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Summary

James was an important figure in early Christianity, the brother of Jesus, according to the New Testament gospels, and the leader of the Jerusalem community, according to the Pauline Epistles and Acts. In the first through fourth centuries C.E. he became an important authority figure in proto-orthodox, Gnostic and Jewish-Christian writings, where he is portrayed as the first bishop of Jerusalem, a caretaker of the revelation of Jesus, an ideal Christian martyr and a priest of the Jewish temple. This thesis explores the portraits of James in early Christian writings in light of the claim to his authority and masculinity. It is argued that the development in his persona in these writings reflects an alternative masculine ideal presented by Christian authors in response to a crisis of masculinity among the Roman aristocracy, and that this contributed to the success of Christianity in the Roman Empire.

Útdráttur

## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Apoc. Jas.</td>
<td>First Apocalypse of James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Apoc. Jas.</td>
<td>Second Apocalypse of James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJ</td>
<td>Ascent of James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant.</td>
<td>Jewish Antiquities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.C.E.</td>
<td>Before Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
<td>Pseudo-Clementine Basic Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E.</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cels.</td>
<td>Contra Celsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor</td>
<td>Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Clement Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epist.</td>
<td>Epistle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum NS</td>
<td>Forum New Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gos. Eb.</td>
<td>Gospel of Ebionites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gos. Heb.</td>
<td>Gospel of Hebrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gos. Thom.</td>
<td>Gospel of Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Pseudo-Clementine Homilies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>Against Heresies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist. Eccl.</td>
<td>Ecclesiastical History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Critical Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa</td>
<td>Isaiah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>Epistle of James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSJ</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of Judaism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSNTSup</td>
<td>Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEK</td>
<td>Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Kerygma Petrou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Lukan L-source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCL</td>
<td>Loeb Classical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint Old Testament Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Matthean M-source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>Gospel of Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC</td>
<td>Nag Hammadi Codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHMS</td>
<td>Nag Hammadi and Manichean Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>Nag Hammadi Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovTSup</td>
<td>Supplements to Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSV</td>
<td>New Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan.</td>
<td>Panarion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prot. Jas.</td>
<td>Protevangelium of James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps.-Clem.</td>
<td>Pseudo-Clementine(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Sayings Gospel Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Revue Biblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHR</td>
<td>Revue de l'histoire des religions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLSS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Sermon on the Mount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNTW</td>
<td>Studies of the New Testament and Its World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Sacra Pagina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Sermon on the Plain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StPB</td>
<td>Studia Post-Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SupVC</td>
<td>Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae: Texts and Studies of Early Christian Life and Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Tchacos Codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vir.</td>
<td>On Illustrious Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMANT</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WUNT</td>
<td>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNW</td>
<td>Zeitschrift für die neustamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction.

This thesis is the end result of a project undertaken in 2007 in collaboration with the late professor Jón Ma. Ásgeirsson at the University of Iceland. It was a part of a Nordic research project entitled Personification in the New Testament Apocrypha under the Network for the Study of Early Christianity in its Greco-Roman Context, which concluded in 2009.¹ Our project, entitled Image of Masculinity: The Persona of James in Early Christian Sources, received funding from The Icelandic Centre for Research (Rannis) and was defined in the following manner:

The purpose of the study is to add to the understanding of the role and position of the persona of Jacob in early Christian apocryphal sources attributed to him from the perspective of masculinity and leadership. The study will proceed with focus on personification within the respective texts, especially James. Furthermore, the research will focus on the ideology of the texts in question with regard to the role and position of the sexes in their cultural environment and the picture emerging about the relations of sexes in these same texts. It will be asked if the picture present in these texts about the relations of the sexes is in accordance with the received ideology of the cultural environment or the criticism launched against it by Jesus of Nazareth. Finally, the study will take into consideration the idea of masculinity, the leader and leadership in the context of early Christianity from the different perspectives of how to define human beings based on the persona of James. The value of the study consists primarily in adding to the understanding of the role of the NT Apocrypha for the realization of the complex origin of Christianity and for the discovery of an anthropological understanding that did not prevail in the history of the church.²

My contribution has been unduly delayed and I am grateful to those who have assisted its completion, prof. Petri Luomanen for motivation, and Dr. Sólveig Anna Bóasdóttir and Dr. Rúnar Þorsteinsson for supervision.

The following discussion is divided into two parts: Part one discusses the early Christian writings that refer to or describe the persona of James and part two interprets these references in light of scholarly discussions of authority and masculinity.

The use of personae as representatives of certain groups or ideologies is common in early Christian narrative and historical figures are continuously reinvented as champions, interlocutors or culprits in Christian

¹ The homepage of the Network for the Study of Early Christianity in its Greco-Roman
writings. Examples abound: the beloved disciple is in the Gospel of John a model of faith for the Johannine community, whereas Thomas represents a culprit that portrays a type of faith that is lacking. Thomas is himself a champion of a Thomasine trajectory on which we find the Gospel of Thomas, The Book of Thomas the Contender and The Acts of Thomas and in the Gospel of Thomas James is a culprit representing a lesser cosmology.

Peter has a near-universal position as a champion in early Christian writings and is placed alongside other authority figures, but historically his position is among the Pillars of Jerusalem, James and John.

James represents a number of groups in early Christianity, but his persona is invariably connected to the Jerusalem community of which the historical James was leader. As he becomes the subject of discussion in Gnostic (Nag Hammadi), Jewish-Christian and proto-orthodox circles, his portrait is embellished with attributes that are not present in the New Testament references; an image of piety in martyrdom, a bishop of the throne of Jerusalem and a symbol of ascetic celibacy.

These embellished character traits are markers of an emerging image of masculinity, which gained hegemony in the 2nd–4th centuries, where a crisis of masculinity was addressed by Christian authors and replaced with a subversive masculine ideal. The central thesis presented here is that the portraits of James’ authority and masculinity in early Christian writings reflect changing ideals of masculinity in Greco-Roman culture.

---

5 Cf. discussion on page 77.
6 Cf. Gal 2.9.
Part I: The persona of James.

he was holy from his mother’s womb. He drank no wine nor strong drink, nor did he eat flesh; no razor went upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil, and he did not go to the baths.  

James the Just is in many ways a fascinating subject, a pillar of the Jerusalem congregation alongside Peter and John and apostle and brother of Jesus. James⁹ was a very common name in the first century world of Judaism, after יַﬠֲקֹב (yaʿqōb) the third Patriarch of the tribes of Israel. The New Testament cites a number of persons named James,¹⁰ but James the brother of Jesus is so well known that the author of the Epistle of James needs only designate “James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (Jas 1.1, NRSV). The designation brother of Jesus¹¹ has been the subject of

---

⁸ Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. II.23.5, (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
⁹ The Septuagint translation is Ἰάκωβος and the same spelling is used in the New Testament, but English Bible translations traditionally distinguish between the Old Testament using Jacob and James in the New Testament.
¹⁰ The others are: James son of Zebedee and brother of John (one of the twelve, tradition calls him James the Greater) (Mark 3.17; Matt 10.3; Luke 6.14; Acts 1.13), James son of Alpheus (another of the twelve) (Mark 3.18; Matt 10.3; Luke 6.15; Acts 1.13), Jacob the younger or the less (Mark 15.40; 16.1; Matt 27.56; Luke 24.10), James the father of Jude (who was one of the twelve) (Luke 6.16; Acts 1.13) and James the brother of the author of the Epistle of Jude (Jude 1.1). These names could of course refer to the same people.
¹¹ The term ἀδελφός does not only refer to blood ties, although that is the most common use. The term is for example used in the New Testament as a brother of the faith (e.g. Matt 28.10; 1 Cor 1.10) and as a blood-relative in a wider sense (e.g. Rom 9.3). In Matt 5.22 the term is used over neighbours and in Mark 6.17-18 over half-brothers (Herod and Philip had the same father). In the LXX it is used over relatives or kinsperson (e.g. Gen 24.48; 29.12). Hartin, James of Jerusalem 2004, 26-28.

Louw and Nida place the noun ἀδελφός in two semantic domains: Domain 10, “Kinship terms” (10.49) referring to “Kinship relations of the same generation” i.e. siblings and Domain 11, “Groups and Classes of Persons and Members of Such Groups and Classes” (11.23, 11.25, 11.57, 11.89). This can refer to being brothers of the same religion or socio-religious entity, of the same ethnic background or nationality or to someone living close beside another and is therefore part of the in-group, i.e. neighbour. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, eds., Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains (New York, N.Y.: United Bible Societies, 1988).
debate since the early church, but it is clearly meant to establish his importance and closeness to Jesus. James’ importance as a figure in early Christianity can be seen through references to him in writings that do not belong to the Christian canon. Josephus tells of his life and martyrdom in the *Antiquites*, recounting that James, “is the brother of Jesus who was called the Christ, and certain others”, and that the high priest Ananus the younger “accused them of having transgressed the law and delivered them up to be stoned”. Another source that shows James’ importance in early Christianity is Eusebius of Caesarea, who embellishes James’ martyrdom by the hands of the high priest. Eusebius bestows upon him the title “James the Just” and, quoting Hegesippus, explains that “many are called James, but he was holy from his mother’s womb”. Eusebius paints James in pietistic terms, and again quoting Hegesippus he continues: “He drank no wine or strong drink, nor did he eat flesh; no razor went upon his head; he did not anoint himself with oil, and he did not go to the baths.” This designation

---

12 The designation is common in early Christian writings, but became the subject of debate with the advent of ideas concerning the perpetual virginity of Mary. A number of ideas were put forth by early church fathers to explain the siblings of Jesus. The first was proposed by Epiphanius of Salamis, but he believed the brothers of Jesus to be sons of Joseph from a previous marriage. This he based on the *Protevangelium of James*, which describes the virgin birth of Jesus and Mary’s perpetual virginity. In the *Protevangelium* Joseph is said to have been selected in the temple to marry the immaculately conceived Mary, but protests saying that he has sons (James and others) and is an old man. (Prot. Jas. 9.2. Oscar Cullmann, “The Protevangelium of James,” in *Gospels and Related Writings* (ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher; vol. I of *New Testament Apocrypha*, trans. R. McL. Wilson; 2nd. ed.; Tübingen: C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990; repr., Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press, 2003), 430.) This explanation is taken up by Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Eusebius. Another explanation is called the Helvidian theory, but Helvidius’ writings are known through the refutations of Jerome in his *Adversus Helvidius de Mariae virginitate perpetua*. According to Jerome, Helvidius proposed that James and the brothers of Jesus were his siblings, sons of Mary and Joseph. Earlier proponents of this view were e.g. Tertullian. Through Jerome’s writing the Helvidian theory was deemed heretical and in *Adversus Helvidius* he proposed the theory, known as the Hieronymian theory, that the term ἀδελφὸς refers to different blood ties, i.e. James was Jesus’ cousin not brother. Jerome believed the brothers of Jesus to be sons of Mary of Clopas, the virgin Marys aunt, yet defended the apostolic origin of the Epistle of James, stating that its author is James son of Zebedee. This view was championed by Augustine and remains the traditional view of the Catholic church. Hartin, *James of Jerusalem* 2004, s. 24-26.

15 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II.23.4 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
16 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II.23.5 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
James the Just was widely used in Christian writings f. ex. in *The Gospel of Thomas* where in saying §12 James ‘the righteous’ is given special status among the disciples of Jesus, for whose sake “heaven and earth came into being”. 17

James was a towering figure in early Christianity and his legacy can be found in three distinct traditions. The oldest can be traced back to the historical James as the leader of Christians in Jerusalem, from the groups foundation to its inevitable disbanding in the Roman siege of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. The New Testament writings of Paul and *Acts* are our main source of information for the historical figure of James, the gospels include information regarding Jesus’ family and the *Epistle of James* preserves the teachings of James, although it is unlikely that its author is the historical James.

A second tradition of James is found in writings that have been described as Jewish-Christian, a tentative categorization at best. In writings such as *The Pseudo-Clementines* and *The Gospel of Hebrews*, James is portrayed as a champion of a Christian faith that diverges from the nascent Pauline orthodoxy in that it kept closer to Jewish heritage and traditions.

The third and final tradition is found in the Nag Hammadi writings that either bear his name, such as *The Apocryphon of James* and *The First and Second Apocalypse of James*, or discuss his persona and teaching, such as *The Gospel of Thomas*. His ascriptions are honorary, at least in the first three aforementioned writings, and place him as a champion of the esoteric teachings that these writings portray. In addition to these writings James is a point of discussion in Josephus and early church fathers, such as Eusebius, Origen, Epiphanius and Jerome.

17 “The disciples said to Jesus, We know that you will depart from us. Who is to be our leader? Jesus said to them, wherever you are, you are to go to James the righteous, for whose sake heaven and earth came into being.” Bentley Layton, *Gos. Thom.* §12.

2.1 The Pauline Corpus.

Galatians

Paul’s letter to the Galatians is most likely the oldest extant reference to James the brother of Jesus. The scholarly consensus regarding Galatians is that it is undisputedly Pauline and most likely written around the beginning of Paul’s extended stay in Ephesus, ca. 52 C.E.\(^{18}\) The issue at stake in Paul’s letter to the Galatians is the Jewish law and Galatians 2 describes a confrontation between Paul, Barnabas and Titus (Gal 2.1) as emissaries of the Antioch Church\(^{19}\) and the pillars of the Jerusalem church, James, Peter (Cephas) and John (Gal 2.9). Galatians recounts three encounters Paul had with James, or those from James, and through Paul’s descriptions James’ importance in the Jerusalem Church becomes evident.

The first encounter is found in Gal 1.15-20 describing Paul’s first journey to Jerusalem, usually dated between 36 and 38,\(^{20}\) the second encounter is his confrontation in Jerusalem in Gal 2.1-10, usually dated between 48 and 49 C.E., and the third is in Gal 2.11-12 “when Cephas came to Antioch” (Gal 2.11, NRSV) and Paul allegedly “opposed him to his face, because [of those who] came from James” (Gal 2.11-12, NRSV).

---


\(^{19}\) Paul does not explicitly say that they called the Apostolic Council as emissaries of the Antioch church, however “a great majority of scholars assume that the discussion in Jerusalem became necessary because the Gentile Christians in Antioch were required to accept circumcision.” Matti Myllykoski, “James the Just in History and Tradition: Perspectives of Past and Present Scholarship,” *CBS 5* (2006): 103-4.

\(^{20}\) Scholars vary in their approach to the chronology of the life of Paul, but rely on a few dates that are more reliable than others. “Among the established dates that help in situating certain of Paul’s activities are: the death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 C.E., the presence of Gallio the proconsul of Achaia in 50-51 C.E. or 51-52 C.E., and Felix as Procurator of Palestine in 58-60 C.E. Using these pointers […] one would place Paul’s conversion around 35 C.E. with his first visit to Jerusalem three years later (around 38 C.E.) and his second visit “after fourteen years” (Gal 2.1; i.e., fourteen years after his conversion, or around 49 C.E.)” Hartin, *James of Jerusalem*, 55.
Paul’s first trip to Jerusalem is described after he has established his independence from those “who were already apostles before me” (Gal 1.17, NRSV), referring to the leaders of the Jerusalem church.\(^{21}\)

Then after three years I did go up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas and stayed with him fifteen days; but I did not see any other apostle except James the Lord’s brother. In what I am writing to you, before God, I do not lie! (Gal 1.18-20, NRSV)

Paul’s aim was to meet and exchange ideas with Peter and the exact roles these two leaders had in Jerusalem is not clear from Paul’s description. Matti Myllykoski presents an overview of the different positions scholars have taken in interpreting this text.

… did he prefer Peter to all the rest because Peter was the acknowledged leader of the community (Pratscher 1987: 56), or because Paul assumed that Peter was more sympathetic to his cause than James (Painter 1997: 60)? Or, should we assume that Paul turned to Peter because, among the apostles, he was the one most interested in mission (von Campenhausen 1963a: 20 n. 7); or, because he was ‘the chief apostle in the mission that brought into being the church that Paul (Saul) had persecuted’ (Farmer 1999: 143)? There seems to be something right in all of these assumptions; at least Paul thought that communication with Peter would be most useful for his future activities. (Gal 1.17, NRSV)

One problem regarding James’ stature in the early Christian movement centres on whether James was regarded as an apostle. In Gal 1.19\(^{22}\) the wording εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, εἰ ἰµὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, can be read both inclusively and exclusively, i.e. that Paul regarded James as an apostle among those in Jerusalem or alternatively that he did not enjoy such stature. Scholars vary in their interpretation of this clause,\(^{23}\) but support in favour of James’ stature as apostle can be drawn from 1 Cor 15.7, where James is counted among “all the apostles”\(^{24}\).

---


\(^{22}\) Gal 1.19: ἔτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων σὺν εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, Nestle-Aland XXVII.

\(^{23}\) Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives,” 89.

\(^{24}\) 1 Cor 15.7, NSRV. ἔπειτα ὡφθη Ἰακώβῳ, εἶτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις πᾶσιν, Nestle-Aland XXVII.
William R. Farmer suggests that while in Jerusalem Paul primarily consults Peter, the apostle responsible for Paul’s conversion,\(^{25}\) and the purpose of his visit (ἱστορῆσαι) was to consult with Peter as an expositor of the law (ἲστωρ).\(^{26}\) Paul only refers to James as a secondary character, an associate of Peter, and in connection with some pivotal moment in the life of the church.\(^{27}\) Farmer argues, however, that James enjoys a grand stature in Paul’s mind: as being preeminent among the leaders of the Jerusalem church (unlike Peter);\(^{28}\) as having a special authority in interpreting Jesus’ words because they where brought up together;\(^{29}\) as representing Mary who was perhaps the most influential voice in the very earliest church;\(^{30}\) and enjoying a twofold status as belonging both to the group of apostles of Jesus and the brothers of the lord.\(^{31}\) Farmer’s conclusions may be too far-reaching, but they underline the importance of James as the leader of the Jerusalem community. Patrick Hartin acknowledges that Peter is undoubtedly the leader of the group, since all traditions at the end of the first century reflect this role, but he maintains that James’ role (distinct from Peter’s) is that of a


\(^{26}\) “The verb translated “to visit” is ἱστορῆσαι. This verb can also have other meanings. In this context we can best understand this verb if we begin with the cognate noun form ἲστωρ. The ἲστωρ in ancient Greece functioned as examiner and arbiter in legal matters. He was learned in the law and skilled in examining witnesses. He knew how to ask the right questions of people who were being examined in order to ascertain the truth in matters of dispute. The truth he was after was not philosophical truth in some abstract metaphysical sense, but rather the kind of truth that can issue in practical wisdom. In the final analysis the ἲστωρ was a judge. Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, James the Just, 135.

\(^{27}\) Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, James the Just, 133-34.

\(^{28}\) Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, James the Just, 143.

\(^{29}\) “The way in which Jesus learned to speak at his mother’s knee and while playing with James and other children in his home and neighbourhood environment and while growing up and assisting in the family place of business, was the final court of appeal in resolving any question about the meaning of the words and idiomatic expressions Jesus used in formulating teaching for his disciples.” Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, James the Just, 142.

\(^{30}\) Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, James the Just, 141.

\(^{31}\) Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, James the Just, 140.
residential leader of the Jerusalem Church. From Galatians we gather that “this [role] is not something he has suddenly inherited from Peter” but was already exercising even while Peter was still present in Jerusalem.

Paul’s second visit, that took place around the year 48 C.E. and is often named the Apostolic Council, was an effort by the Antiochian church to establish unanimity with the Christians in Jerusalem and apparently to silence those “false believers” (Gal 2.4) who sought to enslave Christians by enforcing circumcision and might claim in their defence the law observance of James and the Jerusalem community. Paul’s aim was to ensure ecclesiastical unity among Jewish and Gentile believers, which he thought possible despite the differences with respect to observance of the law. Myllykoski concludes that “[t]he touchstone of the agreement was the question whether the uncircumcised Gentile convert Titus […], would be accepted as a brother in Christ without first being circumcised.”

In Paul’s mind the meeting was quite a success since Titus was not asked to be circumcised (Gal 2.6) and the two churches agreed to respect each other’s missionary activity, the Jerusalem church to the circumcised and Paul to the Gentiles (Gal 2.9). “They asked only one thing, that we remember the poor, which was actually what I [Paul] was eager to do”. (Gal 2.10, NRSV)

The consensus did not last though and when Peter visits Antioch (soon thereafter), division is sparked by an apparent double-standard of Peter regarding dietary practice.

