 3:30; Gal 2:20; 1 Cor 8:6; Jas 2:24 cf. Rom 3:28; Gal 2:16; Jas 3:15-16 cf. 1 Cor 2:14-3:3; 14:3; Jas 5:7 (παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου, cf. 1 Thess 2:19; 3:18; 5:23; 1 Cor 15:23). Also the character of the authorial voice and the expressions used to bind author to audience: ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί (Jas 1:16 cf. 1 Cor 15:58; Phil 4:1); μὴ πλανᾶσθε; (Jas 1:16 cf. 1 Cor 6:9; 15:33; Gal 6:6); τί τὸ ὄφελος; (Jas 2:14, 16, cf. 1 Cor 15:32); εἰ τις δοκεῖ … εἶναι; (Jas 1:26 cf. 1 Cor 3:18; 11:16; 14:37). For discussion of these and other references, see Syreeni, "Power Play"; and esp. Mitchell, "Document of Paulinism?" An elegant table summarising possible links with Pauline texts appears in Nienhuis, *Not By Paul Alone,* 228; a helpful list of words used only by James and Paul in the New Testament appears in J. Painter, "James as the First Catholic Epistle," in eds. K.-W. Niebuhr and R.W. Wall, *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition* (Waco: Baylor University, 2009) 180.

[20] On Pelagius, see Mitchell, "Document of Paulinism?" 94-5 (citing Mark Reasoner); on Chrysostom and Augustine, see Bergauer, *Jakobusbrief bei Augustinus.*

[21] Clement's extant work resonates with James on many occasions, but never directly quotes him. Eusebius, however, says that Clement's *Hypotyposes* commented on all the Scriptures, including the disputed writings and the Catholic Epistles; elsewhere, Eusebius himself describes James as the first of the Catholic Epistles. Eusebius also cites traditions about the person James from Clement's *Hypotyposes*. Thus, as L.T. Johnson has argued, it is very plausible that Clement did in fact hand down not only the traditions, but also commentary on this epistle. Johnson, *Brother,* 89.

[22] Lohse, "Glaube und Werke," 19-20; Mitchell, "Document of Paulinism?" esp. 87-88; E. Cuvillier, "'Jacques' et 'Paul' en débat: L'épître de Jacques et la tradition paulinienne (Jc 2:14-26//Ep 2:8-10, 2 Tm 1:9 et Tt 3:5.8b" *NovT* 53 (2011) 274-8.

wrote after Paul, then it is plausible that he was familiar with Paul, and this becomes yet more likely in the second century. The Alexandrian authors who first cite him as Scripture were devout readers of Paul; indeed, the first quotations are in Origen's *Commentary on the Romans.* Furthermore, despite the fact that James quotes only the LXX, his five chapters have been found by many scholars to resonate strongly with Sirach; (especially Matthean) parts of Q, particularly the Sermon on the Mount; 1 Peter; 1 Clement; the *Shepherd of Hermas,* and possibly Hebrews. Although some of these textual relationships are closer than others (1 Peter is very likely; Hebrews is merely possible), and the direction of influence is not always clear, the extent of evidence for such relationships suggests that the character of James' literary oeuvre is profoundly and self-consciously intertextual. This impression is enhanced when his canonical position at the head of the Catholic Epistles collection is taken into account, since there are literary relationships between the Catholic Epistles that suggest that some construction in awareness of each other and of the collection; D.R. Nienhuis has even argued that James was a "canon-conscious pseudepigraph" designed for the head of the collection.[23] This is more than can be proved, but the observation that James' intertextuality is canonical not just literary draws attention to its significance. To ignore or explain away all the resonances with Paul is thus methodologically inappropriate, on the combined grounds of the intertextual character of the text; the extent of Pauline resonance; the late attestation of the epistle; and the literary context in which it is first known to have been quoted as Scripture. Consequently, this essay acknowledges some form of intertextuality, and on that basis will investigate the development of James' argument.

I shall begin with a brief exegesis of the main Pauline intertext under investigation in this essay, then explore how James' epistle plausibly interacts with Paul's language, literary characters and theology. Finally, I shall ask how this may help us to understand Jas 2:18-19.

Showing One's Work at Judgement: Paul's Righteous Gentiles (Rom 2:14-15) and the Argument of Romans 1-4

James' objector (or James' response to his objector, if Jas 2:18b begins fresh speech) is not the only person in the New Testament who comes forward to show his faith by his deeds.[24] Paul too writes to the Romans of "righteous gentiles" who will show the work of the law written on their hearts:

> [14] ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσιν νόμος [15] οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν
>
> When gentiles, who lack the law by nature do the things of the law, these people, though not having the law, are to themselves a law, who show the work of the law written on their hearts. (Rom 2:14-15)

The interpretation of these verses is disputed in Pauline scholarship, especially the semantics of φύσει and the identity of those depicted here. Some read φύσει ("by nature") with either the phrase which precedes or the one that follows it; however, it is pivotally positioned between two rather similar, contrasting phrases, hence is likely intended to be read with both.[25] It comments both on how these gentiles lack the law (τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα) and on how they do the things of the law (τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν). Some have understood them as unregenerate gentiles who nonetheless stand a better chance at judgement than the hypocritical Jews; others understand them as Christian gentiles, who are an eschatological, faithful people, whether made so in the present through the advent of Jesus, or yet to emerge in an ideal future kingdom.

