§v.J ITS GENUINENESS, &e. {iyrropucrion.   
   
 Greek style of this Epistle mnst ever remain, considering the native   
 place and position of its Writer, one of those difficulties with which it   
 is impossible for us now to deal satisfactorily.   
   
   
   
   
 SECTION V.   
 ITS GENUINENESS, AND PLACE IN TIE CANON.   
   
   
 1, The previous enquiry, in §i,, regarding the authorship of our   
 Epistle, proceeded on assuming that the commonly received superserip-   
 tion rightly designates the Epistle as the work of some apostolic person   
 bearing the name of James. It remains for us now to enquire, how far   
 such an assumption is justified.   
 2. And here we have before us a question not easily settled, and on   
 which both the ancients and moderns have been much divided. The sum   
 of ancient testimony is as follows :   
 8. The intimate connexion admitted to subsist between itand the first   
 Epistle of St. Peter, while it is valucless as an evidence of priority on   
 either side, may fairly be taken into account as an clement in our   
 enquiry \*. The places cited in the note cannot be for a moment fairly   
 called imitations. The case stands much as that between the common   
 passages in 2 Peter and Jude. It may legitimately be supposed, that   
 the writers of the two Epistles were accustomed to hold the same lan-   
 guage and exhort much in the same strains ;—were employed in the   
 apostolic work together : and that thus portions of that teaching in the   
 Spirit, which they had long carried on in common at Jerusalem, found   
 their way into their writings also. I cannot but regard this eireum-   
 stance as a weighty evidence for the Epistle being written in the   
 apostolic age, and by one who was St. Peter’s friend and companion at   
 Jerusalem in its earlier periods.   
 4, If this were so, it surprises us to find the Epistle so little used or   
 referred to by the Apostolic Fathers. Several more or less distant and   
 uncertain allusions have been pointed out in the writings of Clement of   
 Rome \*, Hermas’, and Irenwus\*. Of these the two former are very   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 8 Compare especially James i. 2 f. with 1 Pet. i. i. 10 f, with 1 Pet. i. 21,   
 with 1 Pet. ii. 1 f.; iv. 10, with 1 Pet. v. 5 f.; v. 20, with 1 Pet. iv. 8   
 ® « Abraham, who was called the Friend, was found faithfal, in becoming obedient   
 to the commands of God :” compare James ii. 21,23. And again: “For her faith and   
 hospitality Rahab the harlot was saved :” compare James i. 25.   
 1 « The devil can wrestle against us, but he cannot wrestle us down: if then thou   
 resist him, he will be conquered and flee from thee in disgrace :” compare James iv. 7.   
 2 «Abraham . . . . believed God, and it was reckoned to him for righteous-   
 ness, and he was called the Friend of God :” compare James ii. 23.   
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