But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood self-condemned; for until certain people came from James, he

---

32 Hartin, James of Jerusalem, 54-55.
33 Hartin, James of Jerusalem, 55.
34 Koester, History vol. II, 111. Both these dates are of course an approximation. A recent discussion on the basis for dating the Apostolic council and Galatians time of writing is found in Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives”, 102-4.
used to eat with the Gentiles. But after they came, he drew back and kept himself separate for fear of the circumcision faction. And the other Jews joined him in this hypocrisy, so that even Barnabas was led astray by their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they were not acting consistently with the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas before them all, ‘If you, though a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how can you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?’ (Gal 2.11-14, NRSV)

The exact nature of the conflict is hard to determine, but apparently table fellowship within a Gentile framework was unacceptable to the strict Jewish Christians of James. For Paul the issue of adherence to the Mosaic Law was a difficult one. Paul was a Hellenistic Jew from the Diaspora, but he was also a Pharisee for whom strict observance of the law was a matter of course and whose zeal for the Jewish law made him a persecutor of Christians (cf. Gal 1.13, 23; 1 Cor 15.9; Phil 3.6). A number of scholars hold that Paul maintains his Torah observance as a Christian and his refutations are only polemics against those that misunderstand its purpose.

In his letters Paul often contradicts himself, which can best be explained by the fact his theology is in process and in dialogue / polemics with different ideas. At times he seems to observe the law fully, at times he can allegorize the Torah (e.g. Rom 2.25-29) and at times he refutes it completely and even connects the law with sin, curse and death (e.g. Rom 7.4-13). The

40 The protestant (Lutheran) doctrine of Sola fida justification or “by faith alone“ has of course been refuted as a legitimate reading of Paul’s theology. The doctrine depends on the negative assumption that Jews interpreted the Torah as bondage or a burden and that salvation was to be earned by strict adherence to (impossible) lawful works. This protestant view has been replaced by an understanding of the Torah in Hellenistic Judaism that E. P. Sanders has called “covenantal nomism“: “The ‘pattern’ or ‘structure’ of covenantal nomism is this: (1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God’s promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God’s mercy belong to the group that will be saved. An important interpretation of the first and last points is that election and, ultimately, salvation are considered to be by God’s mercy rather
Perspective on Paul finds that Paul’s main problem with the Law is that it separates Jew from Gentile and for him there is no such distinction in Christ (Gal 3.28).

The Christian congregation in Antioch was one of the two towers of early Christianity along with the Jerusalem community. These centres of faith presented very different positions, both theological and sociological. The Jerusalem church most likely consisted mainly of Jewish-Christians that were law-abiding and Aramaic speaking. They viewed themselves as belonging to a special group within the Jewish religious community and participated in the Temple cult, but were different in their allegiance to Jesus and in their emphasis on the spirit of God, which to them had been poured out at the end of times and they were witnessing. Jerusalem also had a special place among Jews as the centre of their religion and place of pilgrimage to those living in the Diaspora. Respectively the church in Antioch consisted for the most part of uncircumcised Greek-speaking Gentiles and being far from the Temple of Jerusalem conformance to Jewish law was not required. Greek was the language of the church and of its missionary activities, which went far beyond the boundaries of Antioch.

The centrality of the Jerusalem church is evident from Paul’s attitude, not only in Galatians, but in the other Pauline epistles as well.

41 The “New Perspective” is primarily connected with the names of Krister Stendahl, E. P. Sanders and James Dunn. Räisänen, Rise, 177-78.
42 Räisänen, Rise, 178.
45 Examples of this abound. In First Thessalonians Paul compares the plight of the Thessalonians to that of the Jerusalem church rather than that of the nearby church of Beroea (Acts 17.13). “For you, brothers and sisters, became imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus that are in Judea, for you suffered the same things from your own compatriots as they did from the Jews” (1 Tess 2.14, NRSV). In First Corinthians Paul corrects the congregation on matters of correct practice (συνήθεια) with regard to the Jewish Christian church (cf. 1 Cor 11.16; 14.34-36) and in Romans the Gentile churches are said to be “in debt or under obligation (ὀφειλεται) to the “poor among the saints” (i.e. Jerusalem)”. Bengt Holmberg, Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1980), 50-51.
The common opinion among the first Christians was that Jerusalem was the centre of the rapidly growing church and the church of Antioch regarded itself as bound to the mother church in Jerusalem. This is, according to Bengt Holmberg (and others), due to the city’s role as “the salvation-historical centre of the church . . . [and] owing its role as the Holy City and theologico-juridicial centre of Judaism”. Holmberg argues that while Paul disagreed with the Jerusalem church, he was ambivalent in his attitude towards the Jerusalem Pillars and never fully independent of their authority. The Antiochian dispute gives us valuable insight into how the nascent church resolved conflict and which leaders where in a position to exercise authority. Wayne Meeks lists three lessons that can be learned from the dispute: First, that the belief in the messiahship and resurrection of Jesus had formed into a distinct sect among Jews within two decades of his death, not only in Jerusalem but in several places outside Judea; second that there was a concern for unity between these centres: “What happened among Christians in Antioch mattered to those in Jerusalem, and vice versa”; and third that “the primary means for resolving conflict seems to have been meeting and talking”.

We know little about the Jerusalem church, apart from what the Pauline epistles and Acts can tell us, and scholars have raised serious questions regarding the reconstruction of a Jerusalem church from these sources, which Dennis E. Smith claims is based on reading Paul through the

---

47 “On one hand he implicitly recognizes their authority to judge his gospel (Gal 2.2), but on the other he is expressly independent and declares that he has his gospel directly from a divine revelation” (e.g. Gal 1.8, 12). Holmberg, *Paul and Power*, 25.
lens of Luke-Acts. Acts chapters 1–14 are especially difficult since those chapters have no parallels in Paul or other canonical literature. Smith disputes three key claims made in Acts: that “resurrection appearances in Jerusalem served as the foundation event for the faith of the first disciples”; that the first church was founded in Jerusalem, from which Christianity spread; and that “Jerusalem had a claim of authority over churches, especially the Gentile churches of Paul’s mission.” The first claim can be convincingly argued by noting that we have evidence, such as Q and Gos. Thom., of very early groups that were not based in Jerusalem and did not have a resurrection or passion based theology. The second claim is convincing in light of Luke’s intentional narrative and ideological use of Jerusalem, which as Milton Moreland has shown is “tied to his ideological topoi of virtuous living, righteousness, and kingship; his narrative scheme of promise and fulfilment; his idea of the persecuted prophet; his eschatological outlook; and his general desire to link his community to the Jewish epic.” Smith’s third claim, that the Jerusalem

52 Smith reviews that “Luke has come to be recognized by scholars as an author with a theological agenda” and that the genre of Acts, long assumed to be history, has been “identified in more recent scholarship as clearly related to novelistic “romance” literature of the ancient world.” He goes on to say that “some scholars still propose that Acts can be defined under the genre of ancient history in some sense, but the burden of proof has now shifted to those who claim historicity for Acts. Smith, “What do we really know,” in Cameron and Miller, Origins, 239.
53 This is in his view a Lukan fiction created to fit Luke’s theological and literary program. Smith, “What do we really know,” in Cameron and Miller, Origins, 240-41.
church did not in any way have authority over the Gentile (Pauline) churches, is more problematic as Bengt Holmberg has shown.\textsuperscript{57} Smith goes on to argue that the Pillars, Cephas, John and James, did not live in Jerusalem, but met Paul during festivals. Paul knew very little of the ‘Jesus’ people of Galilee (including James), his references to the Jerusalem meetings are polemics in response to his opponents in Galatia, who claimed authority by referring to Jerusalem, and those “from James” in Gal 2.12 consisted of converts in the patron/client sense, rather than emissaries of a Jerusalem church.\textsuperscript{58}

The majority of scholars maintain the view that there was a central Jerusalem church and that James was in a key leadership position in that ekklesia.\textsuperscript{59} From the evidence found in Paul and Acts, Craig C. Hill attempts to reconstruct the ideology of the Jerusalem church, but his position is based on a positive view of the historicity of Acts where in agreement with Paul.\textsuperscript{60} Hill suggests that the Jerusalem church consisted of Jewish-Christians,\textsuperscript{61} who “retained common and important elements of Judaism not generally carried over into Gentile Christianity”.\textsuperscript{62} Those elements being: “belief in the election and hope for the restoration of Israel, obedience to the law of Moses, and reverence for the temple”.\textsuperscript{63} The element of Israel can be found

\textit{and Greco-Roman Discourse} (ed. Todd Penner and Caroline Vander Stichele; SBLSymS 20; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 286.

\textsuperscript{57} See discussion above. Holmberg, \textit{Paul and Power}, 50-51.


\textsuperscript{59} Mylykoski, “James: Perspectives,” 89.

\textsuperscript{60} He states: “The difficulty is … in accepting Acts as a historical source. … The picture of primitive Christianity in Acts correlates too well with Paul’s to be dismissed out of hand. … where Acts converges with Paul, as it frequently does, it ought to be taken seriously as a historical source.” Craig C. Hill, “The Jerusalem Church,” in \textit{Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts} (ed. Matt Jackson-McCabe; Minneapolis, MA: Fortress Press, 2007), 45.


in the division of labour between Paul and the Pillars, “agreeing that we
[Paul and Barnabas] should go to the Gentiles and they [the Pillars] to the
circumcised” (Gal 2.7-9, NRSV). The necessity of preaching the gospel to
the elect was assumed by both parties, the question was if uncircumcised
Gentiles should be included.64 The element of the Law is reflected in the
issues at hand and Hill states that it is unlikely that the Jerusalem church
leaders saw the decision to include Gentiles as a violation of the law of
Moses, but rather as an eschatological hope realized.65 The evidence
concerning the Jerusalem church’ attitude toward the temple is found only
in Acts, where temple reverence is a feature of the church’ piety.66

To summarize the picture of James that emerges from reading
Galatians is that he was an important figure among the Christian leaders of
Paul’s time and the leader of the church of Jerusalem, a central congregation
due to the city’s salvation-historical role.

First Corinthians

First Corinthians, like Galatians, is written during Paul’s extended
stay in Ephesus and if we assume he arrived there in 52 C.E., the letter must
have been written in the winter of 53-54.67 Two references in First
Corinthians are important for our study: the first are discussions of financial
support for itinerant missionaries in 1 Cor 9.5-6 and the second is a list of
resurrection witnesses in 1 Cor 15.

64 Hill, “The Jerusalem Church,” in Jackson-McCabe, Jewish-Christianity Reconsidered, 47.
66 “The temple served as an appropriate place to gather (Acts 2.46; 3.21), to pray (3.1) and
to preach and teach (5.20, 42) – even, according to the author of Acts, for Paul himself
(21.26; 22.17; 25.8).” “The Jerusalem Church,” in Jackson-McCabe, Jewish-Christianity
Reconsidered, 51. The temple is, of course, one of the topos that the author uses to establish
the Jerusalem community’s exemplary (and ideological) piety. “The story of the early
Christians being rejected by the temple authorities and eventually by the residents of the
city [of Jerusalem] fits well with the idea of kingdom/kingship, which is a significant
Lukan ideological topos … working with the idea of Jesus as king with Jerusalem as his
67 Koester, History vol. II, 126.
In 1 Cor 9.5-6 Paul contrasts his (and Barnabas’) missionary activity with that of the circumcised in that they are able to travel with their wives, whereas they themselves did not.

Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a believing wife, as do the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas? Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to refrain from working for a living? (1 Cor 9.5-6, NRSV)

The issue at stake in Corinth was apparently a conflict between those members of the Corinthian church that were more affluent and the poorer majority. The more affluent believers could contribute to the Christian mission with financial and political support, in ways that the poorer could not and tensions arose regarding “whether to accept invitations to eat with pagans (1 Cor 8-10) and the humiliation of the poor in the meetings for the Lord’s supper.”68 The patrons received no honorific titles for their patronage, such as was customary in the synagogue,69 but they belonged to a separate group of “strong” (1 Cor 1.26-28) that Paul addresses his admonitions to.

J. D. Crossan and J. L. Reed recount the dispute in Corinth and Paul’s many correspondences to the congregation in their book In search of Paul.70 Of particular interest is the fact that Paul defends at length his right to receive support for his missionary efforts only to vehemently refuse such support from the Corinthian assembly.

In the same way, the Lord commanded that those who proclaim the gospel should get their living by the gospel. But I have made no use of any of these rights, nor am I writing this so that they may be applied in my case. Indeed, I would rather die than that — no one will deprive me of my ground for boasting! (1 Cor 9.5-6, NRSV)

The authors note that Paul never refused such support from the congregation in Philippi and he even admits to receiving help from them while in Corinth (cf. 2 Cor 11.8-9).71 His rejection is not based on different social settings in

---

68 Meeks, Urban Christians, 118-19.
69 Meeks, Urban Christians, 81.
71 Crossan and Reed, In Search of Paul, 331.
the two cities; both were Roman colonies of comparable size and stature, but on his refusal to accept patronage from those of high standing in the Corinthian community and thereby subjecting himself to the “standard and competitive patronal relationships basic to their culture’s normalcy”. Instead Paul defends the importance of the weak and the poor as equals in the egalitarian Christian community, described by Crossan and Reed as:

A kenotic community begets equality, a patronal community begets inequality; kenosis begets cooperation, patronage begets competition. Instead Paul defends the importance of the weak and the poor as equals in the egalitarian Christian community, described by Crossan and Reed as:

A kenotic community begets equality, a patronal community begets inequality; kenosis begets cooperation, patronage begets competition. Instead Paul defends the importance of the weak and the poor as equals in the egalitarian Christian community, described by Crossan and Reed as:

A kenotic community begets equality, a patronal community begets inequality; kenosis begets cooperation, patronage begets competition.

Paul’s referral to “the brothers of the Lord and Cephas” in 1 Cor 9.5 is part of his defence for receiving support and it is, as in Galatians, secondary in his argumentation. One might ask if his remarks are evidence in support of missionary activity of James in the Diaspora and if his claim to be accompanied by a believing wife means that Paul himself was married, since the idiom is strange if he was not.

An interesting picture emerges in that missionary practice was divided along party lines; those of the circumcision mission travelled with their wives, and both where supported, while those of the uncircumcised mission travelled alone and needed to work to support themselves. James clearly belongs to the group referred to as “brothers of the Lord”, but it is difficult to use 1 Cor 9.4-6 to determine if James himself went on missionary trips. In Corinth only Peter’s party was prominent (cf. 1 Cor 1.10-12; 3.3-4.21) and this explains why he is singled out in Paul’s argument, which as Painter states “tends to confirm the view suggested by the evidence of Galatians, that when Paul encountered opposition from the circumcision mission in the Diaspora, it was associated with Peter, although there might be influence of James in the background.”

---

72 Crossan and Reed, In Search of Paul, 336.
73 Crossan and Reed, In Search of Paul, 334.
74 Painter, Just James, 78.
75 Painter, Just James, 78.
76 Painter, Just James, 78.
In 1 Cor 15 Paul lists a number of resurrection witnesses in support of his claim that he himself is an apostle of the Lord, since he belongs to the group of believers Jesus had revealed himself to:

For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brothers and sisters at one time, most of whom are still alive, though some have died. Then he appeared to James, then to all the apostles. Last of all, as to someone untimely born, he appeared also to me. For I am the least of the apostles, unfit to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. But by the grace of God I am what I am, and his grace towards me has not been in vain. (1 Cor 15.3-10a, NRSV)

This list of resurrections passes on a tradition that gives Peter pride of place as the first mentioned ahead of the twelve and among all who accepted this tradition. Farmer rightly points out that this is by no means the only tradition on this matter as there is no mention of the women whom Jesus appeared to before Peter in the gospel of Matthew, nor the beloved disciple who was given the honour in the gospel of John of entering the tomb before Peter.\(^77\) Putting Peter ahead of James is also a reversal of the pre-eminence between Peter and James given in Gal 2.9, which Farmer interprets as evidence for James’ preeminent role among the pillars.\(^78\)

Source criticism of 1 Cor 15 is notoriously difficult and Jerome Murphy-O’Connor’s detailed examination leads him to conclude, contrary to most exegetes,\(^79\) that all of verse 6 should be attributed to Paul but notes that he must have based his claim of 500 appearances on actual narratives.\(^80\) His argument is based on a thorough analysis of Paul’s vocabulary, which does not indicate the use of any fixed traditional formula.\(^81\) As to why Paul

\(^{77}\) Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, *James the Just*, 142.

\(^{78}\) Farmer, “James, acc. to Paul,” in Chilton and Evans, *James the Just*, 143.

\(^{79}\) Most commentators have claimed that Paul’s reference to πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς belongs to a tradition to which he adds his own emphasis: “authors of particular studies on 1 Cor 15:1-11 consider v.6bc as a Pauline insertion and vv. 6a and 7 as tradition.” Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 230; 323.

\(^{80}\) Murphy-O’Connor, *Keys to 1 Cor*, 240.

\(^{81}\) All of the words in verse 6 have parallels in the Pauline epistles, apart from the Pauline hapax legomenon ἐπάνω which may have been chosen because of euphony with ἐπειτα.
inserted this verse, Murphy-O'Connor again goes against the grain, and says that Paul is apologetically underlying the objectivity of the experience by citing a plethora of visions, whereas a small group might be accused of self-deception.

The reference to James in verse 7, Ἰακώβῳ, ἔιτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, is probably a fixed formula Paul uses and there is consensus that the following πᾶσιν is a reference to a group of missionaries more extensive than the twelve. Again Murphy-O'Connor is unconvinced and through detailed analysis of the usage of πᾶς, both in Pauline usage and his quotations of Old Testament texts and pre-Pauline material, he proposes that Paul added πᾶσιν to the traditional statement (ὡφθη) Ἰακώβῳ ἔιτα τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, in order to show that ‘the apostles’ could and should be extended beyond the twelve to whom he is referring. Paul then has according to Murphy-O'Connor no interest in James in this context. He merely uses a fixed formula that contains reference to him, in order to force the reader to think of him as equal to Peter, James, and all the other apostles who were also called directly by Christ.

Adolf Harnack proposed that the different traditions reflected in the Petrine and Jacobian appearances of verses 5 and 7 reflect rival formulae originating with followers of these two leaders, each asserting that Jesus

Murphy-O'Connor notes that although ἀδέλφοι is common both in the epistles as in the rest of the New Testament, Paul alone associates it with οἱ πλείονες (cf. Phil 1.14), a term that appears five times elsewhere in Paul’s writings and always in the same sense as here. Murphy-O'Connor, Keys to 1 Cor, 232-33.

82 “According to H. W. Bartsch [“Die Argumentation des Paulus in 1 Kor 15:1-11” ZNW 55 (1964) 263-65] and H. Conzelmann [1 Corinthians: a commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians (ed. George W. MacRae; trans. James W. Leitch; Hermeneia xxii; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1975), 257-58.], he intended to prove, against the spiritualists at Corinth, that all must die. Not only does this view rest on a false assumption, but it completely fails to account for the ephapax, ‘at one time’, i.e. ‘at the same time’.” Murphy-O'Connor, Keys to 1 Cor, 233.

83 Murphy-O'Connor, Keys to 1 Cor, 233.

84 Murphy-O'Connor, Keys to 1 Cor, 234.

85 Murphy-O'Connor, Keys to 1 Cor, 236.
first revealed himself to their champion. Harnack relied basically on four arguments as presented by Myllykoski:

1. the parallel linguistic structure of the formulas in vv. 5 and 7 (óphthe ... eíta);
2. the widespread tendency to weaken the significance of Peter’s vision (Mt. 28; Lk. 24; Jn 20-21; etc.); and
3. the relevance of the Jakobusvision in the Gospel of Hebrews, which, despite the legendary character of the story, goes back to an early tradition.

Harnack also claims that ‘all the other apostles’ cannot mean anything else but the twelve – an argument that has not convinced many.