---

[23] Nienhuis, *Not By Paul Alone,* 163-231; W. Popkes, "The Composition of James and Intertextuality: An Exercise in Methodology," *ST* 51 (1997) 91-112. See also the essays on James in K.-W. Niebuhr and R.W. Wall, *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition* (Waco: Baylor, 2009) 43-200.

[24] W. Popkes, *Der Brief des Jakobus* (THKNT 14; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlaganstalt, 2001) 199, following Heiligenthal, argues that James is drawing on Cynic-Stoic teaching about the evidential quality of virtue. However, in a passage otherwise intertextually related to Paul in manifold ways, the Pauline intertext is more significant.

[25] Similarly in Jas 2:18c μου is pivotally positioned and probably belongs with both what precedes and what follows: ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου τὴν πίστιν "by my works my faith".

Paul introduces the gentiles to show that it is "not hearers of the law" but "doers of the law" who will be justified with God (Rom 2:13). They are a third party with which he chides the hypocritical Jew who boasts in the name of Jew, the possession of the law, and confidence in God, but who does not do any of the things he says (Rom 2:17-24). This Jew should have circumcision of the heart, by the spirit (Rom 2:25-9). A parallel is probably intended with the gentiles for whom the work of the law is written on the heart, to obey it (Rom 2:14-16). Both are images of the eschatological gift of the spirit, which shapes believers in the pattern of the covenant, whether envisaged as the law written on the heart (Jer 31:33; Rom 2:15) or the circumcision of the heart (Dt 30:6; Rom 2:29). Thus Paul is probably chiding hypocritical Jews with the proposition of *Christian* gentiles, who, like *Christian* Jews, are shaped by the spirit in the pattern of law obedience.[26]

In the broader context of Paul's epistle to the Romans, these "righteous gentiles" form part of an argument that Paul began in Romans 1 and will bring to an initial conclusion in Romans 4. This will be important for the comparison with James, because James engages with the extended passage. Paul's phrase, "my gospel", by which the righteous gentiles will be judged, refers to "the gospel" that he introduced in Rom 1:16-17, which is "the power of God for salvation for all who believe, first Jew, also Greek. For the righteousness of God in it/him is being revealed from faith to faith, as has been written, 'The righteous man will live by faith'". This radical emphasis on "justification by faith", which so transformed Luther's life, does not at this point in Paul's epistle involve any explicit contrast with "justification by works". In Rom 1:18-32 he depicts the wrath of God upon those who do not perceive God in creation, who idolise mortal man and other animals, and lead licentious lifestyles devoted to their desires. In Rom 2:1-11, he focuses on judgement according to what people "do". The drumming on "doing" is intense (πράσσεις … πράσσοντας … πράσσοντας … ποιῶν, Rom 2:1-3), but still there is no mention of the "law". He quotes Prov 24:12, that God "will give to each according to his 'works' (ἔργα)" (Rom 2:6), but he elaborates this not with "works of the law" but "good work" (ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ, Rom 2:7). It is in this context that he reintroduces the contrast between Jew and Greek, which he had not otherwise mentioned after Rom 1:16. The Jews and Greeks are to be judged alike, and this is not said to be according to whether or not they do the law, but to whether they "do bad" or "do good" (τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν … τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν, Rom 2:9-10). In the call to repentance, Paul underscored the "goodness" of God using χρηστότης and τὸ χρηστόν, vocabulary that perhaps intentionally evokes χριστός, "Christ". Thus the "doing good" by which all are judged is framed in terms suggestive of a Christological *imitatio dei*.

It is only at this point that the "law" is introduced. Again, Paul emphasises complementarity between the righteous gentiles with the laws inscribed upon their heart, and the righteous Jews with circumcision of the heart. The picture is slanted so as to emphasise the utopian appearance of gentiles in this condition, to whom lawfulness is unnatural but become natural (the pivotal role of φύσει), and which "indeed even" provides those who were "without defence" with a "defence" (Rom 2:15, cf. 1:20; 2:1).[27] Conversely, the hypocritical Jew who calls himself a Jew and has confidence in God is particularly chided (Rom 2:17-24). In Rom 3, he underscores the privilege of the Jews but introduces his doctrine of "justification by faith without works of the law" (Rom 3:28). This "justification without the law" occurs in the blood of Christ and faith in/of Christ (Rom 3:21-6). God is "one" who justifies the circumcision from faith and uncircumcision "through faith". Abraham is then introduced as forefather of both, through his act of faith when he was still uncircumcised but believed God that He would bring life from his and Sarah's necrotic bodies. This act of faith too is Christologically shaped, as God raised Christ too from the dead (ἐκ νεκρῶν) on account of 'our justification' (Rom 4:24).

