intropuction. | THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES. [cu. xvi.   
   
   
 doubtful indeed : the latter would seem as if Irenzeus was acqnainted   
 with onr Epistle, seeing that two particulars not conjoined, and one of   
 them not perhaps even mentioned by the Septuagint ', are coupled by him   
 as they are in this Epistle. Still, for this citation we have not the Greek   
 of Irenus, but only his Latin interpreter.   
 5. It is difficult to believe, notwithstanding the precariousness of the   
 phrases cited to prove it, but that Hermas was acquainted with our   
 Epistle. The whole east of some passages resembles its tone and tenor   
 exceedingly. This is especially so in a passage, where he treats of   
 double-mindedness, and in fact expands the thoughts and words of St.   
 James : e. g., “ Cast out of thyself double-mindedness, and be not double-   
 minded in any thing in thy petitions from God . . . for God is not,   
 as men, mindful of grudges, but Himself incapable of bearing malice, and   
 is merciful over His ereatures . . . . . but if thou doubt in thine heart,   
 thou shalt receive nothing of thy petitions. For those who doubt in   
 their approaches to God, these are as it were double-minded and receive   
 nothing at all of their petitions, But those who are perfect in the faith   
 ask all things, trusting in God, and receive them because they ask   
 without doubting, not double-minded in any thing. For every double-   
 minded man if he repent not, shall with difficulty be saved.” Compare   
 this with our ch. i. 5—7, and it is hardly possible to believe the two   
 entirely independent of one another.   
 6. The first Father who has expressly cited the Epistle is Origen. In   
 his Commentary on John we read, “For if faith be predicated, but be   
 without works, such faith is dead, as we have read in the current Epistle   
 of James.” And in another work, ‘‘ Wherefore also it has been said,   
 that God is untempted by evil,” James i. 18. And in several other   
 places in Rufinus’s Latin version we have similar citations : “The   
 Apostle James says,” &e.   
 7. Eusebius says, “ Now of those books which are disputed, but still   
 well known to the Christian publie, we have that attributed to James,   
 and that to Jude, and the second Epistle of Peter, and the second and   
 third of John, be it of the Evangelist or of some other of the same   
 name.” And again in H.E. ii. 23, after relating the death of St. James,   
 he says, “ Such was the history of James, whose is said to be the first   
 of the Epistles called catholic : but it is to be noted that it is accounted   
 spurious : and but few of the ancients have mentioned it, as neither have   
 they that which goes by the name of Jude, which is also one of the   
 seven called catholic. Yet we know that these with the rest are publicly   
 read in most churches.” In this passage it can hardly be that “it is   
 accounted spurious” expresses Eusebius's own opinion as to the fact,—   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 3 See note, James ii. 23,