Harnack concludes that the traditions of verses 5 and 7 reflect a shift of power in Jerusalem from Peter to James. Paul’s sequence of appearances are temporal, from Peter first to himself last, and as Painter points out, his use of composite traditions in 1 Cor 15 neither sees in them a basis for setting the authority of James before Peter nor does he treat the tradition of James as a rival to the Petrine tradition, the controversy surrounds his claim to apostleship. The view that James and Peter belonged to rival factions has been embraced by a number of recent scholars, for example Gerd Lüdemann who like Harnack sees a shift of power from Peter to James which he dates between Paul’s first and second visit to Jerusalem and Robert M. Price who takes the opposite view and states that verses 3–11 are

---

86 Harnack, “Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu,” 66-68.
87 “And when the Lord had given the linen cloth to the servant of the priest, he went to James and appeared to him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he should see him risen from among them that sleep. And shortly thereafter the Lord said: Bring a table and bread! And immediately it added: he took the bread, blessed it and brake it and gave it to James the Just and said to him: My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of man is risen from among them that sleep.” Gospel of Hebrews. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, ed., Gospels and Related Writings (vol. I of New Testament Apocrypha; trans. R. McL. Wilson; 2nd. ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990; repr., Louisville, Ky.: John Knox Press, 2003), 178.
89 Painter, Just James, 81.
90 Painter, Just James, 81.
91 Gerd Lüdemann, Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1989), 49-53. “The formula in 1 Cor. 15:7 grew out of the fact that disciples of James claimed for their leader the primacy that Peter enjoyed by virtue of having received the initial resurrection appearance. To support his claim they constructed the formula of 15:7, patterned after that of 15:5”, Lüdemann, Opposition, 49.
an interpolation to Paul’s letter and evidence for the primacy of Jesus’ appearance to James.\textsuperscript{92}

In Painter’s view the traditions behind 1 Cor 15 suggest rivalry between two factions, but he notes that this rivalry is a product of scholarly reconstruction. In Paul’s discourse Peter and James stand together against him.\textsuperscript{93} He further argues that if verse 7 is understood as a rival tradition to verse 5, then that tradition asserts that the foundational appearance was to James, which is supported by the traditions in the \textit{Gospel of Hebrews}.\textsuperscript{94} While an underlying tension between the Pillars is evident, the two were part of a common circumcision mission and Peter’s problematic presence in Corinth shows that he, along with James, continued to assert the authority of Jewish law.\textsuperscript{95}

\section*{2.2 The Gospels and Acts.}

We turn now to the family of Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels, both in the synoptic tradition and the gospel of John. James undoubtedly belonged to Jesus’ immediate family, and although there is little discussion of James in the gospels, the family to which he belongs is portrayed in an adverse way by the gospel authors. The majority of scholars believe that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were the children of Joseph and Mary, the

\textsuperscript{92}“But what if, as Winter [Paul Winter, “I Corinthians XV: 3b-7,” \textit{NovT} 2 (Apr. 1957): 148-49.] suggests, “all the apostles” means to \textit{exclude} James but to \textit{include} Peter and the rest of the Twelve? Then the sense would plausibly be construed as a polemical counter to the “Cephas, then to the Twelve” formula. The point would be that the Risen Christ appeared first to James, and only then to the apostles, including Peter. Not Peter first, followed by his colleagues, but rather James first, followed by Peter and the rest. Seen this way, it becomes obvious that the James formula is the later of the two, since its very wording presupposes the Cephas formula.” Price, Robert M. “Apocryphal Apparitions: 1 Corinthians 15:3-11 as a Post-Pauline Interpolation.” \textit{Journal of Higher Criticism} 2 (2 1995): 69–99. Cited 8 May 2013. Online: http://www.depts.drew.edu/jhc/rp1 Cor15.html.

\textsuperscript{93}“In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul neither sees in the traditions in verse 7 a basis for setting the authority of James before Peter nor does he treat that tradition as a rival to the Petrine tradition.” Painter, \textit{Just James}, 81.

\textsuperscript{94}Painter, \textit{Just James}, 81.

\textsuperscript{95}Painter, \textit{Just James}, 82-83. “Without 1 Corinthians it might have been possible to argue that Peter reluctantly adopted the Judaizing position only after pressure from James. But there is no evidence of any influence of James at Corinth.” Painter, \textit{Just James}, 83.
Helvidian position, although as Myllykoski points out, a number of Catholic scholars seek to keep the case open for obvious reasons. A recent proponent of the view that Jesus’ siblings were Joseph’s children from a previous marriage, the Epiphanian view, is Richard Bauckham who claims that the second century evidence pointing in that direction could preserve an accurate historical memory. In an article in response to John P. Meier’s monumental study Jesus: A Marginal Jew, Bauckham claims that Meier fails both to separate the patristic discussion on the Epiphanian view from its theological agenda to uphold the perpetual virginity of Mary and to take seriously the possibility that Jesus’ siblings were his half-brothers and -sisters and not step-brothers and -sisters.

Exegetes who do not regard the virginal conception as historical fact almost always think it was unknown to Paul and Mark and often think it was unknown to John or not accepted by him. This means that, supposing these authors knew that Jesus’ brothers and sisters were children of Joseph by a previous marriage, they would have considered them half brothers and half sisters, not, as Meier seems to presume, step-brothers and stepsisters. Therefore, whether or not the virginal conception is considered historical, the Epiphanian view means that in many of the

---

96 In short there are three positions on how to explain the relationship Jesus had with his brothers [and sisters]: 1) The Helvidian view (from the refutations of Jerome in Adversus Helvidius de Mariae virginitate perpetua) that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were children of Joseph and Mary; 2) the Hieronymian view (again from Jerome’s writing) that they were not children of Joseph or Mary but were cousins of Jesus; and 3) the Epiphanian view (which he based on the Protevangelium of James) that they were children of Joseph by a previous marriage.


98 Bauckham, Jude, 19-32.


texts the brothers and sisters of Jesus may be regarded as his half brothers and half sisters.\textsuperscript{101}

Bauckham further argues that reference to Jesus as “son of Mary” in Mark 6.3 rather than “son of Joseph” distinguished him from the children of Joseph by his first wife, a theory that better explains this gospel wording than previous scholarly proposals and is supported by numerous Old Testament parallels.\textsuperscript{102} Both Meier and Bauckham conclude that the evidence is too scarce to draw definite conclusions, but whatever the exact nature of their relations was, we can be confident that James belonged to Jesus’ immediate family as described in the gospel texts under discussion.\textsuperscript{103}

\textit{The Synoptic Gospels.}

The following discussion will be based on the premise that the anonymous gospel ascribed to Mark is the oldest of the three synoptic gospels and that the gospels ascribed to Matthew and Luke use Mark independently as a source\textsuperscript{104} for their writings, along with the sayings source Q and other materials.\textsuperscript{105} This \textit{Two Source Theory}\textsuperscript{106} best explains the connection between the three gospels and there are powerful arguments to support Markan priority.\textsuperscript{107} This scholarly construct is not without problems though and there are dissenting voices that note that the so-called ‘minor

\textsuperscript{101} Bauckham, “Epiphanian response,” 689.
\textsuperscript{104} A full 90% of Mark’s text is preserved in Matthew and 50% is found in Luke.
\textsuperscript{106} The \textit{Two Source Theory} emerged in 19th century scholarship and was expanded by B. H. Streeter in 1924 to include a Jewish source particular to Matthew (M-source) and a source (L-source) which the author of Luke was familiar with. His model which he called the \textit{Four Source Theory} is a standard scholarly model for viewing the synoptic tradition. Burnett Hillman Streeter, \textit{The Four Gospels: A Study of origins} (London: MacMillan and Co., 1927).

There is wide consensus to date Mark’s gospel within the framework of the Jewish war (66–74 C.E.), but scholars are divided as to whether it should be dated during the conflict or as a response to the destruction of the Temple in the following decade.\footnote{Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary* (ed. Harold W. Attridge; Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2007), 7. For a discussion on Mark as a response to the fall of the temple cf. John S. Kloppenborg, “Evocatio deorum and the Date of Mark,” *JBL* 124 (3 2005): 419–50.} The manuscripts preserved are sparse, compared to the other canonical gospels, and based on the theory of Markan priority the synoptics are the only attestations before the middle of the 3rd century.\footnote{“Mark’s gospel appears for the first time in the oldest extant manuscripts containing all four canonical gospels (p\textsuperscript{45}) which was written in the middle of the 3d century. No other manuscript evidence for Mark exists before the 4th century, where Mark is included in the oldest uncial manuscript of the entire Greek Bible (\textit{א} and \textit{B}), in one papyrus (p\textsuperscript{85}), and in two uncial fragments (059, 0188).” Koester, *Ancient Chr. Gospels*, 273.} This is most likely explained by the fact that it was overshadowed by Matthew and Luke, who both intended to replace Mark with their more comprehensive compositions.\footnote{Koester, *Ancient Chr. Gospels*, 275.} A synoptic comparison raises the question whether the versions of Mark the other evangelists possessed, were different from the text preserved today. To explain the issues raised by the minor agreements and the large body of text omitted by Luke the great omission,\footnote{“External evidence for two different versions of Mark circulating at an early date can be derived only from the observation that Luke does no reproduce the section Mark 6.45-8.26. Luke 9.19 = Mark 8.27 follows directly upon Luke 9.17 = Mark 6.44. Luke may have used a copy of Mark that had accidentally lost a few pages.” Koester, *Ancient Chr. Gospels*, 284.} Koester proposes a Proto-Mark\footnote{This \textit{Urmarkus hypothesis} was established by C. H. Weisse who also first proposed the \textit{Two-source hypothesis}.} that the evangelists used and point to features that suggests a redaction of Mark after its usage by Matthew and Mark.\footnote{Koester, *Ancient Chr. Gospels*, 284.}

The author himself knew and used traditions from which he constructed his gospel and through redaction criticism John Dominic
Crossan has notably attempted to separate traditions regarding Jesus’ brothers and sisters handed down to Mark from his antagonism towards them apparent in the gospel.\textsuperscript{115} Crossan’s methodological basis for such an investigation is to examine (i) awkwardness, discrepancy, contradiction, impropriety etc. (ii) to compare the parallels in Matthew and Luke and find where words are absent due to scribal changes in the Markan textual tradition, and (iii) to evaluate Mark’s recognizable theological agenda.\textsuperscript{116}

The gospel of Mark contains three pericopae that refer to the relatives of Jesus: Mark 3.20-35; 6.1-6 as well as references to Mary the mother of James and Joses in the Passion narrative (Mark 15.40, 47; 16.1). Through detailed textual analysis Crossan shows that Mark inherits a tradition in 3.20-35, which he elaborates on in polemic with the Jerusalem church of which James is a representative.

Then he went home; and the crowd came together again, so that they could not even eat. When his family heard it, they went out to restrain him, for people were saying, ‘He has gone out of his mind.’

And the scribes who came down from Jerusalem said, ‘He has Beelzebul, and by the ruler of the demons he casts out demons.’ And he called them to him, and spoke to them in parables, ‘How can Satan cast out Satan? If a kingdom is divided against itself, that kingdom cannot stand. And if a house is divided against itself, that house will not be able to stand. And if Satan has risen up against himself and is divided, he cannot stand, but his end has come. But no one can enter a strong man’s house and plunder his property without first tying up the strong man; then indeed the house can be plundered. ‘Truly I tell you, people will be forgiven for their sins and whatever blasphemies they utter; but whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit can never have forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin’— for they had said, ‘He has an unclean spirit.’

Then his mother and his brothers came; and standing outside, they sent to him and called him. A crowd was sitting around him; and they said to him, ‘Your mother and your brothers and sisters are outside, asking for you.’ And he replied, ‘Who are my mother and my brothers?’.And looking at those who sat around him, he said, ‘Here are my mother and my brothers! Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother.’ (Mark 3.20-35, NRSV)

Apparent in the textual arrangement of Mark 3.20-35 is a rhetorical method known as sandwiching, where a discussion of Jesus’ family is interrupted by an accusation against Jesus from “scribes who come down from


\textsuperscript{116} Crossan, “Mark and the Relatives of Jesus,” 81-82.
Jerusalem”. Jerusalem is for Mark the source of threat to Jesus and apart from a single positive usage where Jerusalem appears in Mark 3.8, all references to the city are negative in the gospel. Mark inherits a tradition about the relatives of Jesus, found in 3.22b, 24-27 and 31-34, which he embellishes to villainize the Jerusalem church through his brothers and disciples, especially the Pillars of Jerusalem: Peter, James and John. Painter stresses that the saying in Mark 3.35, that the true family of Jesus are those that do the will of God, only takes on a negative tone when read in the framework of Mark.

The same is true of Mark 6.1-6, where Mark inherits a reference to Jesus’ relatives, which speaks of them with respect, and appends to a list of those who greeted Jesus without respect, thus hindering him from performing miracles.

He left that place and came to his home town, and his disciples followed him. On the sabbath he began to teach in the synagogue, and many who heard him were astounded. They said, ‘Where did this man get all this? What is this wisdom that has been given to him? What deeds of power are being done by his hands! Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?’ And they took offence at him. Then Jesus said to them, ‘Prophets are not without honour, except in their home town, and among their own kin, and in their own house.’ And he could do no deed of power there, except that he laid his hands on a few sick people and cured them. And he was amazed at their unbelief. (Mark 6.1-6, NRSV)

Mark deliberately does not mention Jesus’ father in this list of his kin, which is “contrary to Jewish custom [...] even when the father is no longer living, except in insulting terms.” This cannot be explained by reference to virginal birth, an issue of little or no interest to Mark and which Luke and

118 Crossan, “Mark and the Relatives of Jesus,” 88-90. The source of threat in the parallels in Matthew (9.34 = 12.24) and Luke (11.15) are the Pharisees and the crowds respectively.
119 The traditions regarding the family of Jesus may have reflected tension between Jesus and his relatives, but certainly not as negative as Mark depicts them (cf. John 7.2-5).
121 Painter, Just James, 30. According to Painter the expression οἱ παρ’ αὐτῷ in Mark 3.21 does not refer to the family, but to the disciples, and therefore Mark offers no evidence against the assumption that James was a disciple.
122 Painter, Just James, 104-5. The traditional datum is Mark 6.2b-4a.
John have no problems with,\textsuperscript{124} but only as a deliberate omission.\textsuperscript{125} The saying that a prophet is not acceptable in his home town is found in the Oxyrhynchus papyri\textsuperscript{126} and in the \textit{Gospel of Thomas},\textsuperscript{127} and in changed form in Luke and John,\textsuperscript{128} but Mark deliberately adds \textit{ἐν τοίς συγγενεύσιν αὐτοῦ} to indict the family with rejecting Jesus, especially James and the Jerusalem church.\textsuperscript{129} There is a strong case for seeing Mark as a pro-Pauline text.\textsuperscript{130}

This polemic with Jerusalem is not apparent in the Gospel of Matthew, which is in many ways a Jewish-Christian document. Building upon Mark, Matthew composes his gospel using other sources such as the Sayings source (Q) and a source known only to him (M). Ulrich Luz is a modern proponent of a hypothesis for the gospel of Matthew proposed by Odil Hannes Steck\textsuperscript{131} that: “Jewish Christians forced out of Palestine by the Jewish War, whose own traditions were collected in the Sayings source, joined the Gentile Christian communities in Syria, whose book was the Gospel of Mark.”\textsuperscript{132}

A striking contrast is found within the gospel between Matt. 10.5-6, where the disciples are prohibited to convert Gentiles (\textit{ἔθνη}), and Matt. 28.19-20, where they are instructed to make disciples of all nations (\textit{πάντα ἔθνη}), and the whole of the gospel prepares the reader for this shift. The Jewish-Christian elements of the gospel, apparent in its law abidance and

\textsuperscript{125} \textit{ἐν τῷ συγγενεύσιν αὐτοῦ}.
\textsuperscript{128} Cf. Luke 4.23 and John 4.44.
\textsuperscript{129} Crossan, “Mark and the Relatives of Jesus,” 104, 113.
\textsuperscript{130} Painter, \textit{Just James}, 31.
\textsuperscript{131} Odil Hannes Steck, “Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten,” \textit{WMANT} 23 (1967): 310f.
attitude towards Israel, have led some commentators to view the Matthean community as a sect within Judaism,\textsuperscript{133} but in order to survive it opened up to the Gentile mission. Luz has proposed that the Q text preserved in Matthew received redaction in the Matthean community (Q\textsuperscript{Matt.}), all of which are in different ways Jewish Christian in character.\textsuperscript{134} While Q is “relatively close to the original literary form of Q [...] and to the Q community”\textsuperscript{135} Mark’s gospel “was an external influence on a community shaped by the traditions and Jewish Christian piety of the Sayings Source.”\textsuperscript{136}

Matthew’s treatment of Mark 3.31-35 follows in general the Markan text, but does not reflect the above mentioned polemic in Mark against the Jerusalem church. Matthew omits Mark’s narrative about Jesus being restrained by his family in Mark 3.20-21,\textsuperscript{137} and names those who in Mark 3.22-27 accuse Jesus of being possessed “scribes and Pharisees” (Matt 12.38, NRSV), removing the reference to Jerusalem. Matthew 12.46-50 reads:

While he was still speaking to the crowds, his mother and his brothers were standing outside, wanting to speak to him. [Someone told him, ‘Look, your mother and your brothers are standing outside, wanting to speak to you.’]\textsuperscript{138} But to the one who had told him this, Jesus replied, ‘Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?’ And pointing to his disciples, he said, ‘Here are my mother and my brothers! For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother.’ (Matt 12.46-50, NRSV)

Mark identifies the disciples as belonging to Jesus’ eschatological family,\textsuperscript{139} but nothing is said of the family’s attitude towards him. Even the scribal

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{133}{Anthony J. Saldarini, \textit{Matthew’s Christian-Jewish Community} (CSJH; Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1994).}
\footnote{134}{Ulrich Luz, “Sermon on the Mount/Plain: Reconstruction of Qmt and Qlk,” \textit{SBLSP} 22 (1983): 473-79. These are Matt. 5.5, 7-9; 5.19(?); 5.41; 6.34; 7.6(?); 10.5-6(?); 10.16b; 10.23(?); 10.41(?); 18.15b-18; 23.15 (?). (Question-mark denotes a higher degree of uncertainty.)}
\footnote{135}{Luz, \textit{Studies in Matthew}, 45.}
\footnote{136}{Luz, \textit{Studies in Matthew}, 9.}
\footnote{138}{Matt 12.47 is missing from the major manuscripts, cf. NA\textsuperscript{28} critical apparatus.}
\footnote{139}{In Mark’s gospel the disciples struggle in their understanding of Jesus, while in Matthew they are perfect students.}
\end{footnotes}
addition in verse 47, which makes the narrative conform more closely with Mark, does not take up his negative attitude.\textsuperscript{140}

Matthew 13.53-58 generally follows its source, Mark 6.1-6, but again with important differences. It reads:

When Jesus had finished these parables, he left that place. He came to his home town and began to teach the people in their synagogue, so that they were astounded and said, ‘Where did this man get this wisdom and these deeds of power? Is not this the carpenter’s son? Is not his mother called Mary? And are not his brothers James and Joseph and Simon and Judas? And are not all his sisters with us? Where then did this man get all this?’ And they took offence at him. But Jesus said to them, ‘Prophets are not without honour except in their own country and in their own house.’ And he did not do many deeds of power there, because of their unbelief.’ (Matt 13.53-58, NRSV)

Matthew identifies Jesus as a carpenter’s son, thereby correcting Mark’s insensitivity to Jewish custom, but does not attribute paternity to Joseph because he is not his biological father as is made clear in the infancy narrative.\textsuperscript{141} The reference to Jesus’ family in the Markan proverb (ἐν τῷς συγγενεύσιν αὐτοῦ) has been deliberately removed by Matthew, which is consistent with his previous amendment of removing Mark 3.20-21. The idea that Jesus’ mother would reject him is at odds with Matthew’s theology of virginal conception.\textsuperscript{142} A third minor change is the list of brothers, where Matthew has the Semitic Ἰωσῆφ, replacing Mark’s Hellenistic Ἰωσῆτος, and reverses the order of Simon and Judas to conform to Mark’s order of disciples (Mark 3.18-19), with which Matt. 10.3-4 agrees.\textsuperscript{143} James remains in first position, showing his importance within the group.