This analysis of Romans 1-4 sets Paul's argument about "faith and works" in Romans 2:12-4:24 in a larger context; in doing so, several dimensions to Paul's thought emerge which invite reassessment of contrasts often drawn between his theology and James'. Firstly, many have argued that in contrasting "faith and works", Paul and James mean different thing with each of the two terms. By "faith", Paul means "faith in Christ", whereas James means mere belief that "God is one"; by "works", Paul means "works of the law",

---

[26] S.J. Gathercole, "A Law Unto Themselves: The Gentiles in Romans 2:14-15 Revisited," *JSNT* 85 (2002) 27-49.
[27] Gathercole, 'Law', 45-6.

especially ritual requirements, whereas James means "good works" of charity.[28] Secondly, it is argued that the relationship between Jews and Gentiles is central to Paul's argument, but is of no concern in James.[29] This account of Paul's theology, however, does not represent the the range or nuance of Romans 1-4. Paul's "works of the law" are introduced only secondarily to the discussion of "good works", and it is the issue of "good works" that he first makes central to the relastionship between Jews and Gentiles. His stress on "good works" and "faith" is indeed Christological, but it is a moot point in James scholarship whether Christology is also at the centre of James' teaching.[30] Furthermore, Paul gives prominence to the phrase that "God is one" at the climax of his debate about faith and works, in language almost identical to James' (Rom 3:30 cf. Jas 2:19).[31]

Literary Use of Romans 1-4 and Other Pauline Passages in James 1:1-2:13

Most scholarly discussions that accept James' relationship to some Pauline texts take one of three approaches. Some, particularly in older scholarship, focus on the "*locus classicus*" for this question, namely Jas 2:14-24, comparing Paul's dichotomy between "faith and works", and considering especially Romans 3-4, Galatians 2-3, and Philippians 3.[32] Increasingly over the last thirty years, however, many scholars have come to consider the whole of James' epistle and the whole of Paul's corpus to find more extensive uses of Pauline intertexts, or other Pauline influence. These sometimes comment on his use of the Corinthian correspondence and of Romans 1-2 as well.[33] Recently, E. Cuvillier has taken the debate in a new direction by arguing that James is theologically, socially and verbally closer to the deutero-Pauline letters than to Paul himself.[34] I know of no extended discussion that comments on James' use of Rom 1-4 as a whole, or that draws out the particular importance of Romans 2 in Jas 2:14-24.[35] In this section, then, I shall revisit the evidence for a literary relationship between James and Paul, focusing on Rom 1-4 in James and highlighting other significant interactions with Pauline texts where relevant. This will make it possible to investigate more fully the relationship between James' objector (Jas 2:18) and Paul's righteous gentiles (Rom 2:14-15).

Some scholars find Pauline resonances as early as Jas 1:1-4. They compare firstly James' opening self-description as Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλος with Pauline openings that present the author as "slave" of either Jesus Christ (Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1) or of God (Tit 1:1).[36] Secondly, James' opening concatenation (Jas 1:2-4) evokes Romans 5:3-4 in theme, structure and some vocabulary. These opening verses in James prominently, perhaps even programmatically, introduce the term "faith" (πίστις), and associate it already with the language of "work" (κατεργάζεται, ἔργον, Jas 1:3-4). At this point, "faith" receives its content from James' opening self-description as slave of God and Lord Jesus Christ; "work" is the outworking of faith in endurance and perfection. The comparable concatenation in Romans omits both terms (Rom 5:3-4), but immediately follows and draws out a celebration of justification "by faith" resulting in peace with God through the Lord Jesus Christ (Rom

---

[28] Cf. J. Jeremias, 'Paul and James,' *ExpTim* 66 (1954-1955), 370; Adamson, *Epistle,* 125; McCartney, *James,* 272-9.

[29] Hengel, 'Polemik,' 257, *pace* Syreeni, 'Power Play,' 422-6.

[30] One of Luther's criticisms of the epistle was its lack of Christology; early twentieth century scholarship continued to disregard its theological or Christological value, but in the latter part of the century these positions were considerably revised. For a summary: Penner, 'Research,' 257-60, 280-7.

[31] E.g. M. Tsuji, *Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung: Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes* (WUNT 2.93; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997) 192.

[32] E.g. Lührmann, *Glaube*; Jeremias, "Paul and James".

[33] M. Hengel, "Der Jakobusbrief als antipaulinische Polemik," in eds. G. F. Hawthorne and O. Betz, *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of E. Earle Ellis for his 60th Birthday* (Grant Rapids: Eerdmans) 248-78; Mitchell, "Document of Paulinism"; Syreeni, "Power Play".

[34] Cuvillier, "'Jacques' et 'Paul'".

[35] But for insightful pointers in this direction, see Nienhuis, *Not By Paul Alone*, 115-16.

