finds peace only in faith in God, who   
justifies him of His free grace, i. e. so looks on  
and accepts him, as if he were righteous.  
This higher kind of justification, St. James  
does not recognize.” The whole question  
of fact, as to whether St. Paul’s teaching,  
or some misunderstanding of it, or neither  
the one nor the other, was in St. James’s  
view here, I have discussed in the Introduction,  
§ iii. 5 ff.

**14.]** **What is the  
profit** (arising from that to be mentioned:  
the resulting profit), **my brethren, if any**  
**man say** (there is no emphasis on the word  
**say,** as many have supposed: the whole  
argument proceeds on the hypothesis of his  
*possessing* faith: and in ver. 19, faith is  
actually ascribed to him. At the same  
time it is not to be wholly passed over,  
that the Apostle has written not “*have*  
faith,” but “*say he hath* faith.” While  
this does not imply any want of genuineness

in the faith, it perhaps slightly

distinguishes the possession of such faith  
from the absolute *having faith*: or, perhaps  
belongs to the dramatic form of the

hypothesis, in which the man is introduced  
boasting of and appealing to his faith) **that  
he has faith, but have not works** (i. e.  
those acts in his lite which are proofs and  
fruits of faith: not mere ceremonial works:  
see De Wette’s remarks cited above)? (a  
note of interrogation, not a comma, is to  
be placed here. The sentence contains two  
distinct but connected questions: “What  
is the profit, if &c.?” and, “Can &c.?”)  
**can (his) faith save him** (**him** is noticeable,  
as confining the question within the limits  
of the hypothesis, by making this   
particular man, who has faith and not works,  
the object of the question, and not any,  
or every man. Here lies the true key to  
the nullity of the faith in question)?  
  
**15, 16.]** *The quality, and unprofitableness,*

*of such faith shewn*, as in vv. 2, 3,  
*by a familiar example*. {15} **But** (so literally.  
It takes up the argument against the  
person supposed, or against his supporters.  
It is best rendered in English by   
beginning the sentence abruptly, not giving  
any word for it) **if a brother or a sister**  
(the case of a Christian brother or sister  
is supposed, to bring out more strongly  
the obligation to help, as a duty) **be**  
(found, on your access to them) **naked**  
(there is no need to interpret the word  
*badly clothed*, as so many Commentators:  
extreme destitution, and nakedness in the  
literal, or almost literal sense, might well  
go together) **and destitute of daily food,**{16} **and** (literally, **but**: bringing in the slight  
contrast between the want and the manner  
of its supply) **some one from among you**  
(not, as Grotius, of you, “who believe  
faith to suffice for salvation,” but generally;  
and put in this form to bring the  
inference nearer home to themselves) **say**  
(‘*shall have said*’), **Go in peace** (see  
Judg. xviii. 6; 2 Sam. xv. 9. The words  
would imply, that the wants were satisfied),  
**be warmed** (as being *naked*) **and filled; but  
ye** (enlarging the former “*one of you,*” and  
now applying the hypothesis to all) **give  
them not** (*have not given them*) **the**

**necessaries of the body; what is the profit?**

**17.]** *Application of the similitude.* **So  
also faith, if it have not** (be not

accompanied by as its proper result. Here,  
again, the quasi-identification of the *faith*  
with the man, and ascription of the *works*  
to it as a possession, shew in what relative  
places the two stand in the Apostle’s estimate)  
**works, is dead in itself** (not as A. V.,  
“being alone,” but the words belong to and  
qualify **dead**; it is dead, not merely to this