In Luke-Acts, a gospel in two parts, the city of Jerusalem is given pride of place and James and the family of Jesus are therefore unsurprisingly painted in a positive light. Luke closely resembles Matthew in form and content, due to the common sources they use, yet they differ fundamentally in that the gospel is one half of a larger work, split in two

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{140} Painter, Just James, 36.
\textsuperscript{141} Painter, Just James, 37. Cf. discussion above.
\textsuperscript{142} Brown et al., Mary in the NT, 100.
\textsuperscript{143} Painter, Just James, 37.
\end{footnotes}
most likely due to the maximum length of text a scroll can hold.\textsuperscript{144} Luke also differs from Matthew in the way he uses his sources, as Luke is usually more conservative in preserving the sequence and wording of his sources, and he does not try to compose major units such as Matthew’s speeches.\textsuperscript{145}

The importance of location in the Lukan narrative is apparent throughout both volumes. The gospel travels from Nazareth to Jerusalem, where Jesus completes his work upon the cross, and then from Jerusalem to Rome, or in Lukan rhetoric “to the ends of the earth” (Acts 1.8, NRSV). The polemical tone towards the Jerusalem church, apparent in the Pauline letters and Mark, is not present in Luke-Acts, as the city has been destroyed and the Jerusalem church disbanded, and the author presents an idealized narrative of Christian beginnings.\textsuperscript{146} The importance of Jerusalem in Luke-Acts is connected to the author’s agenda of mythmaking in the formation of his community and the credibility his message gains by tracing its origin to Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{147} The need for an epic narrative for Luke’s community arises from the same need as other voluntary associations in the Greco Roman world\textsuperscript{148} and shares common traits with contemporary biographies,\textsuperscript{149} historiographies\textsuperscript{150} and epics.\textsuperscript{151} By placing the group in Jerusalem, Luke could claim “that the early Christian founders where extremely pious”, establish a clear link to the Hebrew epic and conclude that “Jerusalem was

\textsuperscript{144} Koester, Ancient Chr. Gospels, 339.
\textsuperscript{145} Koester, Ancient Chr. Gospels, 336.
one of the few cities of early Roman Palestine that people all around the Mediterranean would have readily recognized.” 152

Luke’s versions of the Markan references to Jesus’ family are more redacted than Matthew’s and he changes the order of events. In Luke 4.16-30 Jesus travels to Nazareth, having performed miracles in Capernaum, and teaches in the synagogue. The narrative is set “where he was brought up” 153 (Luke 4.16, NRSV), a wording which distances Jesus’ next of kin from the narrative, and the proverb in verse 24 is about prophets not being accepted “in [their] home town” 154 (Luke 4.24, NRSV). There is no mention of Mary or his siblings, only Joseph is mentioned as the crowd ask: “Is this not Joseph’s son?” in connection with amazement of “the gracious words that came from his mouth” (Luke 4.22, NRSV).

The second pericope from Mark is taken up in Luke 8.19-21:

Then his mother and his brothers came to him, but they could not reach him because of the crowd. And he was told, ‘Your mother and your brothers are standing outside, wanting to see you.’ But he said to them, ‘My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it.’ (Luke 8.19-21, NRSV)

Luke has no mention of the family’s attempt to restrain Jesus and transfers the charge that he is possessed to a later stage in the narrative (Luke 11.14-23). This new context reflects a positive attitude towards Jesus’ family and the preceding parable of the seed in verses 11-15 creates a parallel with verse 21, which includes his family among those who “hear the word, hold it fast in an honest and good heart, and bear fruit with patient endurance” (Luke 8.15, NRSV). 155

**The Acts of the Apostles.**

James is not mentioned by name in Luke’s gospel and only after James, “the brother of John”, is killed (12.2) do James and his leadership in

---

153 οὐ ἦν τεθραμμένος
154 ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ
155 Heartin, James of Jerusalem, 17.
the Jerusalem community become a topic. In the opening of Acts “Mary the mother of Jesus, as well as his brothers” (Acts 1.14, NRSV) are counted among those that belong to the highly idealized community in Jerusalem and there is no suggestion that their presence is surprising. The fact that James is never mentioned by name before Acts 12.17, and then not introduced in any way, suggests that it was common knowledge who he was and that he was a brother of Jesus.\footnote{Painter, \textit{Just James}, 42.}

The historicity of Acts has already been discussed briefly in the above section on Galatians, but both Paul and Acts are in agreement that James held a leadership position in the Jerusalem church. John Painter has addressed three dominant assumptions in scholarly discussion of James that deserve mentioning in the context of Acts. The first is the assumption that James and his siblings were unbelievers during Jesus’ ministry; the second is that James underwent a conversion from opposition to believer and the third that James’ leadership was the result of a transition from the leadership of Peter, caused by his escape from prison and supposed flight from Jerusalem.\footnote{John Painter, “Who was James?: Footprints as a Means of Identification,” in \textit{The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission} (ed. Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 24.} The first reading is based on the gospels as already discussed,\footnote{And in the case of John, to be discussed below.} the second on 1 Cor 15.7 already discussed,\footnote{Cf. discussion on page 24.} and the third on Acts 12.17:

\begin{quote}
He [Peter] motioned to them with his hand to be silent, and described for them how the Lord had brought him out of the prison. And he added, ‘Tell this to James and to the believers.’ Then he left and went to another place. (Acts 12.17, NRSV)
\end{quote}

None of these assumptions are supported by the narrative of Luke-Acts and in Acts 12.17 it is neither said that Peter fled the city nor that his message was meant as a handing over of power.\footnote{Cf. Lüdemann, \textit{Opposition}, 45.} If there was a handing over of power, one must ask why Peter did not resume his leadership position when
returning to Jerusalem, since “nothing is more natural than that Peter should report to the leader.”

The historical circumstance behind the apostolic council, described in Acts 15, have also been discussed and although Luke tries to smooth out the friction between Paul and the Jerusalem church his conflicting narrative betrays the tensions behind the fundamental disagreement. The Cornelius story in Acts 10-11 is in contradiction with the apostolic council of Acts 15, where Peter’s visions in Acts 10.9-16 present all Gentiles as clean and accepted into the people of God and in Acts 15 they are subjected the apostolic decree. His descriptions of Paul’s role in the events are also conflicting, as he is present at the apostolic council in chapter 15 but is then presented with the decree by James in Acts 21.25. James’ speech is a Lukan composition but the speeches contain important insight into the legacy and theology of James:

After they [Paul and Barnabas] finished speaking, James replied, ‘My brothers, listen to me. Simeon has related how God first looked favourably on the Gentiles, to take from among them a people for his name. [...] Therefore I have reached the decision that we should not trouble those Gentiles who are turning to God, but we should write to them to abstain only from things polluted by idols and from fornication and from whatever has been strangled and from blood. For in every city, for generations past, Moses has had those who proclaim him, for he has been read aloud every Sabbath in the synagogues.’ (Acts 15.13-21, NRSV)

The preceding speech delivered by Peter (Acts 15.7-11) deliberately reflects Pauline theology, thereby indicating that there is no difference between their positions. Also James’ speech reflects a mediating position between Paul and the Jewish Christians that demanded circumcision. Patrick Hartin highlights four significant aspects that emerge from James’ speech: that for James the restoration of Israel is taking place in the Jewish Christian community of Jerusalem; that James is the community’s organizational

---

162 Cf. discussion on page 10.
164 Painter, Just James, 50.
leader; that James refers to and endorses Peter’s role and position in the community; and that all Gentile converts are freed from the stipulations of the Jewish ritual laws.\textsuperscript{165} James has the final word and his decision ends the discussion. The importance of this event for Luke’s theology is apparent and by connecting his community’s mythmaking with the leadership of James and the Jerusalem church, he claims authority for his gospel that anyone can become a follower of Jesus.\textsuperscript{166}

The final reference to James in Acts is an enigmatic narrative of Paul’s return to Jerusalem in 21.17-26.

When we arrived in Jerusalem, the brothers welcomed us warmly. The next day Paul went with us to visit James; and all the elders were present. After greeting them, he related one by one the things that God had done among the Gentiles through his ministry. When they heard it, they praised God.

Then they said to him, ‘You see, brother, how many thousands of believers there are among the Jews, and they are all zealous for the law. They have been told about you that you teach all the Jews living among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, and that you tell them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs.

What then is to be done? They will certainly hear that you have come. So do what we tell you. We have four men who are under a vow. Join these men, go through the rite of purification with them, and pay for the shaving of their heads. Thus all will know that there is nothing in what they have been told about you, but that you yourself observe and guard the law.

But as for the Gentiles who have become believers, we have sent a letter with our judgement that they should abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from fornication.’ Then Paul took the men, and the next day, having purified himself, he entered the temple with them, making public the completion of the days of purification when the sacrifice would be made for each of them. (Acts 21.17-26, NRSV)

This narrative has invoked much scholarly debate about the nature and purpose of the vows Paul is made to undertake at the request of James and the underlying tensions apparent in Luke’s harmonizing account. The account is among the so-called we-passages of Acts, a section where the author speaks in the first person plural,\textsuperscript{167} and this has lead scholars to

\textsuperscript{165} Hartin, \textit{James of Jerusalem}, 65-68.
\textsuperscript{167} These texts are Acts 16.10-17; 20.5-15; 21.1-18; 27.1-29 and 28.1-16 (possibly also 11.28).
propose a source behind the narrative or even that this is an eye-witness account.\textsuperscript{168}

Luke’s narrative however raises a number of questions: We know from Romans (15.25-33) and 2 Corinthians (8-9) that Paul intended to make a third journey to Jerusalem, to present the Jerusalem church with a collection for the poor, taken by the churches in “Macedonia and Achaia” (Rom 15.26, NRSV). This collection is not mentioned in Luke’s narrative until after he is arrested (Acts 24.17), which is puzzling. James Dunn explains this on the basis that “the Jerusalem church refused to accept the collection [...] and for the Jerusalem Christians acceptance [would mean] approving the attitude Paul had towards the law”.\textsuperscript{169} Dunn’s reading is based on Paul’s own fear that his collection would be rejected (Rom 15.30f.), but Hartin says this is reading conjecture into Luke’s text, which seems to assume, when Paul testifies before Herod, that the collection was delivered (Acts 24.17).\textsuperscript{170}

A second problem relates to the intentions behind the accusations that Paul taught Jewish Christians to forsake circumcision and the Jewish customs, which in the narrative world of Acts is of course untrue.\textsuperscript{171} At stake is Luke’s attempt to disprove the idea that Christians were hostile to the customs of the Jews, following Greco-Roman historiographical tradition, and to show that they preserved the ancient customs of Moses.\textsuperscript{172} To prove his loyalty Paul undergoes a vow, that from the point of view of Acts should solve all tension between the believers, but would in all likelihood have been unacceptable to both Paul and those described as


\textsuperscript{170} Hartin, \textit{James of Jerusalem}, 79.

\textsuperscript{171} Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 15.

\textsuperscript{172} Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 15.
“zealous for the law”, whose leader was James.\textsuperscript{173} The vow in question is, for the purpose of Luke’s narrative, meant to be an act of obedience and purification, but the information provided is problematic because it does not conform to our knowledge of Nazirite purification.\textsuperscript{174} An interesting aspect in this regard is Jacob Neusner’s comparison with rabbinical literature, where he concludes: “So far as James had in mind for Paul to make a public affirmation of his adherence to the law of the Torah, the case at hand proves ambiguous, the advice [of James] bearing a measure of irony”.\textsuperscript{175} For Luke this is unintended and his purpose to portray Paul as a Nazirite is part of his theological agenda “to emphasize that the apostle to the Gentiles freely and voluntarily followed a Jewish custom which he did not have to observe.”\textsuperscript{176}

A final problem, already mentioned\textsuperscript{177}, is the way in which James relates the apostolic decree to Paul (Acts 21.25), a letter which he supposedly took part in deliberating. This according to Luke Timothy Johnson is due to Luke’s narrative device of mirroring the narratives of the Jerusalem council (chapter 15) and their encounter.\textsuperscript{178} The narrative of Acts is fraught with inconsistencies, which leads to the conclusion that Luke is trying to compromise the positions of different factions that were in conflict. Painter’s conclusion after reviewing the texts in question is as follows:

\textsuperscript{173} Painter, \textit{Just James}, 56.
\textsuperscript{174} “There is no Nazirite purification that lasts only seven days, as Acts 21.27 has it […] there is no evidence for a haircut at the start of the Nazirite vow, and according to rabbinic texts, those who take the vow while abroad must wait at least 30 days after their arrival in Jerusalem to complete their purification.” Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 17.
\textsuperscript{176} Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 20.
\textsuperscript{177} Cf. discussion page 37.
\textsuperscript{178} Johnson, \textit{Acts}, 379. “First, he [Luke] obviously seeks to make this meeting mirror that of the Jerusalem council in Acts 15. As Paul and his party move through a series of local stops before reaching Jerusalem, they are welcomed just as the Antiochian delegation had been (15.3). Like that earlier delegation, this one is “welcomed gladly by the brothers” (15.4). Like the earlier delegation as well, this one “relates what God had done” (15.4, 12). And like the Jerusalem leadership’s response to Peter’s defence of his Gentile initiative, we find the brothers “giving glory to God,” (11.18), which is Luke’s signal for a recognition of God’s visitation.”
It is as if Luke has pushed James into the background, but, because of his prominence, has been unable to obscure totally his leading role. He sought to minimize the role of James because he was aware that James represented a hard-lined position on the place of circumcision and the keeping of the law, a position that Luke himself did not wish to maintain. In contrast Paul had adopted a law-free policy in relation to his mission, and, while Luke might have been more in sympathy with this, he harbored reservations and modified Paul’s mission to the nations into a mission to the Gentiles which did not take in Jews.  

The course of action recommended by James and the elders of the Jerusalem community lead to Paul’s arrest and the narrative does not mention any concern for his wellbeing by the Jerusalem leaders. James’ leadership position in the Jerusalem community is clear from the narrative of Luke-Acts, although the presentation of his role and persona is somewhat downplayed. James of course suffers the same fate as Paul, and is arrested and killed, and his martyrdom is surprisingly missing from Luke’s account.

**The Gospel of John**

The fourth gospel is, according to most commentators, independent of the synoptic tradition, yet has in common with the synoptic gospels a Passion narrative. The gospel has close connections with Gnostic ideas and the Nag Hammadi corpus has provided us with important parallels with the Gospel of John. There are no references to James in the Gospel of John, but the brothers of Jesus are mentioned in two sections, which both belong to the proposed *Semeia source*. In addition, the saying: “a prophet has no honour in the prophet’s own country” (John 4.44, NRSV) is spoken
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181 There are connections to the Sethian writings, such as *The Apocryphon of James* (NHC I,2) Pheme Perkins, *Gnosticism and the New Testament* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1967), 122-123.
182 The *Semeia Source* is a hypothetical writing that John knew and used as a basis for his narrative use of Signs in the revelation of Jesus’ as the son of God. This theory is attributed to Alexander Faure and most famously proposed by Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (21st; KEK 2; 1941; repr., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1986). For a detailed discussion cf. Gilbert van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis* (BETL 116; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994).
by Jesus in Galilee, without there being any reference to his rejection by family members or his inability to perform miracles because of unbelief.\footnote{Cf. Mark 6.4, Matt. 13.57.}

The first reference to the brothers of Jesus is connected to the wedding in Kana, which is the first of seven signs \textit{(semeia)} in the Gospel:

Jesus did this, the first of his signs, in Cana of Galilee, and revealed his glory; and his disciples believed in him.

After this he went down to Capernaum with his mother, his brothers, and his disciples; and they remained there for a few days. (John 2.11-12, NRSV)

In the conclusion of the Kana narrative his disciples are said to show faith and then his mother and brothers are counted as among those who travelled with him, along with his disciples. John 2.12 is, according to Painter, an editorial bridge and the reference to the brothers is completely gratuitous, since they are neither mentioned at the Kana wedding nor at the subsequent events at the Temple, and should be seen as a traditional summary, which shows that the brothers (James) were an essential part of the following of Jesus.\footnote{Painter, \textit{Just James}, 15.}

The second reference to the brothers has lead most commentators to conclude that the brothers of Jesus were hostile to his ministry:

So his brothers said to him, ‘Leave here and go to Judea so that your disciples also may see the works you are doing; for no one who wants to be widely known acts in secret. If you do these things, show yourself to the world.’ (For not even his brothers believed in him.) (John 7.3-5, NRSV)

A common theme connected to the wedding at Kana is that Jesus is replying to a proposal, which he refuses and then follows out anyway. His mother asks him to perform a miracle, which he refuses by saying “My hour has not yet come” (John 2.4, NRSV), but then complies despite his refusal. The same is true of this narrative, where his brothers ask him to come with them to a festival in Jerusalem, which he refuses by saying “My time has not yet come” (John 7.6, NRSV) and then goes anyway.

This can be interpreted in at least two ways: Culpepper emphasizes an important difference in that while his mother is later shown in a more
positive light, the brothers are not, and their request is remarkably similar to Satan’s in the temptation narrative of Q. He concludes:

Later Jesus’ mother is given a new son, the Beloved Disciple (19:25-27), and Jesus’ disciples become his “brothers” (20:17-18). Henceforth the mother, who may symbolize the church, will live with the Beloved Disciple, not in Jerusalem (19:27). The brothers, although venerated in other circles of the church in Jerusalem, remain part of the world in John.

In contrast Hartin emphasizes that true belief is the major theme in the narrative world of John and that like his disciples, the brothers exhibit faith that in some way is lacking, because of its reliance on exterior signs or public displays. He concludes:

On the line of the continuum of faith, John shows that the brothers certainly are not at the level of opposition to Jesus at which the Jews are portrayed, nor do they show any form of hostility to Jesus. Rather, they are at the initial stages of faith, where faith is seen to rely on miracles and signs. For John that is not true faith [...] they are very much like the disciples, in the periphery of faith.

A final text often examined in relation to the brothers is John 19.25-27, where the beloved disciple is entrusted with Jesus’ mother at the cross, undoubtedly a sign of his importance within the Johannine community. Barret is confident the account is fictional because even though “it is not inconceivable that Jesus, as the head of the family (supposing his brothers to have been younger than he, not sons of Joseph by a former wife), should have made provision for care of his mother [...] it is surprising that the brothers should be overlooked, for their lack of faith in Jesus (7.5) could not annul their legal claim”. Painter and Hartin agree that no significance should be placed on the absence of James at the cross, any more than Peter or other followers: “For the community of John, the Beloved Disciple is the
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True disciple. He demonstrates a discipleship that is clearly more faithful than that of Peter, and by implication that of James as well.”

2.3 The Epistle of James.

Perhaps the most important witness to James’ legacy in the New Testament is the Epistle of James, although his name is only mentioned in the opening address as “James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (James 1.1, NRSV). The Epistle has raised divergent views from the early church to modern scholarship. Its content has raised contention among religious leaders throughout the history of the Church, from the early fathers to the 16th century reformers, and while John Calvin admired its practical teachings, Martin Luther’s distaste for this Stroern Epistel was such that he could see in it nothing of the nature of a gospel.

20th century scholarship has had difficulties situating the Epistle of James in the framework of nascent Christianity. As the letter is mostly composed of paraenesis and admonitions and contains few references to historical places or subjects, proponents of the historical-critical method such as Martin Dibelius could find little to place its Sitz im Leben. Comparison with Pauline epistles led many scholars to conclude that it was not an epistle in the same sense that Pauls letters are, and again Dibelius found in it little structure or continuity in thought other than maxims tied together with catchphrase connections. Another conundrum is the strongly Jewish content of the epistle, while James contains more learned Greek than most other New Testament authors command; this seeming paradox has led scholars to draw very different conclusions, some believing that the epistle was originally a Jewish circular letter with Christian
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190 Hartin, James of Jerusalem, 42.
191 Cf. Luther’s introduction to the first edition of the German New Testament from 1522.
glossing\textsuperscript{194} and others concluding that the author could not have been Jewish because of his fluent Greek.\textsuperscript{195} Finally the date and authorship of James has caused much contention and while scholars have traditionally seen it as a second-century pseudo graphic epistle written in polemic against Paul, many now view it as a pre-synoptic writing originating from the first century Christian community in Jerusalem, headed by James the brother of Jesus (died in 62), and uprooted in the Jewish-Roman War of 70 C.E.\textsuperscript{196}

Modern scholarship has seen renewed interest in the Epistle of James for a variety of reasons. With increased understanding of Hellenistic Judaism (e.g. through the works of Martin Hengel)\textsuperscript{197} we know that Greek learning was more widespread among Jews in Palestine than scholars previously held and the study of Greek and Roman epistolography has freed the Epistle from comparison in form to the letters of Paul.\textsuperscript{198} Methodology that broke the hegemony of higher criticism, such as social-scientific criticism and literary-criticism, invoked new and exciting readings of James, and the letter is a fundamental document in the study of Jewish-Christianity, which has been ‘reconsidered’ in the past two decades.\textsuperscript{199} The strongest argument for the letter’s firmly Christian origin is its connection with the sayings traditions of Jesus as found in the \textit{Sayings gospel Q} and especially in the \textit{Sermon on the Mount} (SM). This closeness to Jesus’ words has been


\textsuperscript{198} An important contribution was Fred O. Francis, “The Form and Function of the Opening and Closing Paragraphs of James and 1 John,” \textit{ZNW} 61 (1 1970).