[36] The Pauline openings add a further designation, such as "apostle". See discussion in Dibelius, *James,* 65-66.

5:1). Thus the theological and Christological content of faith is similar in both authors.[37] In Paul, these verses conclude not in "perfect work" but in grace, hope and love (Rom 5:2, 5). For a reader familiar with Paul, James' opening resonates with Paul's account of the new approach to God, without repeating it or critiquing it.[38]

The resonances with Romans 1-4 become prominent as James' develops his teaching. At 1:20 he urges that people be "slow to wrath, for the wrath of man does not work the righteousness of God" (ὀργὴ γάρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐκ ἐργάζεται). Syreeni has suggested that this argument gains bite through "a strange intertextual twist" of Paul's opening indictment in Romans, where he presents the revelation of "the righteousness of God" (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ), which is "from faith to faith", in parallel with the revelation of the "wrath of God" (ὀργὴ θεοῦ), which is against human impiety and injustice (Rom 1:16-17).[39] The programmatic character of these verses within Paul's epistle strengthens the suggestion that James is playing upon them. Whereas Paul emphasised "faith" (τῷ πιστεύοντι, ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, Rom 1:16-17) in the power of salvation and the revelation of righteousness, James builds the language of "work" into his resonant expression (δικαιοσύνην … ἐργάζεται), and rather than introduce the term "faith" (πίστις) he launches his paraenesis to "receive the *implanted word*, which is able to save your souls" (δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον **λόγον** τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, Jas 1:21).

James' ὁ ἔμφυτος λόγος has provoked much discussion; some scholars have compared Stoic teaching that each person has a rational *logos* within, which is a portion of the *logos* that governs the universe, and by which they attune themselves to the perfect life in accordance with nature.[40] However, James speaks of *receiving* the ἔμφυτος λόγος, thus it is not innate. "Receive the word [of God]" is a common expression for receiving with faith the gospel message in other New Testament texts, thus the language is germane to the image of Christian conversion.[41] The term "implanted" develops the idea of conversion, for it draws out James' use of birth imagery in depicting God's new creation "by/for the word of truth" (Jas 1:18). The "implanted word" is most plausibly the Christian word received and made innate in the second birth of conversion.[42]

James' next command develops the theme by repeating the term λόγος in an antithesis that strongly evokes Paul. James urges his brothers to "become doers of the word, not just hearers" (**ποιηταὶ λόγου καὶ μὴ μόνον ἀκροαταί**). Similarly Paul introduces his "righteous gentiles" by insisting that it is "not hearers of the law that are righteous with God, but doers of the law will be justified" (οὐ γὰρ οἱ **ἀκροαταὶ νόμου** δίκαιοι παρὰ [τῷ] θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ **ποιηταὶ νόμου** δικαιωθήσονται). The topos of seeking those who are "doers not just hearers" is not uncommon (cf. Philo, *Congr.* 63-70; Matt 7:24-27; Lk 6:46-49; Avot 5.14),[43] but the use of ποιητής with the genitive for "doer of" what is enjoined upon one is a Semitism associated with doing commandments, and the phrasing of the contrast between ποιηταί and ἀκροαταί finds its only known precedent in Rom 2:13.[44]

---

[37] There is no manuscript basis for omitting Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as did F. Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896), 2:3-8, nor for taking "God" as an epithet of "Jesus Christ". See Dibelius, *James,* 66.

[38] I find no "anti-Paulinism" here, *pace* Hengel, "Polemik," 254; Syreeni, "Power Play," 410, but *with* Lüdemann, 195-6.

[39] Syreeni, "Power Play," 408-9.

[40] M.A. Jackson-McCabe, *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) 154.

[41] Mk 4:16 par.; Acts 8:14; 11:1; Gal 6:6; 1 Thess 2:13. See Dibelius, *James,* 114; Laws, *Commentary,* 82.

[42] Perhaps even of baptism. See Konradt, *Christliche Existenz,* 61-2; D.J. Verseput, "Reworking the Puzzle of Faith and Deeds in James 2:14-26," *NTS* 43 (1997) 100-101;

[43] These and further references in Dibelius, *James,* 114.

[44] In Classical Greek, ποιητής usually means "composer", "author" or "poet", or else the "maker" of something (LSJ *s.v.*). The meaning "doer" is found once in the LXX (1 Macc 2:67), but without the contrast with ἀκροατής. This usage remained rare in later Christian Greek: Lampe's *Patristic Lexicon* does not list ποιητής in this sense. Cf. Laws, *Commentary,* 84, "in ordinary Greek, *poiētēs logou* would be 'a word-maker', i.e. an orator, as *poiētēs nomou* would be a 'law-maker'".

