§vJ ITS GENUINENESS, &e. [ixrropvcrion.   
   
 “it is spurious —but it simply announces the fact, that some ¢o think   
 of it.   
 8. Euscbins says of Clement of Alexandria, “that he wrote short   
 expositions of all the books of the (Old and ?) New Testament, not even   
 passing over the disputed ones, the Epistle of Jude, and the rest called   
 catholic, and that of Barnabas, and the book called the Apocalypse of   
 Peter.” But it is manifest, that even were we to take thi fact, its   
 testimony, when taken with the last clause, is very fecble as regards the   
 canonicity of our Epistle.   
 9. Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus near Rome, quotes our Epistle appa-   
 rently as Scripture, but not by name: “ Your lamps are dark by reason   
 of your want of compassion: depart from me, for judgment shall be with-   
 out mercy to him who shewed no mercy” (James ii, 13).   
 10. Jerome says, “ James, who is called the brother of the Lord, snr-   
 named the Just... .. wrote one Epistle only, which is among the seven   
 catholic ones, which is moreover said to have been published by some one   
 else under his name, although by degrees, as time went on, it has gained   
 authority.”   
 11. Against these somewhat equivocal testimonies of the early Fathers,   
 may be set the fact, that the Peschito, or primitive Syria version, con-   
 tained our Epistle from the first, although it omitted the second and   
 third of John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. And this fact has the more   
 weight, becanse the Syrian church lay so near to the country whence the   
 Epistle originated, to those to which it was, in all probability, prin-   
 cipally addressed. And, as might be expected, we find it received and   
 cited by the Syrian church as the Epistle of James the Lord’s brother.   
 So Ephrem Syrus, and other writers of that church.   
 12. In the Western chureh also it soon, though gradually, rose into   
 general acecptation and canonical authority. It was recognized by the   
 council of Carthage in 897. From that time onward, we find it univer-   
 sally received: and indeed the great company of illustrious Greek Fathers   
 of the fourth century all quote it as canonical Scripture: Athanasius,   
 both the Cyrils, Gregory of Nazianzum, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Chry-   
 sostom, the author of the Synopsis, &e.   
 13. Various reasons might be assigned for the delay in receiving the   
 Epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty   
 about the personal identity and standing of its Writer: the fact, that it   
 was addressed entirely to Jewish believers: the omission in it of most   
 of the particulars of distinctively Christian doctrine: its seeming opposi-   
 tion to the doctrine of justification as laid down by St. Paul: all theso   
 would naturally work together to indispose the minds of Gentile Chris-   
 tians towards it. But as Thiersch and Wiesinger have rightly remarked,   
 so much the more valuable are those recognitions of its genuineness aud   
 caronicity which we do mcet with.   
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