\textsuperscript{199} Jackson-McCabe, \textit{Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts}. 
noted by many commentators (e.g. Gerhard Kittel)\textsuperscript{200} and two PhD dissertations written simultaneously provide detailed analysis of these connections, one by Patrick J. Hartin\textsuperscript{201} and another by Dean B. Deppe,\textsuperscript{202} from 1988 and 1989 respectively.

Hartin’s comparison of the epistle to a reconstruction of $Q$ leads him to conclude that although no single text can be conclusively shown to be dependent on $Q$, together the examples suggest that “James is steeped in the traditions of the sayings of Jesus […] [whose] words operate for him [the author] as that law which is meant to direct all action.”\textsuperscript{203} The works of Helmut Koester and James M. Robinson\textsuperscript{204} on the Gattung of $Q$ and its wisdom content as well as John S. Kloppenborg’s stratification of $Q$\textsuperscript{205} are essential to Hartin’s hypothesis and his comparison is based on a then recent scholarly reconstruction.\textsuperscript{206} The *Sermon on the Mount* (SM) plays a pivotal role in defining an early sapiential layer in $Q$, as proposed by Koester\textsuperscript{207} and expanded upon by Kloppenborg\textsuperscript{208} and Piper.\textsuperscript{209} Hans Dieter Betz has, on the other hand, proposed that the $Q$ sermons are an independent written source added to $Q$ and developed by the early Jesus movement to instruct converts from Judaism, as reflected in the Matthean SM, and those coming

\textsuperscript{200} Gerhard Kittel, “Der geschichtliche Ort des Jakobusbriefes,” *ZNW* 41 (1942).
\textsuperscript{201} His dissertation was submitted at the University of South Africa in 1988 entitled “James: A New Testament Wisdom Writing and its Relationship to Q” and published as: Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* (ed. David Hill; JSNTSup 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).
\textsuperscript{203} Hartin, *James and Q*, 198.
\textsuperscript{208} Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*.
from a Greek background, as reflected in the Lukan *Sermon on the Plain* (SP).\textsuperscript{210} The distinctive Jewish-Christian character of the SM can be explained by the difficulties Jewish converts had with the tenets of the Jesus Movement and the opposition they faced from within. The SM document reflects, according to Betz, “the situation of the early Christian movement prior to and concurrent with Paul’s letters (c. 50 CE)”\textsuperscript{211}. Patrick J. Hartin has argued that the Epistle of James shows knowledge of the Q *Sermon on the Mount* and its development in the context of the Matthean community (Q\textsuperscript{Matt}), but shows no sign of knowledge of the final Matthean redaction or its Lukan counterpart, the SP. Hartin’s conclusion is that James is an independent witness to the existence of the Q *Sermon on the Mount*.\textsuperscript{212}

In my Cand. theol. thesis at the University of Iceland, entitled *The Traditions of Jesus and the Divine Sophia: The Nature and Expression of Wisdom in the Epistle of James, the Sayings Gospel Q, and Jewish-Christian Literary Fragments from the Perspective of Greek and Jewish Wisdom*,\textsuperscript{213} I traced the trajectory of the personified wisdom of God ‘Sofia’, from Jewish-Hellenistic wisdom literature through James and Q and to Jewish-Christian texts using a database constructed with the help of the *Thesaurus Lingua Graecae* search option.\textsuperscript{214} There I suggested that the absence of reference to Pauline soteriology or Passion narrative in Q is


\textsuperscript{211} Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, 88.


\textsuperscript{214} http://www.tlg.eci.edu
related to the scant references to Christology in the Epistle of James, if there is a soteriological theme inherent in James it is more likely based on the Jewish (Stoic) concepts of law or the wisdom of God and not a risen Christ. Deppe reviews the various explanations proposed for the “almost complete omission of Christology”, ranging from postulating a Jewish origin to it being assumed and not mentioned because of James’ closeness to his brother, the holiness of the Gospels or, as Deppe suggests, mentioning it being unnecessary in a Christian paraenetic writing. The idea that these Christological references (at least Jas 2.1) are interpolations, has been proposed anew by Dale Allison and John S. Kloppenburg, an interesting proposal in light of the lack of reference to such Christology in the Jesus traditions of Q, but unfortunately not supported by evidence from manuscripts. Nevertheless James’ relationship with Q and especially the SM, which derives from the same Jewish-Christian milieu as James and contains no reference to the death and resurrection of Jesus, could be evidence that the out of place Christological references of Jas 1.1 and 2.1 are glossings from proto-orthodox Christians.
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217 Cf. Spitta, Der Brief des Jakobus and Massebieveau, “L’Épitre de Jacques est-elle l’oeuvre d’un chrétien”.
222 Betz, Essays on the Sermon on the Mount, 92.
223 In Jewish-Christian circles James the Just became a towering figure in writings such as the Pseudo-Clementines [F. Stanley Jones, An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71 (SBLTT 37; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1995)] and the champion of groups such as the Nazarenes [Petri Luomanen, “Nazarenes,” in A Companion to Second-Century Christian ‘Heresics’ (ed. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen; VCS 76; Leiden: Brill, 2005)] according to the Church fathers.
Few scholars currently claim authentic authorship of the epistle, and the majority opinion remains that it is a pseudonymous document, written outside of Jerusalem in the late first to early second century, but the tide is shifting towards viewing James as a pre-synoptic writing. Vernon K. Robbins emphasizes the uncertainty concerning the date of composition of James, a position that implies that the likelihood of the range of possible dates is evenly distributed, which of course is not the case. Kloppenborg has reviewed the arguments ranging from the epistle being an authentic composition of James (dating before 62 C.E.) to literary dependence on the Gospel of Matthew (dating after 90 C.E.). The most likely hypothesis is that James is composed before Matthew and is partially dependent on Q (or Q⁵Mat), although this hypothesis is not without problems as Kloppenborg states. The letter is a wisdom writing that focuses on issues that are pertinent to Jewish Christians and proposes an ideal of spirituality that is based on perfection or integrity, much like the Sermon on the Mount. The letter is the most Jewish of all the writings of the New Testament and lies closer to the sayings traditions attributed to Jesus, than any other New Testament epistle. James is presented as the mediator or wisdom teacher of this important Jewish strand of early Christianity, and
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224 A notable exception is Wilhelm Pratcher, Der Herrenbruder Jacobus und die Jacobustradition (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987).
225 Wachob, The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James, 26-30.
226 “The truth is that, in terms of definite proof, the Gospel of Luke, for example, could have been written anytime between ca. 58-155 CE and the Acts of the Apostles could have been written anytime between ca. 61-175 CE (Robbins 1992b: 91-94). Likewise, the Epistle of James could have been written anywhere between ca. 47-150 CE (Robinson 1976: 135-139; cf. Johnson 1995: 118-121). With possible variation like this, a historical account of early Christian discourse is extremely difficult.” Vernon K. Robbins, “Making Christian Culture in the Epistle of James,” Scriptura 59 (1996), 342.
227 A recent dissertation argues that an early date and a late date are equally likely and therefore a matter of interpretive choice [Ingeborg A. K. Kvammen, Imperial Presence in the Assembly: An Interpretation of Jas 2.1-13 with a Postcolonial Optic (School of Mission and Theology Dissertation Series 6; Stavanger: Misjonshøgskolens forlag, 2008)].
“the greatest contribution the letter of James makes to the figure of James […] lies in its witness to its Jewish heritage”.

3. Images of James in early Christianity.

Outside the New Testament canon the continuation of James’ legacy can be traced in at least three distinct categories, in individual writings of Jewish and Christian authors, in the Gnostic writings of the Nag Hammadi corpus and in Jewish-Christian writings, most notably the *Pseudo-Clementines*.

3.1 Josephus.

Josephus is perhaps the most important independent witness to the early Christian movement, although his account should not be read without caution. Born in 37 C.E. he was an aristocratic Jew, who wrote an extensive historiography of Judaism, defending his heritage to a Flavian Roman audience. Josephus makes reference to three characters central to the Christian movement, John the Baptist, Jesus, and James, yet these have been suspected to be Christian interpolations. The reference to James in Josephus is made in connection with the passing of the high priesthood in Jerusalem to Ananus in 62 C.E., and it describes James’ execution in passing. The passage is as follows:

Upon learning of the death of Festus, Caesar sent Albinus to Judea as procurator. The king removed Joseph from the high priesthood, and bestowed the succession to this office upon the son of Ananus, who was likewise called Ananus. [...] He followed the school of the Sadducees, who are indeed more heartless than any of the other Jews, as I have already explained, when they sit in judgment. [...]
[He] convened the judges of the Sanhedrin and brought before them a man named James, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, and certain others. He accused them of having transgressed the law and delivered them up to be stoned.

Those of the inhabitants of the city who were considered the most fair-minded and who were in strict observance of the law were offended at this. They therefore secretly sent to King Agrippa urging him, for Ananus had not even been correct in his first step, to order him to desist from any further such actions. Certain of them even went to meet Albinus [...] and informed him that Ananus had no authority to convene the Sanhedrin without his consent. Convinced by these words, Albinus angrily wrote to Ananus threatening to take vengeance upon him. King Agrippa, because of Ananus’ action, deposed him from the high priesthood which he had held for three months and replaced him. **234**

Scholars have regarded the historicity of this account more positively than other references to the Jesus movement in *Jewish Antiquities*, because of the unembellished nature of the description. **235** The issue at stake is the high priesthood of Jerusalem and Josephus’ emphasis is on the heartless nature of the Sadducees and the illegality of the calling of the Sanhedrin without the procurator’s permission. **236** An interesting point is made by J. D. Crossan regarding this text. He states that “an abstract illegality could hardly have obtained such a reaction, so James must have had powerful, important, and even politically organized friends in Jerusalem.” **237** Crossan goes on to argue that Josephus’ reference to “those who were in strict observance of the law” **238** refers to the Pharisees and asks if James himself was a Pharisee. **239** This is in line with recent reconstructions of the connection between the Pharisees and the Jesus movement, such as the works of E. P. Sanders. **240**

Another interpretation is that James’ execution reflects a “pattern of opposition by the members of the Ananean family toward Jesus and his followers.” **241** Acts 4.6 mentions Ananus (the older) as among those that
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238 Josephus, *Ant. 20.*201 (Thackeray, Marcus, and Feldman, LCL).
241 Vanderkam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 478.
tried Peter and John and it is possible, too, that Matthias son of Ananus was high priest when Agrippa I had James the son of Zebedee killed (Acts 12.1-2). Myllykoski has reviewed scholarly reconstructions that either presume that James was executed because of his political opposition to the priestly aristocracy or, drawing on Eusebius, “suggest that James died because of his confession of Jesus Christ”, whatever the historical circumstances. This reference by Josephus further establishes James’ position as an important figure, which was well known and supported in the city of Jerusalem.

3.2 Portraits of James in the Church fathers

Origen

Contra Celsum, the systematic apology of Origen in response to Celsius’ attacks on Christianity, is an unparalleled culmination of the whole apologetic movement of the second and third centuries. Origen’s intention was to show “that Christianity was not an irrational credulity but a profound philosophy”, and for this purpose he drew on Greek and Roman thought, as well as Christian and Jewish authors, such as Josephus, from which he claims to have knowledge of James’ martyrdom. Our knowledge of Origen’s life comes mainly to us from Eusebius’ Ecclesiastical History, but he devotes much of his sixth book to him. Origen was born around 185 C.E., to a Christian family, and served as the head of the catechetical school of Alexandria during a time of much
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242 Vanderkam, From Joshua to Caiaphas, 478.
243 “Some scholars argue that [...] Ananus did not have James executed because of his proclamation of Christ but because of [...] 1. Rivalry between Ananus and James (cf. Lüdemann, Opposition, 62.) [...] 2. James’s criticism against the exploitation of the poor priests (cf. Painter, Just James, 140-141.) [or] 3. James’s zelotism and his blaspheming activities as a self-declared high priest.” Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 66-67.
245 Henry Chadwick, introduction to Contra Celsum, by Origen, ix.
246 Henry Chadwick, introduction to Contra Celsum, by Origen, ix.
247 Origen, Cels. I.47
persecution until 231 when Demetrius, bishop of the city, excommunicated him. During his life Origen produced a prodigious volume of writings, of which his commentaries have had the most lasting influence, along with the magisterial Contra Celsum.

In his later life Origen lived in Caesarea, where he came in close contact with Palestinian Judaism, and there he wrote both his Commentary on Matthew and Contra Celsum in the years between 244 and 249 C.E. In Comm. Matt. X.17 Origen discusses Matt. 13.54-56 with reference to Jesus’ family, and begins by establishing the brotherhood of James as the son of Joseph by a former wife, with reference to the Gospel of Peter and the Protevangelium of James. He further qualifies their brotherhood in Cels. I.47 where he says it refers not “so much to their blood-relationship or common upbringing as to his moral life and understanding.”

Although Origen is not the first Christian writer to mention Josephus, he is the first to “incorporate Josephus into Bible interpretation and Christian apologetics and thus the first to mention him substantially and meaningfully.” When Origen refers to Josephus he rarely gives the exact passage, but rephrases his historical account for the purpose of endorsing his interpretation of Christianity. In both Commentary on Matthew and Contra Celsum, Origen quotes Josephus on the destruction of Jerusalem:

Commentary on Matthew:
And to so great a reputation among the people for righteousness did this James rise, that Flavius Josephus, who wrote the Antiquities of the Jews in twenty books, when wishing to exhibit the cause why the people suffered so great misfortunes that even the temple was razed to the ground, said, that these things happened to them in accordance with the wrath of God in consequence of the things which they had dared to do against James the brother of Jesus who is called Christ. And the wonderful thing is that, though he did not accept Jesus as Christ, he yet gave

249 Rankin, From Clement to Origen, 132.
250 Rankin, From Clement to Origen, 132.
251 Painter, Just James, 200.
253 Origen, Cels. I.47 (Chadwick).
testimony that the righteousness of James was so great; and he says that the people thought that they had suffered these things because of James.256

---

*Contra Celsum:*
For Josephus in the eighteenth book of the Jewish antiquities bears witness that John was a baptist and promised purification to people who were baptized. The same author, although he did not believe in Jesus as Christ, sought for the cause of the fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple. [...] If therefore he says that the destruction of Jerusalem happened because of James, would it not be more reasonable to say that this happened on account of Jesus the Christ? His divinity is testified by great numbers of churches, which consist of men converted from the flood of sins and who are dependent on the Creator and refer every decision to His pleasure.257
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The siege began when Nero was still emperor, and continued until the rule of Vespasian. His son, Titus, captured Jerusalem, so Josephus says, on account of James the Just, the brother of Jesus the so-called Christ, though in reality it was on account of Jesus the Christ of God.258

These three quotations are unanimous in attributing to Josephus the idea that James’ death led to the Jewish War, but this is nowhere to be found in the preserved manuscripts of the writings of Josephus. This would suggest that either Origen himself made this connection or received it as a tradition attributed to Josephus. In *Comm. Matt.* X.17 Origen introduces a small but meaningful addition to Josephus’ text: he distinguishes between Josephus’ conclusion and that of the people, regarding the suffering of Jerusalem.259 In *Contra Celsum*, however, he makes no such distinction and attributes directly to Josephus the view that James’ death caused the destruction of Jerusalem, while correcting him that he should have attributed it to Jesus.260 Painter points out that if Origen was himself creating this connection, he could have attributed the siege directly to Jesus without having to correct
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257 Origen, *Cels.* I.47 (Chadwick).
258 Origen, *Cels.* II.13 (Chadwick).
Josephus, and thus concludes that “the tradition antedates Origen”. This reasoning culminates in *Cels.* IV.22, where Origen states that the destruction of the city was the result of mistreatment of Jesus, without reference to the martyrdom of James.

**Eusebius**

The monumental work of Eusebius *Ecclesiastical History* is an important witness to the development of traditions of James, and he discusses his martyrdom in length based on available sources. Little is known of Eusebius’ life, as he did not write a biography, but he was probably born in the early 260s C.E., was the bishop of Caesarea in Palestine from around 313 and died in 339. Eusebius’ most important contribution to our understanding of Early Christianity is his manner of naming sources and accurately quoting texts, at a time when this was neither expected nor customary. For his references to James he names as sources Paul and Josephus, as well as Clement of Alexandria and Hegesippus, whose works are only available through his quotations. The *Ecclesiastical History* was written over a period of a quarter of a century (300-324) and thus reflects changing perspectives and purposes in that time period. A separate reference to James’ martyrdom is found in his *Demonstration of the Gospel*, written in 312-318 in a section that bears similarity to Origen’s work.

When, in addition to James, the brother of the Lord, whom those formerly living in Jerusalem called “the righteous one” because of the excellencies of his virtue, was asked by the high priests and the teachers of the Jewish people what ideas he held...
about the Christ and promptly answered that he was the Son of God, he was thrown with stones by them.\textsuperscript{268}

The righteousness (δίκαιον) of James and excellencies of his virtue (τῆς ἀρετῆς πλεονεκτήματα) are connected to his martyrdom, which according to Eusebius is the result of confessing that Christ is the Son of God.

The first reference to James in the Ecclesiastical History, book I chapter 12, is a discussion of the disciples of Jesus, based on 1 Cor 15.5-7. Quoting Paul Eusebius writes “Next, [Paul] says, he [the saviour] was seen by James, who was one of the alleged brothers of the saviour.”\textsuperscript{269} This sentence is added to Paul’s letter, εἶς δὲ καὶ ὁ ἐκ τῶν φερομένων τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀδελφῶν ἦν, and thereby casts doubt on the actual relationship of James and Jesus. This type of commentary is typical of Eusebius, when he is not quoting others but adding his own summary information.\textsuperscript{270}

The second reference to James, book II chapter 1.2-5, is a summary statement about James (1.2), followed by a quotation from Clement of Alexandria (1.3-4) and concludes with a clarification by Eusebius (1.5):

At that same time James, who was called the brother of the Lord, inasmuch as the latter too was styled the child of Joseph, and Joseph was called the father of Christ, for the Virgin was betrothed to him when, before they came together, she was discovered to have conceived by the Holy Spirit, as the sacred writing of the Gospels teaches — this same James, to whom the men of old had also given the surname of Just for his excellence of virtue, is narrated to have been the first elected to the throne of the bishopric of the Church in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{271}

This summary clarifies the connection of James as a brother of Jesus, upholding the virginal conception, and supposing with the Protevangelium of James that James is Joseph’s son from a previous marriage.\textsuperscript{272} As well as restating his virtue, Eusebius claims that James was the bishop of Jerusalem, a title that reflects later ecclesiology onto the first century Jerusalem church. Lüdemann attributes the idea that James was made the first bishop of

\textsuperscript{269} Eusebius, Hist. eccl. I.12.4-5 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
\textsuperscript{270} Painter, Just James, 108.
\textsuperscript{271} Eusebius, Hist. eccl. II.1.2 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
\textsuperscript{272} Prot. Jas. 9.2. Cf. discussion page 8.
Jerusalem by the apostles to Eusebius’ redactional work, while Painter concludes that Eusebius knows of many traditions stating his episcopacy and that Clement preserves two conflicting traditions. His use of the word “throne” (θρόνος) is interesting in that he uses it frequently to describe the position James held, but it is a term Eusebius uses of the seat of no other bishop. In *Hist. eccl.* VII.19.1 this throne is said to be preserved to his day.

Clement of Alexandria (c. 150-220 C.E.) was a Gentile Christian convert who held a position as the head of a catechetical school in Alexandria but had to leave the city, either due to persecution or disagreement with the bishop Demetrius. His writings were according to Eusebius ten, yet only five of those have survived. His literary corpus is particularly interesting because, although he saw himself as a defender of orthodoxy, he stood at the fringes of Gnosticism. Eusebius quotes a lost eight volume work of scripture commentary known as the *Hypotypōseis* in (1.3-4):

Clement in the sixth book of the *Hypotyposes* adduces the following: "For," he says "Peter and James and John after the Ascension of the Saviour did not struggle for glory, because they had previously given honour by the Saviour, but chose James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem." The same writer in the seventh book of the same work says in addition this about him, "After the Resurrection the Lord gave the tradition of knowledge to James the Just and John and Peter, these gave it to the other Apostles and the other Apostles to the seventy, of whom Barnabas also was one. Now there were two James, one James the Just, who was thrown down from the pinnacle of the temple and beaten to death with a fuller's club, and the other he who was beheaded."