In Romans 2:13, Paul asserts that "hearers of the law (οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου) are not righteous with God, but doers of the law (οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου) will be made righteous". Both are contrasting hearers with doers in a context of salvation. The main difference is that James has λόγου whereas Paul has νόμου, but this distinction diminishes when both are read in context. James' "doers of the word" are those who "do" the "implanted word (ἔμφυτος λόγος)" just mentioned, which is "capable of saving souls" (Jas 1:21-22). They are thus not far removed from those enigmatic Pauline characters, the righteous gentiles, who, "not having the law φύσει do the things of the law". If, as argued in the previous section, we read φύσει with *both* what precedes *and* what follows, and understand these gentiles as Christian converts, then Paul is depicting the gentiles who have not the law by birthright (by contrast with those who are φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, Gal 2:15), but they do the things of the law by nature (φύσει), when they become Christians, with the work of the law inscribed on their heart in fulfilment of Jer 31:33. Similarly, Paul will later speak of Christians becoming σύμφυτοι with the likeness of Christ's death in baptism (Rom 6:5), and of growing to be σύμμορφοι with Christ in suffering and later in glory (Rom 8:29). James' converts who receive the ἔμφυτος λόγος likewise did not have the λόγος by nature, but in receiving it and becoming doers of it, they too will do the things of the λόγος "by nature" or according to their ἔμφυτος λόγος.

Furthermore, James develops his interpretation of what it means to be a "doer" using the term "law" (νόμος), which, along with "works" (ἔργα), is Paul's point of reference in Rom 2:12-15. James' mere "hearer" looks in a mirror, discerns the "face of his origin/becoming" (τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως), and goes away forgetting what he was like, but a "doer of work" (ποιητὴς ἔργου) peers intently into the "perfect law of freedom" and abides in it. Doing the word and doing the "perfect law of freedom" are thus alike for James (Jas 1:22, 25). Some scholars have thought that "law of freedom" is a notably unpauline (even "anti-Pauline") phrase; Paul never uses it, and in Galatians especially he characterises being under the law as slavery. However, as others have pointed out, Paul also associates freedom in Christ with the freedom to obey the law;[45] this is case with the righteous gentiles and their counterparts, the Jews circumcised at heart (Rom 2:12-29), and it is also a very plausible interpretation of the "freedom" Paul envisages when the stony-hearted, veiled people who had beheld the stony, veiled Mosaic covenant turn to Christ and "beholding in a mirror are transformed into the same image from glory to glory" (2 Cor 3:14-18).

James' two terms for what people should perceive in the mirror and abide in are the "face of one's origin" (τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως) and the "perfect law of freedom" (νόμον τέλειον τὸν τῆς ἐλευθερίας). In his characteristic style of concatenation, he picks up both terms in his socially rooted paraenesis that follows, criticising προσωπολημψία (Jas 2:1, 9) and urging his audience to "fulfil the royal law" of brotherly love (νόμον τελεῖτε βασιλικόν, Jas 2:8). He draws out the parallelism between discerning the face and fulfilling the law, which was structurally evident already in Jas 1:23-5: the royal law is brotherly love, which rules out προσωπολημψία, which is likewise incompatible with truly discerning and remembering who one is in one's earthly origin (γένεσις as "origin") or who one was created to be, and is perhaps becoming, in the image of God (γένεσις as "creation"/"becoming").[46] These two sections of the epistle are also bound together by the formal echo of Jas 1:21 in the start of the new section in Jas 2:1: μὴ ἐν προσωπολημψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν cf. ἐν πραΰτητι δέξασθε τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον. James' nexus between fulfilling the law, doing the emplanted word, brotherly love and avoiding partiality continues to develop his intertextual engagement with Paul. In Paul's account of judgement, προσωπολημψία is a key term; he attributes it to God rather than enjoining it upon men, but it is nonetheless closely linked to his ethical teaching that judgement concerns "doing good" and "good works" (Rom 2:1-11). This he unpacks around the focus of the work of the law, as it is done or neglected by righteous Gentiles (Rom 2:14-16) and unrighteous/righteous Jews (Rom 2:17-29).

[45] Paul also uses the expressions "law of Christ" and "law of the Spirit" in depicting Christian freedom (Gal 6:2; Rom 8:2): M. Klein, *»Ein vollkommenes Werk« Vollkommenheit, Gesetz und Gericht als theologische Themen des Jakobusbriefes* (BWANT 139/19; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995) 143-4.

[46] Konradt, *Christliche Existenz,* 174-5, associates τῆς γενέσεως with Jac 1:18, which indicated new birth through the "word of truth", hence the "face" is the new being that the new-born Christian is becoming.

James' Objector (Jas 2:18-19) and Paul's Righteous Gentiles (Rom 2:14-15)

The previous section showed that the texture of James' interaction with Paul is complex, but richly patterned. James is not merely repeating what Paul says, nor paraphrasing it, but in framing his own teaching on how brother should relate to brother, not in wrath, but in discernment of his πρόσωπον, not in προσωπολημψία, but in fulfilment of the royal law of loving his neighbour, James' text resonates at multiple points with Paul's Letter to the Romans, and with some of his other letters. It is in this context of a rich but complex intertextuality that we should turn to examine the passage that has been treated as the heart of James' relationship to Paul, both literary and textual: the discussion of faith and works in Jas 2:14-24.

Two signals that James is interacting with Paul are widely accepted. First and most importantly, he bandies about the dichotomy between "faith and works" in discussing the means of salvation or justification. This strongly suggests that James' debates are rooted in Paul's jargon and theological concerns.[47] James first opens the issue in debate with imaginary interlocutors in Jas 2:14, 16 and 18. However, it is his dogmatic statement about justification that is most frequently compared with Pauline texts:

ὁρᾶτε **ἐξ ἔργων δικαιουται** ἄνθρωπος καὶ **οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον** (Jas 2:24)

διότι **ἐξ ἔργων νόμου** οὐ **δικαιωθήσεται** πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ … νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται … **δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Rom 3:20-22)

λογιζόμεθα γὰρ **δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει** ἄνθρωπον **χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου** (Rom 3:28)

οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος **ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ** (Gal 2:16)

καὶ εὑρεθῶ ἐν αὐτῷ, **μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ** τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει (Phil 3:9)

Each of these declares a doctrine of justification by faith *versus* justification by works, but James' version is at least radically different in its nuance and emphasis, if it does not (as some have thought) contradict Paul outright.[48]

A second widely acknowledged signal to interaction with Paul is James' appeal to Abraham.[49] James appeals to a different incident in Abraham's story from Rom 4 and Gal 3:6, but he gives central authority to exactly the same Scriptural quotation as Paul does there: "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness" (ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, Jas. 2:23 // Rom 4:3 // Gal 3:6). However, according to James this proves a doctrine of justification that, as seen above, may sound like the exact opposite of what Paul argues (Jas 2:24). Furthermore, it is a quotation which seems rather inapposite to James' argument unless one envisages a Pauline intertext, for although this verse and this episode were used in Jewish texts that celebrate Abraham's faith-in-action,[50] in the context of a debate about the term "faith" the language of Gen 15:6 requires palpable massaging to support James' case, and indeed remains in tension with his οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον.[51]

---

[47] Dibelius, *James,* 179; Hengel, "Polemik," 254; Mitchell "Document of Paulinism?" 89; Syreeni, "Power Play," 406.
[48] Lührmann, *Glaube,* 82 "the conclusion that Jas in 2:24 draws out of the Abraham example sounds like a direct counterthesis to what Paul claimed in Gal 2:16 and Rom 3:28 and there grounded in the exegesis of Abraham" (my translation).
[49] Tsuji, *Glaube,* 190-1.
[50] E.g. Sir 44.20-1; 1 Macc 2:52; Philo, *Abr* 262, with Davids, *James,* 21; I. Jacobs, "The Midrashic Background of James II.21-3," *NTS* 22 (1976) 457-64; Konradt, *Christliche Existenz,* 236-7. See discussion in Nienhuis 116-17 n.75, who rightly points out that in this passage James' particular language and soteriological interest in Abraham are shared only with Paul.
[51] Tsuji, *Glaube,* 190.

In this debate about James' theological and literary relationship with Paul in Jas 2:14-26, the "objector" in Jas 2:18a(-c) has usually remained little more than a literary and punctuational problem, peculiar to James. However, he is perhaps more Pauline than has been thought. Like Paul's righteous gentiles, who "show (ἐνδείκνυνται) the work of the law (τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου) written on their hearts", James' interlocutor (or James himself, depending on punctuation) says, "I will show (δείξω) you by my works (ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου) my faith" (Jas 2:19). Thus Paul and James both emphasise not just *doing* work but the *demonstrative* value of work, and they do so in similar language.

Paul places this in the context of salvation at judgement: it is these righteous gentiles who will fare well when God judges the hidden things of human beings "according to my gospel through Christ Jesus" (Rom 2:16). Their "cardiac inscription" is one of several witnesses on their behalf at that judgement, alongside their conscience and their thoughts (Rom 2:14-16).[52] James introduces his argument about faith and works in the context of judgement: "for the judgement is without mercy for those who do not do (ποιήσαντι) mercy" (Jas 2:13). His expression, τί τὸ ὄφελος, continues this point rather than beginning a new one,[53] and he makes salvation the underlying question in his debate about the relationship between faith and works: "What good is it, my brothers, if a person says he has faith but has not works; surely the faith cannot save him, can it?" (Jas 2:14).

There are some differences between Paul's and James' language. Paul does not use πίστις to describe either what the righteous gentiles possess or what the self-righteous Jews claim, and James does not use νόμος either to qualify the works of the righteous interjector or to articulate what his self-righteous addressees claim. However, these differences appear less significant when the texts are read in their broader contexts.