This quotation is important for several reasons. First, James is connected with the Pillars of Jerusalem Peter and John, and is chosen as bishop without there being a “struggle for glory”. This touches on an important

---

273 Lüdemann, *Opposition*, 162.
274 Painter, *Just James*, 115-16
279 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II.1.5 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
subject discussed in detail later in this thesis that the noble classes of Rome fought for the positions of power in the church, by competitively stating their humility as a mark of social distinction and justification for authority. James is thus first among equals and chosen by his peers as bishop, a prototype for election of bishops in the 3rd century.

A second point is the reversal of names in the lists in Eusebius’ quotes, where Peter is first before James is elected, James is first (among peers) in receiving knowledge from the risen Christ, which the Pillars then pass on to the other Apostles. These church fathers may have known the traditions reflected in The Gospel of Thomas, The Gospel of Hebrews and the Pseudo-Clementines, where James receives wisdom directly from Jesus. Painter concludes that this presentation of Eusebius (Clement and Hegesippus) lacks the intimacy between James and Jesus that is found in the Gospel of Hebrews and reflects the interests of the greater church. By combining the Gnostic tradition with the names of Peter and John, “a Gnostic tradition is turned into an anti-Gnostic weapon”. The leadership of James is not in question, though.

A final element is the elaboration of the martyrdom of James by Clement, where he says that James was “beaten to death with a fuller’s club”. This tradition is also reflected in Hegesippus’ account (cf. Hist. Eccl. II.23.1-25), which combines stoning with the beating on the head with a club. Eusebius believes these accounts to be independent of each other, but F. Stanley Jones has argued that Hegesippus is the source for not only Clement, but also other accounts of his martyrdom in the Second
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281 Gos. Thom. 12.
282 Gos. Heb. 7.
283 As stated above, Painter argues that Clement reflects two independent traditions without making an attempt to reconcile them. “The second [quotation] implies that James’s priority came from the risen Lord, while the first asserts that Peter, James, and John chose James the Just.” Painter, Just James, 115.
284 Painter, Just James, 116.
As Painter points out, the execution of James with a club instead of stoning, the more usual form of Jewish execution, calls for explanation and is possibly related to priestly offences, where the punishment was a blow to the head. A possible explanation is that Clement thought stoning imply a more lawful execution than he wished to portray. Painter says that the unadorned nature of the account suggests that Clement might reflect a tradition independent from Hegesippus. Eusebius concludes his quotation of Clement by clarifying that James the Just is indeed the same James as Paul describes as “James the brother of the Lord” in Galatians.

The third mention of James in the *Ecclesiastical History* is an elaborate description of James’ martyrdom, book II chapter 23.1-25, based mainly on the writings of Hegesippus. Hegesippus (c. 110-180) was a contemporary of Ireneus, and according to Eusebius he wrote a five-volume memoir (*Hypomneumata*) which is now lost except for the quotations in Eusebius. In *Hist. Eccl.* IV.22.8 Eusebius concludes that Hegesippus was a Jewish Christian, a statement he argues on the grounds that he knew the Jewish traditions well and especially the *Gospel of Hebrews*, which might add weight to his conclusion. Scholars have understandably been sceptical of any historical value that Hegesippus’ account adds to Josephus and Dibelius calls attention to typical legendary motives found in the narrative.

Eusebius begins by summarizing the account already given (II.23.1-3) and describes James as an example of righteousness because “of the
height which he had reached in a life of philosophy and religion”, a
description meant to appeal to Greco-Roman readers.\textsuperscript{292} He then goes on to
cite Hegesippus’ account:

Hegesippus, who belongs to the generation after the Apostles, gives the most
accurate account of him speaking as follows in his fifth book:

"The charge of the Church passed to James the brother of the Lord, together with
the Apostles. He was called the 'Just' by all men from the Lord's time to ours, since
many are called James, but he was holy from his mother's womb.

He drank no wine nor strong drink, nor did he eat flesh; no razor went upon his
head; he did not anoint himself with oil, and he did not go to the baths.

He alone was allowed to enter into the sanctuary, for he did not wear wool but
linen, and he used to enter alone into the temple and be found kneeling and
praying for forgiveness for the people, so that his knees grew hard like a camel's
because of constant worship of God, kneeling and asking forgiveness for the
people.

So from his excessive righteousness he was called the Just and Oblias, that is in
Greek, 'Rampart of the people and righteousness,' as the prophets declare
concerning him.\textsuperscript{293}

Hegesippus’ embellished character descriptions are in many ways
interesting. First there is the statement that James was holy from his mothers
womb, suggesting an election from birth (or conception) comparable to that
of Jesus in Luke and Matthew, and Mary in the \textit{Protevangelium of James.}\textsuperscript{294}

That James did not “anoint himself with oil [nor] go to the baths”
reflects according to Painter a rejection of Greco-Roman ways, i.e. Roman
baths and not Jewish rites of purification.\textsuperscript{295} Archaeological evidence
suggest a change in Roman architecture, from separate baths for men and
women, to the sexes bathing together in communal pools sometime in the
first century C.E.\textsuperscript{296} This change constitutes a “break with everything

\textsuperscript{292} Eusebius, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} II.23.2, (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
\textsuperscript{293} Eusebius, \textit{Hist. Eccl.} II.23.4-8, (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
\textsuperscript{294} \textit{Prot. Jas.} 11-12.
previously considered moral and practicable for the Romans,\textsuperscript{297} and was opposed by some Christian authors,\textsuperscript{298} but most silently accepted the practice.\textsuperscript{299} The ensuing promiscuity that was associated with such baths was at stake in distancing James from bathing. The reference to vegetarianism is harder to explain, since such practises were generally associated with deviant Jewish sects.\textsuperscript{300} Abstaining from meat is characteristic of many Jewish-Christian groups\textsuperscript{301} and F. Stanley Jones proposes that such vegetarianism is not based on difficulty with acquiring kosher meat, but a “strongly Hellenized (Pythagorean) mentality among the Jews and Jewish Christians.”\textsuperscript{302}

The fourth paragraph draws on priestly imagery, but does so in an anachronistic way. While the historical James may have maintained a connection with the temple and priests, he is portrayed here either as a Jewish priest or, as the wording suggests, the high priest. The sanctuary was reserved for the high priest and only to be entered on the Day of Atonement.\textsuperscript{303} “The description of James in high priestly terms allowed for the development of a tradition of episcopal succession in Jerusalem modelled on the traditions of the high priesthood.”\textsuperscript{304} Neither Hegesippus, nor Eusebius, would have had direct information available about the then

\textsuperscript{299} Ward, “Women in Roman Baths,” 147.
\textsuperscript{300} Painter, \textit{Just James}, 126.
\textsuperscript{301} “[Vegetarian] attitudes and practises are witnessed elsewhere for Jewish-Christians: [...] the vegetarian and anti-sacrificial attitude of the \textit{Gospel of the Ebionites}, the vegetarians of the Jewish Christians of the \textit{Didascalia} 23, and statements by Epiphanius about anti-sacrificial and vegetarian attitudes among the Jewish Christians (\textit{Pan.} 30.16.7; 30.15.3; 19.3.6).” F. Stanley Jones, “Jewish Christianity of the Pseudo-Clementines,” in \textit{A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics'} (ed. Antti Marjanen and Petri Luomanen; VCS 76; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 322.
\textsuperscript{302} Jones, “Jewish Christianity of the Pseudo-Clementines,” in Marjanen and Luomanen, \textit{A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics'}, 322
\textsuperscript{303} Hartin, \textit{James of Jerusalem}, 123.
\textsuperscript{304} Painter, \textit{Just James}, 126
long destroyed Jerusalem temple. James’ intercessory prayers are emphasized by the hyperbole about camel-like knees, and this imagery originates according to Dibelius in portraits of ascetic piety.305

Due to James’ righteousness Hegesippus says that he is called Ῥβλίας, which he explains as meaning: “rampart of the people and righteousness”.306 This concept raises difficulty since there is no Semitic root containing βλ, that comes anywhere near the meaning of περιοχή, which is translated as rampart307 and bulwark308 of the people.309 A convincing explanation, proposed by C. C. Torrey,310 and expanded upon by K. Balzer and H. Koester,311 is that the word is a corrupt form of Ὧβδίας, “i.e. the name of Obadiah; and that James the Just was given the honour of this added title because he performed in the New Dispensation a service like that which his predecessor had performed in the Old.”312 There have been many other proposed explanations, for example the existence of a Semitic source behind Hegesippus’ text,313 and Bauckham argues that Ὁβλίας is meant to be a pun on the term נְבֵלִים (gbwl-ʿās) referring to his position as a praying wall גֶּבֶל (gbwl) around the temple of Jerusalem, holding off the imminent destruction that followed his death.314

Hegesippus then narrates James’ martyrdom as the result of his large following among Jews and resulting in the siege of Jerusalem by the hands of Vespasian:

305 Dibelius, James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James, 16-17.
306 ἐς ἐπὶ Ἑλληνιστὶ περιοχῇ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. II.23.8, (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
307 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. II.23.8, (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
308 Cf. Painter, Just James, 127 et al.
309 Torrey, “James the Just and his name ”Oblias”,” 94.
310 Torrey, “James the Just and his name ”Oblias”,” 96.
312 Torrey, “James the Just and His Name ”Oblias”,” 96.
Thus some of the seven sects among the people, who were described before by me (in the Commentaries), inquired of him what was the 'gate of Jesus,' and he said that he was the Saviour.

[...] but as many as believed did so because of James. Now, since many even of the rulers believed, there was a tumult of the Jews and the Scribes and Pharisees saying that the whole people was in danger of looking for Jesus as the Christ.

So they assembled and said to James, 'We beseech you to restrain the people since they are straying after Jesus as though he were the Messiah. We beseech you to persuade concerning Jesus all who come for the day of the Passover, for all obey you. For we and the whole people testify to you that you are righteous and do not respect persons. So do you persuade the crowd not to err concerning Jesus, for the whole people and we all obey you. Therefore stand on the battlement of the temple that you may be clearly visible on high, and that your words may be audible to all the people [...]

And he answered with a loud voice, 'Why do you ask me concerning the Son of Man? He is sitting in heaven on the right hand of the great power, and he will come on the clouds of heaven.' And many were convinced and confessed at the testimony of James and said, 'Hosanna to the Son of David.'

[...] So they went up and threw down the Just, and they said to one another, 'Let us stone James the Just,' and they began to stone him since the fall had not killed him, but he turned and knelt saying, 'I beseech thee, O Lord, God and Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

[...] And a certain man among them, one of the laundrymen, took the club with which he used to beat out the clothes, and hit the Just on the head, and so he suffered martyrdom. And they buried him on the spot by the temple, and his grave-stone still remains by the temple. He became a true witness both to Jews and to Greeks that Jesus is the Christ, and at once Vespasian began to besiege them."

This is, as Dibelius notes, one of the oldest martyr-legends in early Christianity, and it is therefore not surprising that it borrows elements from the Jesus-tradition. This martyr narrative is in many ways an exercise in textual relations, due to the similarities between Hegesippus’ account, the Nag Hammadi Second Apocalypse of James (44.11-63.32) and the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions (1.66-71.4). These texts will be treated separately below, but there is reason to review scholarly assumptions regarding their

315 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. II.23.9-18, (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
316 These motifs being the pinnacle of the temple, a witness to the Son of man dying and the dying prayer for the enemy. Dibelius, James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James, 16.
textual relations. The three stories have essential points in common,\textsuperscript{317} but the relationship between them has puzzled scholars. There are similarities between \textit{Ps.-Clem. R 1} and \textit{2 Apoc. Jas.},\textsuperscript{318} but there are also striking differences that exclude the likelihood of literary dependence. In two aspects they agree against Hegesippus: (1) Instead of scribes and Pharisees, they present the priests as those that turn against James and (2) they both mention the temple steps.\textsuperscript{319} The similarities between Hegesippus and \textit{2 Apoc. Jas.} are numerous\textsuperscript{320} and suggest that they at least share a common tradition. This common source solution was proposed by A. Böhling\textsuperscript{321} and has been supported by e.g. Painter\textsuperscript{322} and Bauckham.\textsuperscript{323} Pratcher\textsuperscript{324} assumes that the authors of \textit{Ps.-Clem. R 1} and \textit{2 Apoc. Jas} used the same stratum of tradition, but from different sources, and Lüdemann\textsuperscript{325} in a similar vein suggests a common archetype.\textsuperscript{326} Finally there are even more similarities between Hegesippus and \textit{Ps.-Clem. R 1}\textsuperscript{327} and these have led scholars to diverging conclusions. The dominant view in present scholarship is that

317 Points in common in all three texts are: “The temple as the scene of events, the great number of spectators, James’ speech and it’s ultimately negative reception, the appearance of a defender, and finally the fall of James.” Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II”, 70.

318 These being: (1) Prediction of the temple’s fall, (2) a secret ally in the council, (3) speeches of James, (4) the appearance of priests and (5) the tumult. Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 74, summarizing Pratcher, \textit{Der Herrenbruder Jacobus und die Jacobustradition}, 242-43.

319 Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 75-76.

320 These being: (1) The title James the ‘Just’, (2) Jesus as the door, (3) the tumult, (4) James alone is accused, (5) Use of Isa. 3.10, (6) the speech of James, (7) James’ fall from the pinnacle, (8) the wording of the verdict, (9) stoning, (10) James’ prayer, (11) burial and (12) linkage to the fall of Jerusalem. Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 76-77.


322 Painter, \textit{Just James}, 177.

323 Bauckham, “For What Offence was James put to Death,” in Chilton and Evans, \textit{James the Just}, 202-4.


326 This summary of arguments is based on Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 76-78.

327 These being: (1) The listing of Jewish sects, (2) faith among the leaders, (3) James’ preaching, (4) James summoned by leaders, (5) takes place at Passover, (6) James is on a high place, (7) Questions posed to him, (8) James speaks about the parousia, (9) positive effect of his speech, (10) decision to kill James, (11) crying out, (12) James is thrown down, (13) a cry of intervention on his behalf, (14) gravestones and (15) the Jewish War explained on the grounds of the rejection of Christianity. Myllykoski, “James: Perspectives Part II,” 802.
these accounts can be traced either to a lost source or to a common tradition, although direct dependence is problematic because of the great differences between them. As noted above, F. Stanley Jones argues that Hegesippus is the source for all three traditions (including the Clement narrative in Hist. eccl. II.23.3-4), but Pratcher conversely argues that the Hegesippus narrative reflects a later stage of development.

There are many interesting points in Hegesippus’ narrative, which shed light on the development of James as a champion of faith. First the question posed to James “what is the gate (θύρα) of Jesus” is odd, unless we, as Baukham argues, “remember that the architectural features of the messianic temple were taken, in early Christianity, to represent persons.” This reference to a single gate is most likely based on Ps 118.20, “This is the gate of the Lord; the righteous shall enter through it” (Ps 118.20, NRSV), and has in view the temple entrance. Craig A. Evans has argued that Psalm 118.19-27, along with Temple imagery, is common ground connecting the martyr narratives of Jesus and James running through the New Testament, Josephus and the narratives preserved in Eusebius. James is thus portrayed as a righteous man that enters the (metaphorical) temple first for others to follow.
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336 Bauckham, “For What Offence was James put to Death,” in Chilton and Evans, James the Just, 211.
The tumult of the Jews and the scribes and Pharisees was according to Hegesippus the result of James’ success as a preacher and they therefore beseech him to retract his confession of Jesus as saviour. Dibelius asserts that the supposition that “the Jews seriously expect the leader of the Christian community to give the people anti-Christian instruction is a legendary exaggeration [meant to] glorify the righteousness [of James] by making [him] an authority figure for the Jews”.

James is consequently thrown down from the temple parapet, stoned and finally beaten on the head with a club used by a laundryman. This combines the tradition of stoning in Josephus with him being thrown from the temple and beaten to death in Clement. To explain the presence of a club, Hegesippus elaborates on the purpose of beating out clothes by laundrymen, and this is evidence that “the simpler account of Clement, although later [according to Painter], is independent of Hegesippus and manifests an earlier form of the tradition.

James’ grave stone by the Temple seals his succession as the high priest of the new temple (Jesus), but this detail could only make sense for later authors since burial of the dead was prohibited in the old city of Jerusalem. To conclude the Hegesippus narrative of James’ martyrdom, Eusebius makes a summary statement: “James was indeed a remarkable man and famous among all for righteousness, so that the wise even of the Jews thought that this was the cause of the siege of Jerusalem immediately after his martyrdom, and that it happened for no other reason than the crime which they had committed against him.”

This assertion that James’ death caused the Jewish war is according to Eusebius supported by Josephus, although we have no such statement in his preserved works. There is reason to believe that Eusebius is dependent on Origen (Contra Celsum I.47) in his quotation of Josephus, as noted by

337 Dibelius, James: A Commentary on the Epistle of James, 16.
338 Josephus, Ant. XX.
339 Eusebius, Hist. eccl. II.1.3-4.
340 Painter, Just James, .
341 Eusebius, Hist. eccl. II.23.19 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
Henry Chadwick who showed that Eusebius quotes Origen’s passage verbatim, but changed it to direct speech.\textsuperscript{342}

Of course Josephus did not shrink from giving written testimony to this, as follows: “And these things happened to the Jews to avenge James the Just, who was the brother of Jesus the so-called Christ, for the Jews killed him in spite of his great righteousness.”\textsuperscript{343}

Eusebius used Josephus’ writings extensively and had direct access to both \textit{Jewish Antiquities} and \textit{The Jewish War}, and therefore it may instead be the case that his copy contained interpolations, “specifically a gloss of what Origen had written in the \textit{Contra Celsum}.”\textsuperscript{344} Painter points out that Josephus presents a philosophy of history, where the fate of the nation is the result of God’s reward and retribution, and in \textit{Ant.} 11.297-305 “Josephus tells of the retribution of God for the killing of another Jesus in the temple with the result that the people were made slaves and the temple defiled by the Persians.”\textsuperscript{345} Origen attributes to Josephus the idea that James’ death caused the siege and argues that it was in fact due to Jesus’ death. Eusebius took this line of thought further, reconciling the two views, and argues that the siege of Jerusalem was delayed because of the righteousness of James (and the other apostles), until his death.\textsuperscript{346}

There are numerous other references to James in the \textit{Ecclesiastical History}, which will only be discussed briefly. Book III narrates the events following the siege and describes the Jerusalem community’s fate:

In addition to all, James, who was the first after the ascension of our Saviour to be appointed to the throne of the bishopric in Jerusalem, passed away in the manner described above and the other Apostles were driven from the land of Judaea by thousands of deadly plots.

\textsuperscript{342} Baras, “The Testimonium Flavianum and the Martyrdom of James,” in Feldman and Hata, Josephus, Judaism and Christianity, 345. “his (Eusebius’) verbatim quotation corresponds exactly to Origen’s words here with only such alterations as are necessary to turn it from oratio oblique.” Origen, Cels. I.47 (Chadwick), 43, n. 2.

\textsuperscript{343} Eusebius, \textit{Hist. eccl.} II.23.20 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).

\textsuperscript{344} “In this case, either the gloss had entered the text of Josephus before Origen used it, or the gloss entered the text afterward (but before Eusebius), as a result of what Origen had written.” Andrew Carriker, \textit{The Library of Eusebius of Caesarea} (ed. J. Den Boeft et al.; SupVC 68; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 160.

\textsuperscript{345} Painter, \textit{Just James}, 207.

\textsuperscript{346} Painter, \textit{Just James}, 207.
They went on their way to all the heathen teaching their message in the power of Christ for he had said to them, "Go and make disciples of all the heathen in my name." On the other hand, the people of the church in Jerusalem were commanded by an oracle given by revelation before the war to those in the city who were worthy of it to depart and dwell in one of the cities of Perea which they called Pella.

To it those who believed on Christ migrated from Jerusalem, that when holy men had altogether deserted the royal capital of the Jews and the whole land of Judaea, the judgement of God might at last overtake them for all their crimes against the Christ and his Apostles, and all that generation of the wicked be utterly blotted out from among men. Those who wish can retrace accurately from the history written by Josephus how many evils at that time overwhelmed the whole nation in every place and especially how the inhabitants of Judaea were driven to the last point of suffering ...

By appealing to Josephus, Eusebius argues that when the last Christians had left the city, there was no hindrance to destroy it and goes on to describe that despite “all its ancient fame [...] it perished utterly and passed away in flames.” The tradition of a Pella flight is also preserved in Epiphanius and is the foundation legend of a Jewish-Christian community that had settled in the city by the early second century.