Concerning πίστις, Paul's righteous gentiles are judged according to his gospel (Rom 2:16), and he has already described that gospel as "the power of God for salvation *for all who believe*" (δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Rom 1:16). They are Christian gentiles, whose hearts inscribed with the law manifest the eschatological fulfilment of the prophetic promises to Israel (Jer 31:33). Like Paul, James is seeking the kind of faith that has the power to save (μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶσαι αὐτόν; Jas 2:14, cf. Rom 1:16). Furthermore, this expression in James picks up his earlier injunction in the epistle to "receive the implanted word which has the power to save your souls" (τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον τὸν δυνάμενον σῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, Jas 1:21). I have already argued above that the "implanted word" functions in a similar way to Paul's idea of the righteous gentiles who do the things of the law φύσει, though they have not the law φύσει.

James does not use the term νόμος in depicting the works that show faith. However, read in the context of the development of his argument, the works of charity that he looks for from "faith" in Jas 2:14-16 continue the theme of the "law" as he has depicted it since first introducing it in Jas 1:25. Doers of the "perfect law of freedom" are those whose worship involves bridling the tongue and caring for the needy (Jas 1:26-27); the "royal law" is loving one's neighbour as oneself (Jas 2:8); one should speak and "do" as if going to be judged by the law of freedom, whereas there will be merciless judgement for those who do not "do" mercy. It is in this setting that James introduces the discussion of faith and works. Faith without works is faith without works of charity, merciless and insensitive to suffering brethren (Jas 2:15-16). These are precisely the kinds of works that he has been evoking in his depiction of the "law of freedom" and "royal law", hence they are appropriately coloured by the discourse of "law", even if the term is not used to qualify ἔργα. Conversely, when Paul writes of the doers of the law and the righteous gentiles, contrasting the hearers of the law and the hypocrites who boast in it, he emphasises that it is "works *of the law*" that the righteous gentiles do. However, this follows and develops a discussion in which he had emphasised doing good deeds, without reference to the law. He had insisted that judgement turns on works, good or bad, not on being Jewish or Gentile, and he summarised this by declaring that there is no προσωπολημψία with God.

---

[52] Gathercole, "Law," 40-6.
[53] Verseput, "Reworking," 100. The formula is Pauline, derived from the Corinthian correspondence: Syreeni, "Power Play," 403 with n.24; Mitchell, "Document of Paulinism?" 90.

In literary terms, the relationship to the Pauline intertext lends coherence to both the structure and the development of James' argument. Both James and Paul are introducing a third party to critique those who are too self-righteous in their faith, who are their immediate addressees. Paul's righteous gentiles show up the Jew whom he addresses in the second person, who calls himself a Jew, boasts in having the law and has confidence in God, but whose actions transgress the law and dishonour God (Rom 2:17-24). James' interlocutor extends and deepens James' own critique of his immediate audience, whom he addresses in the second person, who say they have faith, but whose actions show no real mercy (Jas 2:14-17). If one punctuates with Translation 2, above, then there emerges continuity and distinctiveness in James' own authorial voice: he underscores that faith without works is "dead" (νεκρά, vv.17, 26), and appeals to Jewish forebears as examples (vv.20-25), while his interlocutor alone offers demonstration from his own works of his faith. The main argument against this punctuation was that ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις always introduces an objection in other comparable texts. If we hear the voice of the righteous gentiles here, then that tone too makes better sense, for James' interlocutor accuses both James and his audience, tarring James with the same brush as his "brothers" (v.14). This person is mocking the faith of James inasmuch as he is the leader and brother of the irresponsible Twelve Tribes (Jas 1:1; 2:14). When the interjecting voice of the righteous gentile is heard, James' own critique of his brothers is deepened by that of an outsider. This interpretation also responds to the unlikelihood that James would introduce an entirely unknown and unspecified "someone" who would seek to prove his faith by his deeds, for his argument requires that the person's deeds must be credible to his addressees. My suggestion is that James *is* citing someone known to his audience: he is citing Paul's righteous gentiles. His ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις is used in a manner similar to the famous "Alexandrian footnote", where Greek and Roman poets cleverly inserted "they say" or "rumour has it" to cite anonymously a known intertext.[54] It serves to draw attention to the citation of an intertext well known to both James and his readers.[55]

The continuation in Jas 2:19 supports this interpretation. The text is corrupt, but the speaker undoubtedly critiques those who acknowledge mere faith that "God is One" (or perhaps that "there is one God").[56] Many scholars have perceived an allusion to Romans 3:30, where "God is One" in matters of justification by faith is the culmination of Paul's argument, before launching his example of Abraham: εἷς ὁ θεὸς ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως. In Jas 2:19 the speaker's mockery of those who believe "that God is One" is the culmination of James' argument before launching his example of Abraham. Paul's righteous gentiles were a criticism of Jews whose practices belie their confidence in God (Rom 2:17); James' speaker is criticising those whose practices belie their assertion of faith that "God is one", a phrase which resonates with the Shema, but *also* with pagan use of εἷς to describe God doxologically.[57] Paul's assertion that "God is one" celebrated the unity of God among Jews and Gentiles, after arguing for God's lack of προσωπολημψία in judging them on the basis of their works, good or bad. James' speaker makes a mockery of his and his brothers' faith that "God is one", by insisting in the mouth of an outsider that only faith effective in action will save. The shuddering of the demons discloses God's presence in judgement. When James in v.20 resumes in his own person his dialogue with his earlier, brotherly[58] interlocutor of vv.14-17, now his argument is strengthened by the humiliation received through the Pauline interjection that has just intervened.