Eusebius tried to establish the continuation of the Jerusalem church, from the time of James until it became a Gentile church after the second siege in 135 C.E. He does this by describing the succession of the throne of Jerusalem from James to Symeon son of Clopas, a cousin of Jesus, and traces it through fifteen bishops, all “of the circumcision.” Eusebius attempted to reconcile a tradition of discontinuity, with one of continuity by playing down the gap in leadership between James and Symeon, and by emphasizing that the first bishops were Hebrews. We are
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347 Eusebius, Hist. eccl. III.5.2-4 (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
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351 Painter, Just James, 145.
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354 Painter, Just James, 145, 147.
left with an image of James, whose authority was unquestioned and whose throne continued to influence and inspire to his day.\(^{355}\)

**Epiphanius**

In the fourth century the brotherhood of James again became an issue in the church, and sparked a debate between Epiphanius bishop of Salamis (ca 310/20-403 C.E.) and Jerome (Hieronymus) (ca 347-420 C.E.), who is best known for his Latin Bible translations. Epiphanius’ magnum opus is the *Panarion*, a medicine chest of remedies against Christian heresies, which symbolically take the form of poisonous beasts.\(^{356}\) His heresiology contains descriptions of eighty sects and their teachings, which were according to him subversive of the true church doctrine, and two of those sects, the Ebionites and the Nazareans, revered James as their champion.\(^{357}\)

Epiphanius based his interpretation that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were Joseph’s children from a previous marriage, on the *Protevangelium of James* and possibly also the *Gospel of Peter*, based on Origen’s *Comm. Matt* X.17.\(^{358}\) In his refutations of the sects he names his opponents and traces their origins, but these are often imaginary interlocutors, labels for ideas that Christians should avoid.\(^{359}\) This is true of the *Antidicomarians*, which is a fictional group, consisting of:

> those who say that St. Mary, the ever-virgin, had intercourse with Joseph after giving birth to the Saviour. Such people I have called ‘Antidicomarians.’\(^{360}\)

---

\(^{355}\) Cf. *Hist. Eccl.*, VII.19.1

\(^{356}\) Frank Williams, introduction to *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1-46)*, by Epiphanius, xix-xx.


\(^{359}\) Williams, “Introduction.”

\(^{360}\) Epiphanius, *Pan. Proem I* 4,8 (Williams, NHMS), 5.
These Antidicomarians are given ample consideration as the antepenultimate sect of the *Panarion* and present Epiphanius’ view of Mary’s perpetual virginity.

For how could such an old man, who had lost his first wife so many years before, take a virgin for a wife? [...] Joseph took his first wife from the tribe of Judah and she bore him six children in all, four boys and two girls, as the Gospels according to Mark and John have made clear. His firstborn son was James, whose surname was Oblias, or “wall,” and who was also surnamed “The Just” and was a nazirite, or “holy man.” He was the first to receive the episcopal throne, the first to whom the Lord entrusted his throne on earth. He was also called the Lord’s brother [...] not by nature but by grace, because of being brought up with him.  

The reference to Hegesippus is obvious in the Oblias reference, but Epiphanius appears to be using the *Protevangelium of James* and develops the argument in two important ways: “First he stresses Joseph’s advanced age at the time Mary was allotted to him. Second he asserts that the relationship was not intended to be a consummated marriage.” The view that Joseph was a widower, and the siblings of Jesus were his children from a previous marriage, was widespread in the East long before the time of Epiphanius, but because the issue of Mary’s perpetual virginity was hotly debated in the fourth century, J. B. Lightfoot named this position ‘the Epiphanian theory’, in honour of its most zealous advocate. A modern proponent of the *Epiphanian* theory, albeit in a modified form, is Richard Bauckham.  

---

361 Epiphanius, *Pan.* 78.7.5-9 (Williams, NHMS).
362 Cf. discussion page 62.
364 “In the early ages of the Church two conflicting opinions were held regarding the relationship of those who in the Gospels and apostolic Epistles are termed “the brethren of the Lord.” On the one hand it was maintained that no blood relationship existed; that these brethren were in fact sons of Joseph by a former wife, before he espoused the Virgin; [...] On the other hand certain persons argued that the obvious meaning of the term was the correct meaning [...] Such was the state of opinion, when towards the close of the fourth century Jerome struck out a novel hypothesis [...] that the Lord’s brethren were his cousins after the flesh, being sons of Mary the wife of Alpheus and sister of the Virgin. [...] I shall call [these claims] respectively the Epiphanian, the Helvidian, and the Hieronymian theories, from the names of their most zealous advocates in the controversies of the fourth century, when the question was most warmly debated.” J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians: A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes and Dissertations* (London: Warren F. Draper, Publisher, 1870), 88-90. Cited 2 August 2014. Online: https://archive.org/stream/stpaulsepistleto00ligh.
Epiphanius’ zeal to advance Mary’s perpetual virginity can be seen by his emphasis on the virginity of James: 366

John, James and James, these three, lived in virginity—the two sons of Zebedee and James, who was the son of Joseph and the Lord’s brother because he had lived with him, had been brought up with him, and had the status of a brother because of Joseph’s only relationship to Mary, her betrothal to him. Only this James was allowed to enter the Holy of Holies once a year since he was a nazirite and a member of the priesthood. Thus Mary was related to Elizabeth in two ways and James was distinguished by priesthood, since only the two tribes intermarried, the kingly with the priestly and the priestly with the kingly. […] James also wore the priestly diadem. And once he raised his hands to heaven and prayed during a drought, and heaven immediately gave rain. He never put on a woolen garment. From their continual kneeling before the Lord with extreme piety, his knees grew as hard as camels’. He was no longer addressed by name; his name was “The Just.” He never washed in the bath house, did not eat meat, as I have already said, and did not put on a sandal. And a great deal could be said about James and his virtuous life. 367

The priestly and kingly exaltation of James’ genealogy is intended to emphasize his holiness, and that of Mary and Jesus. Josephus describes the amalgamation of the high priestly office and the title of king during the short reign of the Hasmonaean ruler Aristobulus I in the Jewish War 1.3, 368 and he was the first to add the royal diadem to the high priestly turban. 369 This dual authority, as entrusted with godly and earthly power, is entrusted to James with reference to a legendary Jewish past.

The piety of James in Epiphanius is based on Hegesiippus’ description, but with added elements. 370 James is endowed with power to control the weather and produce rain during a draught, simply by raising his hands to heaven. Procuring rain was a known theme with Jewish miracle workers, 371 most notably Elijah in the Lives of the Prophets. 372 Epiphanius

366 Painter, Just James, 212.
367 Epiphanius, Pan. 78.13.4-14.2 (Williams, NHMS).
368 Jospehus, Ant. 13.11 (Thackeray, Marcus, and Feldman, LCL).
370 Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. II.23.4-8, (Lake and Oulton, LCL). Cf. discussion page 60.
concludes his list of virtues with the statement that he “did not put on a sandal”, which might be based on the ascetic ideal of itinerancy, such as is found in Q 10.2-16, where Jesus instructs his followers to travel without the normal accoutrements of travel.373

Jerome (Hieronymus)

Jerome saw the church rise in power and influence after a period of persecution, the legalisation of Christianity by Constantine and finally becoming the dominant religion of the Roman Empire. At the end of the fourth century he contemplated writing a Church history that showed how the church had “increased in influence and wealth but decreased in virtue”.374 For much of the fourth century Jerome stood at the front line of theological debate, never hesitating to fight against powerful opponents “whom he lampooned as half-witted heretics and cantankerous backbiters”.375 One of those opponents, Helvidius, denied the perpetual virginity of Mary and defended Christian marriage against celibacy, and was thus dismissed by Jerome in a pamphlet called Against Helvidius.376

Jerome’s impetus for discussing the biblical basis for virginity was a growing trend towards chastity and asceticism in Roman Christianity and in a treatise ‘On the preservation of virginity’,377 Jerome “encouraged ascetic seclusion, sexual abstinence, fasting, and [...] urged the superiority of virginity to marriage.378 Helvidius was apparently critical of these growing claims for the superiority of celibacy to Christian marriage and expressed

376 Rebenich, Jerome, 18.
377 Jerome, De Virginitate servanda. Written in Rome in 384.
378 Rebenich, Jerome, 16.
these views in a writing that has not survived. In his argument, as summarized by John Painter:

Helvidius seems to have made five main points.

1. He argued that Matthew 1:18, 25 imply that, subsequent to the birth of Jesus, Joseph and Mary had other children. [...] The assertion that Joseph did not “know” Mary “until she bore a son” was taken to mean that he did come to “know her,” that is, have sexual intercourse with her, subsequently (Against Helvidius 3).

2. He appealed to Luke 2:7, which refers to Jesus as Mary’s “first born son,” arguing that it implied subsequent children (Against Helvidius 9).

3. He listed the various passages in which the evangelists mention and sometimes name the brothers and sisters of Jesus (Against Helvidius 4).

4. He appealed to older Western tradition (Against Helvidius 17) in which the brothers and sisters of Jesus had been mentioned in a way consistent with his views anti specified Tertullian (cf. his Adv. Marc. 4.19; De carne Christ 7; De monog. 8) and Victorinus of Pettau. [...] 5. He argued that it was no dishonor that Mary was a real wife to Joseph since all the patriarchs had been married men and that child bearing was a participation in the divine creativity (Against Helvidius 18).

The support of Tertullian is interesting in this regard as Jerome does not deny that he supports a Helvidian position.

Jerome argues that Mary the mother of James and Joses (Mark 15.40) is the wife of Alpeheus and sister of Mary’s mother, which makes James and the brothers the cousins of Jesus. He further rightly argues that the term ἀδελφός does not necessarily entail blood relations, Jerome uses the words natura, gente, cognatione and affectu to describe the term’s semantic categories, but his reading is not supported by the texts in question nor any early Christian source. Jerome’s position, which he developed further in later works, became the dominant view due to the support of Augustine.

380 Painter, “Who was James,” in Chilton and Neusner, The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission, 21.
382 Painter, “Who was James,” in Chilton and Neusner, The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission, 17.
383 Painter, “Who was James,” in Chilton and Neusner, The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission, 17.
384 Painter, “Who was James,” in Chilton and Neusner, The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission, 17.
385 “Jerome’s distinctive position was developed in his work Against Helvidius in 383. Nevertheless, in his later (387) commentary on Galatians (commenting on 1:19) he writes:
of Hippo (354-430 C.E.). Although the issue at stake for Jerome is the virginity of both Mary and Joseph, James’ preeminent position is stated on the basis of his “high character, his incomparable faith, and extraordinary wisdom”.

3.3. James in the Nag Hammadi Library.

No discovery has changed the picture of early Christianity more profoundly than the discovery of the Nag Hammadi texts in 1945 and scholars are only beginning to understand the implications these texts entail. The texts discovered were written on papyrus parchment and kept in earthen jars in a cave near the modern Egyptian town of Nag Hammadi, where they were found. These texts, mostly translations from Greek into Sahidic Coptic, were written and collected in their current form by Christian monks in the early 4th century C.E., although the writings themselves are much older. Of the 52 texts found at Nag Hammadi, there were six duplicates and six were previously known, so the discovery gave access to forty early Christian works that were previously only known to us by refutations in the writings of church fathers. James is prominent in four of these texts, he is an important character in the sayings of the Gospel of Thomas, and three writings bear his name, the Apocryphon of James, and the First- and Second Apocalypses of James.

“Suffice it now to say that James was called the Lord’s brother on account of his high character, his incomparable faith, and extraordinary wisdom; the other apostles also are called brothers (John 20.17; comp. Ps. 22.22), but he pre-eminently so, to whom the Lord at His departure had committed the sons of His mother (i.e., the members of the Church of Jerusalem)”. Lightfoot, “The Brethren of the Lord,” in Lightfoot, Galatians, 96. Painter, “Who was James,” in Chilton and Neusner, The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission, 20.

386 Painter, “Who was James,” in Chilton and Neusner, The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission, 16.
The Gospel of Thomas.

The Gospel of Thomas is perhaps the most valuable discovery for our study of the earliest traditions of Jesus, since it is most likely composed before the canonical gospels and is by genre a sayings gospel, much like the Sayings Gospel Q. The tendency of scholars has unfortunately been to treat the Gospel of Thomas in isolation when discussing Christian beginnings with notable exceptions, but it will have to be taken seriously if we want to appreciate “the richness of Christianity’s complicated beginnings”.

There has been much scholarly debate concerning the date of composition of the Gospel of Thomas, with views ranging from the middle of the first century to the middle of the second century C.E. Although the date may better be described as a process instead of a fixed event, Helmut Koester has argued that the way in which various authority figures appear in the gospel, suggests an original date before the end of the first century: “With respect to the development of ecclesiastical authority, the GTh reflects the authority position of James, the brother of Jesus (saying 12). [...]”

---

393 This being e.g. John Dominic Crossan, The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately after the Execution of Jesus (New York, N.Y.: Harper Collins, 1998).
His authority however is superseded by that of Thomas, who is entrusted with the secret tradition (saying 13)."\(^{397}\)

Saying 12
(1) The disciples said to Jesus: “We know that you will depart from us. Who (then) will rule\(^{398}\) over us?”
(2) Jesus said to them: “(No matter) where you came from, you should go to James the Just for whose sake heaven and earth came into being.”

Saying 13
(1) Jesus said to his disciples: “Compare me and tell me whom I am like.”
(2) Simon Peter said to him: “You are like a just messenger.”
(3) Matthew said to him: “You are like an (especially) wise philosopher.”
(4) Thomas said to him: “Teacher, my mouth <can>not bear at all to say whom you are like.”
(5) Jesus said: “I am not your teacher. For you have drunk, (and) you have become frenzied from the bubbling spring that I have measured out.”
(6) And he took him, withdrew, (and) he said three words to him.
(7) But when Thomas came back to his companions, they asked him: “What did Jesus say to you?”
(8) Thomas said to them: “If I tell you one of the words he said to me, you will pick up stones (and) throw them at me, and fire will come out of the stones (and) burn you up.”\(^{399}\)

The authority of James in this text is somewhat ambiguous. Antti Marjanen has argued that the “very fact that James is appointed by Jesus to be the leader of the disciples implies that his characterization [...] is to be seen in a positive light”, and that these “parallels not only suggest the positive nature of the expression but point to its Jewish or Jewish-Christian origin”.\(^{400}\)

The following saying 13 has frequently been thought to be a correction of the place of authority by the compiler,\(^{401}\) exalting Thomas at the expanse of James (Matthew, and Peter), but Marjanen argues that this does not show James in a negative way since criticism is directed specifically to Matthew and Peter.\(^{402}\) In contrast Valantasis has argued that

---

398 Literally “be great”.
Jesus’ statement to “go to” James is ironic, since he has before disavowed all recognized authority (cf. Saying 3), and the appeal to James the Just thus represents a sign of weakness. The underlying issue of cosmology is also at stake, where creation is throughout the gospel negative, so the qualification “for whose sake heaven and earth came into being” becomes ironic in light of Gos. Thom. 11.

The question remains if the designation of James reflects either Jewish-Christian origin or traces its origins to the Jerusalem community. Marjanen shows that the honorific attributed to James is a traditional Jewish honorary title, and the fact that it is attached to him makes it likely that the saying was rooted in Jewish Christian traditions showing reverence to him. Ismo Dunderberg points out that James is one of the followers of Jesus, which are called beloved (ΠΜΕΡΙΤ) in the Nag Hammadi corpus, and that this is a Jewish Christian homage to James. In the Gospel of John, James is replaced by the beloved disciple (John 19.25-25); as part of John’s polemic against Jewish-Christians, the beloved disciple becomes John’s anti-James. In a similar vein does the Gospel of Thomas downplay the importance of the brothers of Jesus (Gos. Thom. 99) and displays a

---

405 Gos. Thom. 12, Patterson, Bethge, and Robinson, The Fifth Gospel, 3.
408 “A similar phrase is used as an honorific epithet of Israel in 4 Ezra 7.11, of patriarchs, David, and the Messiah in rabbinic writings, and of the Christian church in the Shepherd of Hermes (1.1.6; 2.4.1). Marjanen, “Is Thomas a Gnostic Gospel,” in Barclay, Marcus, and Riches, Thomas at the Crossroads, 119.”
410 Cf. Pistis Sophia 68, 78.
critical attitude towards the observance of the Law represented by James, thus portraying Thomas as the true disciple. This opposition to James is reflected independently, but with a common intention to counter the significant growth of Jewish-Christian traditions about James between 80 and 140 C.E.

The Apocryphon of James.

The epistle entitled *The Apocryphon (Secret Book) of James* is preserved in the Nag Hammadi Codex I (NHC I), among Valentinian writings, and has generally been attributed to his Gnostic school of thought. The author of the book is identified simply as “James” and it opens with a scene where the disciples are together composing their gospels. This narrative setting is likely to be a rejection of the process of canonisation, as Jesus claims their understanding to be false, and Peter and James are singled out to be filled with a secret teaching. This narrative frame is according to Koester the latest addition to the composition and although the sayings show similarity with the gospels of the New Testament, especially the Johannine farewell discourse, there is no sign of literary dependence. Ron Cameron has argued that the sayings of Jesus in the *Ap. Jas.* reflect a tradition independent from the Synoptic

---

Gospels and constitutes a primary source for the sayings of the Jesus tradition.\textsuperscript{421}

Although James and Peter receive the secret teaching together, there is special emphasis on James, which might reflect tensions with the larger Petrine church: “If Peter is the authority behind the opposition to the gnostics, he may be introduced with James to show that he should have received gnosis but failed.”\textsuperscript{422} At the conclusion of \textit{Ap. Jas}, James states that his own salvation is based on others being enlightened through him.

We (Peter and I, James) answered them (the other disciples): “He ascended. He gave us his right hand, and promised all of us life. He showed us children coming after us and commanded [us] to love them, since we are to be [saved] for their sakes.”

When they heard this, they believed the revelation, but they were angry about those who would be born. Not wishing to give them reason to take offence, I sent each of them to a different location. I myself went up to Jerusalem, praying that I might acquire a share with the loved ones who are to appear.

I pray that the beginning may come from you. This is how I can be saved. They will be enlightened through me, by my faith, and through another’s that is better than mine. I wish mine to be the lesser.\textsuperscript{423}

The brother of Jesus stands as a model for readers of the importance of evangelizing, which for James has salvific consequences.\textsuperscript{424} Although most commentators have excluded a Jewish-Christian origin of this writing, Painter argues that it does contain strong elements reminiscent of such traditions: The primacy of James, the claim that the letter was written in Hebrew,\textsuperscript{425} and the journey to Jerusalem for prayer,\textsuperscript{426} point in that direction, but missing are the well known Jewish-Christian honorific titles, brother of the Lord and James the Just.\textsuperscript{427} These dubious categories, Gnostic\textsuperscript{428} and Jewish-Christian,\textsuperscript{429} are of course not mutually exclusive.

---

\textsuperscript{421} This was the subject of his PhD dissertation published as Ron Cameron, \textit{Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James} (HTS 34; Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1984).

\textsuperscript{422} Perkins, “Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas. (NCH 1,2),” 408, n. 18.


\textsuperscript{425} \textit{Ap. Jas.} 1.16.

\textsuperscript{426} \textit{Ap. Jas.} 16.8-11.

\textsuperscript{427} Painter, \textit{Just James}, 163-68.

James’ audience, the “children coming after us” (15.39-40), are those that constitute the group from which this secret book originates, and for them James holds the key to them being filled (16.16-17) and this is being spread from the city of Jerusalem (16.8-11).

**The First Apocalypse of James,**

The Nag Hammadi Codex V contains two writings that are entitled Apocalypse of James and the designations first and second refer only to their respective placing within that codex. The *First Apocalypse of James* is a Coptic translation of a Greek text that describes James’ preparation for martyrdom and the subsequent fall of Jerusalem.\(^{430}\) The first scholar to translate and publish this text, Alexander Böhlig, offered what has been an influential view that *1 Apoc. Jas.* reflects themes from a Jewish Christian milieu taken up into a Gnostic context and transformed.\(^{431}\) His eleven arguments for this were as presented by Painter:

1) The presentation of James as the brother of the Lord (24.12-16); 2) the presentation of James as the true prophet (39.18); 3) the identification of James by the epithet ‘the Just’ (31.30: 32.1-3, 12: 43.19-21); 4) the opposition to sacrifice (41.7ff); 5) the focus on the second coming of the Lord (30.16-17); 6) the use of the intimacy of James with the Lord as an anti-Pauline motif (31.1-5; 32.7); 7) false pericopes in Scriptures (26.2ff); 8) the use of the syzygy motif (36.2-6); 9) the exoneration of the Jews (31.21f); 10) the exodus of James (the Jerusalem church) to Pella (25.15); 11) the presentation of James’ authority over the twelve [...]