---

[54] D.O. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975) 77-8. The common trope, "they say" (*ferunt, dicunt*) or "rumour has it" (*fama*), differs from James' formula, because it draws attention in a learned style to a tradition acknowledged as already known, but it is similar in offering an anonymous third-person speech to "footnote" a citation of a specific intertextual source.

[55] Paul's righteous gentiles were referred to explicitly in several other early Christian authors: e.g. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.95.3; 2.44.4; 3.46.2; 7.10.1; Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 4.16.15; 5.13.4; Origen, *Comm. Matt.* 17.16; *Fr. Matt.* 435, 437. Most of these references were found with the help of www.biblindex.mom.fr.

[56] Major variants in NA27: εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός: 𝔓74 ℵ A 2464 *pc* | εἷς ὁ θεός ἐστιν C 33vid. 81. 1243 *pc* | εἷς θεός ἐστιν B 614. 630. 1505.1852 *al* | ὁ θεός εἷς ἐστιν (K* *om.* 1) 𝔐   The first two and the last are best translated "God is one"; the third is closer to "There is one God."

[57] S. Mitchell and P. van Nuffelen (eds.), *One God: Pagan Monotheism in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

[58] Cf. ἀδελφοί μου … τις ἐξ ὑμῶν (Jas 2:14, 16). The vocative ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ is used for the first and only time in James in Jas 2:20, striking a harsh tone of rebuke. Elsewhere in the New Testament ὦ ἄνθρωπε is used in

This argument depends on recognising the extent of references and allusions to Paul in the earlier parts of the epistle, and especially in this exchange here (Jas 2:14-26). It is not in James' style to give names to the texts or authors with whom he interacts, nor to draw attention to a Jew-Gentile issue, which he would have to do if he cited Paul more explicitly. Only the slightest hint of that line of division remains in his use of his intertext; rather, James recasts the Pauline passage in a way that underscores the heart of Paul's argument that judgement turns on works, good or bad, such that even someone considered an outsider makes a mockery before God of the "in-group" of brethren whose faith is not shown in works. This is literary intertextuality, where texts are creatively recast rather than straightforwardly re-presented by stylists of allusion. James' relation to this educated world of intertextuality has been closely explored in recent years by J.S. Kloppenborg in his study of James' engagement with Jesus traditions. Kloppenborg identifies James' approach as *aemulatio,* an ancient, recognised rhetorical method of creatively and allusively rewriting an intertext, emulating and seeking to improve upon, rather than merely repeating or representing, the original.[59] Kloppenborg's analysis needs to be nuanced by recognition of James' intertextuality with a wide range of texts other than Q; but his location of James in this literary scene is apt. Conversant with a range of texts, James presents his own argument but in such a way that he regularly cites, alludes to, reshapes and inventively reworks his intertexts, thus providing his audience with a richer reading experience insofar as they know the same intertexts.

Conclusion

This essay has revisited the problems of Jas 2:18, which appears to jar with its literary context and whose proper punctuation and tone are unclear. It proposed that the semantic analysis of the verse in its context should be complemented by attentiveness to James' intertextuality. Building on recent scholarship that has argued for James' coherent structure, stylistic accomplishment, and literary use of Paul's letters, it argued that James' intertextuality with Paul is not limited to one portion of his own epistle, nor to one portion of Paul's. Rather, Jas 1-2 is shot through with allusions to Rom 1-4, which James interprets in a way that gives priority to the subtly Christological emphasis on good works in Rom 2:1-12. The "someone" who interjects in Rom 2:18-19 is plausibly the voice of the righteous gentiles (Rom 2:14-15), known to James' audience within their broader context in Paul. Hauntingly, one of these figures, who was but a literary character for Paul, introduced to make a theological point, in James is heard through "someone's" critique of James and his brothers for their hypocrisy, much as Paul used the righteous gentiles in critiquing the hypocritical Jews. We are in a world where Paul has become celebrated intertext for a subsequent master of allusion. Paul's gentiles never acquired their own voice in Romans; James grants them this, quickening to life the taunting tones and making the interplay more arresting through its combination of literary art and theological acuity.

---

this way only in Rom 2:1, 3 and 9:20. This could be added to Mitchell's list of vocatives that James shares with Paul in constructing his relationship with his addressees: "Document of Paulinism?" 85.

[59] J.S. Kloppenborg, "The Reception of the Jesus Tradition in James," in Niebuhr and Wall (eds.), *Catholic Epistles,* 71-100 [also printed in *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition* (ed. J. Schlosser; BETL 1526; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2004) 93-142]; "Diaspora Discourse: The Construction of *Ethos* in James," *NTS* 53 (2007) 264-7.