While not all of these points are equally persuasive, together they present a prima facie case for the Jewish Christian origin of *The First Apocalypse.*\(^{432}\)

This view has, however, been challenged on the grounds that in the apocalypse James is a thoroughly Gnosticized figure. William Schoedel argues that “although the figure of James the Just was originally the

---


property of Jewish Christianity, it has become little more in our apocalypse then a convenient peg on which to hang Gnostic doctrine” and is used to show that the “destruction of Jerusalem follows with perfect poetic justice immediately upon the martyrdom of James.”

James is portrayed in the writing as gradually overcoming his initial ignorance and fear of being persecuted, to having “received [the firstfruits] of knowledge.” He faces martyrdom courageously praying for his oppressors with the words “father [in the heavens, forgive] them, for [they do] not [know] what [they are doing].” The Tchacos Codex (TC), which has only recently been made available to scholars, contains a copy of the First Apocalypse of James and it will in due time fill in some of the lacunae in the NHC V text. The martyr narrative at the end of the writing is for example missing in NHC V, as 13 lines are lost, but is in place in the TC James 29-30. The designation James the Just is said to be explained in Apoc. Jas. 31, but there are lacunae in NHC V which hide the explanation, and this can now by reconstructed using TC: “But [you are concerned that the] just [God] became angry with [you, since you used to be a] servant to him, […] That is why you have this name, ‘James the Just’.” This is important in understanding James’ role and relationship towards the old and new faiths in the apocalypse.

Karen L. King argues that the first three documents collected in the TC, the Letter of Peter to Philip, the First Apocalypse of James and the Gospel of Judas, share a common theme concerned with persecution. Her

---

433 Schoedel, “A Gnostic Int. of the Fall of Jer.: 1 Apoc. Jas,” 166 and 174 respectively.
436 Meyer, Nag Hammadi Scriptures, 330, n. 38 and n. 39. He is arrested, wrongly accused and convicted, and subsequently stoned. His offence is not explicitly mentioned.
suggestion is that “these works illuminate some aspects of early Christian
debates not only over how to understand the violent death of Jesus, but also
over how believers should prepare themselves to face suffering and
death”. In this light James becomes a prototype for leading a Christian
life, under the threat of persecution:

James said, “Rabbi, you said, ‘They will arrest me.’ What can I do?”
He said to me, “Don’t be afraid, James. You too will be arrested. [Leave]
Jerusalem, for this city always gives the cup of bitterness to the children of light.
This is the dwelling place of many archons, but your deliverance will deliver you
from them”

James is told to flee Jerusalem, which is at the mercy of archons, and his
martyrdom subsequently ensues the fall of the city: “As soon as you leave,
there will be war waged against this land, so weep for anyone who dwells in
Jerusalem.” There is an overlap between the Gnostics and the church
fathers concerning the fate of Jerusalem, but the view of Apoc. Jas. is
much more negative since Jerusalem was never the abode of God, but the
dwelling place of archons. In the end James is not killed for any action, it
was as King puts it: “A case of mistaken identity! Or perhaps not. We are
told that “the just God” is angry with James because James used to serve
him.” The Apocalypse goes on the say that the twelve, and not only the
twelve but also a further seventy two (NHC V 26.13-16, TC 13.1-4), are
under the rule of archons, and there is thus no other authority recognized but
the Brother of the Lord.

Rice University, Houston, Texas, March 13-16, 2008 (ed. April DeConick; NHMS 71;

439 King, “Martyrdom and its Discontents in the Tchachos Codex,” in DeConick, The
Codex Judas Papers, 24.
442 Cf. discussion on Origen, page 54.
443 Schoedel, “A Gnostic Int. of the Fall of Jer.: 1 Apoc. Jas,” 175-76.
444 1 Apoc. Jas TC 30.21-26. “the judges recognize that he is innocent [...] Ironically the
claim that “James is not worthy of life,” meaning this life of the flesh, but of course the
reader now understands that James is indeed worthy of life – immortal life”” King,
“Martyrdom and its Discontents in the Tchachos Codex,” in DeConick, The Codex Judas
Papers, 28, n. 20.
445 Funk, “The Significance of the Tchacos Codex for Understanding the First Apocalypse
of James,” in DeConick, The Codex Judas Papers, 531-33.
The Second Apocalypse of James.

Much has already been said about the connection of the martyr narrative of James in the Second Apocalypse of James and Hegesippus.\(^{446}\) While most scholars propose a common source for these narratives, Jones believes that their relation is best described with direct dependence on Hegesippus’ account.\(^{447}\) A classic study is S. Kent Brown’s comparison to Mishna material, where he shows through reading the tractate Sanhedrin 6.2-4, that the stoning of James in 2 Apoc. Jas. fits the requirements found there much more precisely than in Hegesippus’ account.\(^{448}\) Brown concludes that both are drawing from tradition, but Hegesippus’ interest in seeing James emulating the pattern of Jesus’ death, reflects greater redaction.\(^{449}\) After witnessing to the crowds, about walking with the Lord, he is arrested and tried:

They arose and said, “Yes, let us kill this man, that he may be removed from our midst. For he will be of no use to us all.”

They were there, and they found him standing by the pinnacle of the temple, next to the mighty cornerstone. They determined to throw him down from the height, and they did just that.

[When] they [looked at him], they saw [he was alive. So] they arose [and went down], and they seized him and [abused] him, dragging him on the ground.

They stretched out his body and rolled a stone on his abdomen, and they trampled him with their feet and said, “O you who have gone astray!”

Since he was still alive, they raised him up again, made him dig a hole, and forced him to stand in it. They covered him up to his abdomen and stoned him in this manner.\(^{450}\)

The martyr narrative then concludes with a dying prayer, the type of which is found in various corpora of Gnostic affiliation, but has yet to be studied to any degree.\(^{451}\)

\(^{446}\) Cf. discussion on page 59 and 64.
\(^{448}\) S. Kent Brown, “Jewish and Gnostic Elements in the Second Apocalypse of James (CG V, 4),” NovT 17, Facs. 3 (July 1975): 229.
\(^{449}\) Brown, “Jewish and Gnostic Elements in the Second Apocalypse of James (CG V, 4),” 231.
As with other Nag Hammadi texts, scholars struggle to categorize the content of 2 Apoc. Jas., but Charles H. Hedrick452 and Funk agree that it is an early Jewish-Christian writing and Funk argues that its origins lie “in a portion of the exiled Jerusalem community [...] in some part of Syria [...] somewhere in the second century.”453 This writing portrays James’ connection with Jesus in a somewhat unusual light, stating enigmatically that “Your father is not my Father, but my Father has become a father to you.”454 In the opening address James is described in the following way:

This is the discourse that James the Just delivered in Jerusalem and Mareim wrote down.
One of the priests told it to Theudas, the father of this Just man, since he was a relative of his.455

[...]

One time when I (James) was sitting and meditating, the one whom you hated and persecuted opened the door and came in to me, and he said to me, Hello, my brother; brother, hello.

“As I raised my [head] to look at him, mother said to me, ‘Don’t be afraid, my son, because he said to you, “My brother.” You were both nourished with the same milk. That is why he says to me, “My mother.” He is not a stranger to us; he is your stepbrother. [I am] not ...”456

Unlike the church fathers, the aim of this designation does not seem to be to show Mary’s virginity; on the contrary one could understand Theudas as Mary’s second husband and thus James as her younger son.457 Painter proposes that the author of 2 Apoc. Jas. intends to show that Jesus in fact has no earthly mother, and this is confirmed by comparing this text to 1

452 “As to the date and place of composition, little can be said with certainty. Because of the basic Jewish-Christian traditions out of which the tractate is composed, it is probable that its origin is to be associated with Jewish-Christian circles. The absence of allusions to the later developed Gnostic systems, and the almost total absence of allusions to the New Testament tradition suggest an early date for the origin of the tractate.” Charles W. Hedrick, “Introduction to the Second Apocalypse of James,” in The Nag Hammadi Library: The Definitive Translation of the Gnostic Scriptures Complete in One Volume (ed. James M. Robinson; The Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1988; repr., New York, N.Y.: HarperCollins, 1990), 270.


455 2 Apoc. Jas. 44.11-23. Meyer, Nag Hammadi Scriptures, 333.

456 2 Apoc. Jas. 50.4-23. Meyer, Nag Hammadi Scriptures, 335-36.

The exact relationship that Mary was about to explain is regrettably lost in a lacuna, 2 Apoc. Jas. 50.23ff. The image of James has evolved beyond the normal meaning behind the epithet Just: James is in 2 Apoc. Jas. the “heavenly guide of those that pass through the heavenly door, [...] he is the illuminator and deliverer” to the elect that receive his esoteric teaching.459

3.4 Jewish-Christianity.

The discussion of James in the Nag Hammadi corpus has made clear that the categories Gnostic and Jewish-Christian are not as neatly distinguished as their use sometimes entails and if they are to be used at all their problematic nature should be kept in mind.460 A helpful reminder of these difficulties is Raymond Brown’s well known article “Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity”, where he divides Jewish-Christian groups into four categories depending on their attitude towards the Torah and the Jewish law, three of which can be traced to the Jerusalem community.462 Petri Luomanen recognises the multifaceted character of both ancient Judaism and Christianity and instead of defining neat categories suggests looking for the following indicators of Jewish Christianity:

- Are characteristically Jewish practices such as (Jewish) circumcision, the Sabbath and purity laws observed?
- Are characteristically Jewish ideas such as Yahweh as the only God, the temple as Yahweh’s abode, or the Torah, maintained?
- What is the pedigree of the group/person? Jewish or not?
- What is the role of Jesus in the worship and ideology of the community? Is Jesus considered as a Jewish prophet or is he more a divine being, worshipped as Kyrios (“Lord”), an equal to God?

---

458 Painter, Just James, 176. “For not without reason have I called you my brother, though you are not physically my brother.” 1 Apoc. Jas. 24.14-15. Meyer, Nag Hammadi Scriptures, 324.
462 Brown, “Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity,” 77.
Is baptism in the name of Jesus (or the triune God) an entrance rite to the community? To what extent are these or other issues important for inter- or intra-group relations. What roles do they play in defining the borders and identity of the group in question.  

This last indicator is especially important when distinguishing between groups that, like most early Christians, sought to draw on the epic of Israel in their presentation of their religious ideas or drew borders to distinguish themselves from other Jewish and Christian movements.

**The Jewish Christian Gospels.**

The authoritative *New Testament Apocrypha* lists three Jewish-Christian Gospels that are mentioned by the church fathers, the *Gospel of the Nazaraeans*, the *Gospel of the Ebionites*, and the *Gospel of the Hebrews* and gives references to them. This three-gospel hypothesis has become the scholarly consensus in German and English speaking scholarship, but in French academia scholars generally use only two, Gos. Eb. and a conflated *Gospel of the Hebrews/Nazareans*. This threefold distinction is not without difficulty, as A. F. J. Klijn, a modern defender of the hypothesis, concedes, and in recent years many have challenged its presentation. Luomanen proposes a revised two gospel hypothesis, which includes Gos.

---

Heb. and Gos Eb., as well as a specific Nazarene collection of passages from the Gospel of Matthew; but finds no evidence of a Nazarene gospel.⁴⁶⁹

In his heresiology, Against Heresies, Irenaeus (ca. 130 – 202 C.E.) mentions “those who are called Ebionites [and] practice circumcision, preserve the customs which are according to the Law and practice a Jewish way of life, even adoring Jerusalem as if it were the house of God.”⁴⁷⁰ This group is then mentioned in most of the church fathers and although the possibility of contact with such a group varies between authors, it can be shown that practically all heresiologists from the second to fourth century rely on his description.⁴⁷¹ There are four elements that suggest that the Ebionites originated in the Jerusalem community: The name matches the title of the earliest Jerusalem community (cf. Rom 15.26; Gal 2.10), anti-Paulinism characterizes the groups that come from Jerusalem before 70 C.E., they emphasize law obedience and circumcision and these groups venerate and/or pray to Jerusalem, regarding James the Just their founder (Acts 2.46, 21.17-26; Eusebius, Hist. eccl. II.23.3-18).⁴⁷²

Epiphanius devotes a chapter to the sect of Ebionites and much of what he presents is consistent with earlier accounts,⁴⁷³ but there are also important differences in his elaborate presentation.⁴⁷⁴ They for example celebrated the Eucharist with unleavened bread and water only,⁴⁷⁵ held that James spoke against the temple and sacrifices⁴⁷⁶ and forbade celibacy even though they “at one time prided themselves on virginity, presumably

---

⁴⁷³ These being a rejection of virginal conception, adherence to the law and circumcision, use of the Gospel of Matthew and an anti-Pauline stance. Luomanen, “Ebionites and Nazarenes,” in Jackson-McCabe, Jewish-Christianity Reconsidered, 86.
⁴⁷⁴ For a list of these cf. Jackson-McCabe, Jewish-Christianity Reconsidered, 87-88.
⁴⁷⁶ Epiphanius, Pan. 30.16.7.
because of James the Lord’s brother.” These Ebionites are most likely not the same group that Irenaeus describes, although they share a common ancestry and common ideas. The exact relationship between the Ebionites and the Jerusalem Church has been debated since the days of the Tübingen scholars. F. C. Baur believed that the Ebionites were successors of the very first Jewish Christians in Jerusalem and Albrect Ritschl argued conversely that the Nazarenes were their successors.

Comparison of Epiphanius’ description of the Ebionites and their gospel with the *Pseudo-Clementines*, shows that they contain related material at least with the proposed *Basic Writing*, thought to be a common source of the surviving *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* and *Homilies*. Luomanen is “inclined to assume that Epiphanius’s Ebionites were in fact successors of the Hellenistic ‘poor’ of the early Jerusalem community, and that Irenaeus’s Ebionites were successors of the Hebrews (c.f. Acts 6-8) of the same community”. The differences between the portraits are too great to assume that the Ebionites described in the *Panarion* were direct successors of the group described by Irenaeus, but this proposed common connection would explain the similarities. Joseph Verheyden cautions us while reading Epiphanius and states that he knew very well that the Jewish-

---

477 Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.2.6 (Williams, NHMS).
479 For a modern proponent of this position cf. Lüdemann, *Heretics: The Other Side of Early Christianity*.
482 “The similarities between ideas attributed to Epiphanius’s Ebionites and the *Basic Writing* (including *Rec.* 1.27-71) include speculation about Christ’s position over the angels (*Pan.* 30.3.4; 30.16.4; cf. *Rec.* 2.42.5; 1.45.1-2), his pre-Christian appearances to Abraham and the patriarchs (*Pan.* 30.3.3; 30.3.5; *Rec._ 1.32.4-33.2; cf. *Hom.* 8.10), and speculations about Adam as a prophet and one that was anointed (*Pan.* 30.3.3.5; *Rec._ 4.9, par. *Hom.* 8.10; *Rec._ 1.47.1-4). Luomanen, “Ebionites and Nazarenes,” in Jackson-McCabe, *Jewish-Christianity Reconsidered*, 92-93.
Christian movements had long since become a marginal phenomenon and posed no threat to the Church. The Ebionites served as the perfect interlocutors for his refutation of those that “failed to see that for Christians these requirements of the Law have now received a new meaning as words of Jesus”.

Similar caution is raised by Luomanen regarding Epiphanius’ refutations of the Nazarenes, but his description of what he calls a heresy of the first century is the earliest that we have. None of his predecessors refer to a heretical sect called Nazarenes, and by the end of the fourth century the only other mention of them is by his contemporary and friend Jerome. Scholars have struggled to explain this in varying ways from the time of the Tübingen scholars: F. C. Baur proposed that they were later, more tolerant Jewish-Christians, Albrect Ritschl argued that they were early “orthodox” Jewish Christians and in the 20th century Alfred Schmidtke thought that they were later local “catholic”(sic) Jewish Christians, who formed a community in Beroa to better follow their national customs. A monograph tracing the Nazarene Jewish Christianity: From the End of the New Testament Period until its Disappearance in the Fourth Century, argues that Justin Martyr, Origen and Eusebius discuss them alongside other Jewish Christian groups, but do not name them specifically. Luomanen’s thesis is that Epiphanius constructed an imaginary interlocutor, based on Acts and his stereotypical ideas about what a Jewish Christian opponent might believe, and then goes

---

on to refute its ideas.\textsuperscript{488} James, being an indispensable component of Jewish Christian ideology, received pride of place as the high priest and bishop of the Jerusalem church,\textsuperscript{489} first born son of Davidic descent and consecrated Nazirite,\textsuperscript{490} wearing a priestly tablet.\textsuperscript{491}

Jerome, in his \textit{Letter to Damascus} says that he has begun to study Hebrew from Syriac speaking Jewish Christian converts with whom he lived near Chalcis, and there begin his quotations from a supposed Hebrew original of the Gospel of Matthew.\textsuperscript{492} There is no evidence to suggest that such an original existed, but in all likelihood Jerome had knowledge of a Syriac translation of Matthew.\textsuperscript{493} In the following years Jerome devotes more and more time to the study of Hebrew as apparent in his \textit{Commentary on Micah} (389 C.E.), where he makes extensive use of rabbinical exegesis,\textsuperscript{494} and his writings on the Hebrew language, \textit{Hebrew Names}, the \textit{Book of Places} and \textit{Hebrew Questions}. His motivation was a zeal to get back to an original reading of God’s word, which was supported by the uniformity of the Hebrew manuscripts available to him, unlike the varied Greek and Latin translations. Jerome believed that the etymologies of Hebrew names could be used as entryways into the texts spiritual meaning.\textsuperscript{495} The \textit{Commentary of Isaiah} cites numerous examples of Jewish exegesis to be refuted, and the tone of the commentary is even more anti-Jewish than usual.\textsuperscript{496} Luomanen examines the references to a Nazarene Gospel in \textit{Com. Isa.} and the \textit{Commentary on Matthew} and concludes that they in fact refer to the canonical Matthew, albeit as used by Syriac

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{488} Luomanen, “Nazarenes,” in Marjanen and Luomanen, \textit{A Companion to Second-Century Christian ‘Heretics’}.
\textsuperscript{489} Epiphanius, \textit{Pan.} 29.3.8-9.
\textsuperscript{490} Epiphanius, \textit{Pan.} 29.4.1-3.
\textsuperscript{491} Epiphanius, \textit{Pan.}
\textsuperscript{494} Luomanen, \textit{Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels}, 94.
\textsuperscript{495} Michael Graves, \textit{Jerome's Hebrew Philology: A Study Based on his Commentary on Jeremiah} (ed. J. den Boeft et al.; VCSup 90; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 189.
\textsuperscript{496} Luomanen, \textit{Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels}, 98.
\end{footnotesize}
speaking Christians. The Gospel of Hebrews, as it is called in the three gospel hypothesis, is “pure work of fiction”.

Jerome’s Christian counterpart to the chronicles of secular authors, On Illustrious Men, traces the succession of apostles from Jesus, to Peter, then James and from James to Matthew, which according to him composed his gospel in Hebrew. This writing contains an important quotation from the Gospel of Hebrews:

This is that about which the apostle Paul also writes to the Galatians: "But another of the apostles I did not see apart from James, the brother of the Lord"; and the Acts of the Apostles repeatedly mention this and also the Gospel which is called according to the Hebrews and which I have recently translated into Greek and Latin of which also Origen often makes use, says after the account of the resurrection of the Lord: "But the Lord after he had given his linen cloth to the servant of the priest went to James and appeared to him (for James had sworn that he would not eat bread from the hour in which he drank the cup of the Lord until he had seen him rising again from those who sleep), and again, a little later, it says: "Bring the table and bread, said the Lord. And immediately it is added: "He brought bread and blessed and brake it and gave it to James the Just and said to him: My brother eat thy bread for the Son of Man is risen from those who sleep".

The description has many counterparts in later texts, such as Pseudo-Abdias’ Historiae Apostolica (VI 1) and Gregorious Episcopus Turonensis’ Historiarum Libri Decam (I 22), all based on Jerome and this popularity can be explained by the scarce information on James in the New Testament. Klijn says that the introduction of this text is reminiscent of the Acts of Thomas and concludes that the tradition of bread only must reflect an ancient tradition. The swearing to fast is in any case intended to emphasize James’ devotion and piety, and this text portrays him as preeminent among the disciples, receiving a private eucharistic meal reserved for James the Just.

497 Luomanen, Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels, 103-17.
500 Klijn, Jewish-Christian Gospel Traditions, 83.
The Gospel of Hebrews, although now lost was known by most of the early Christian writers, such as Papias, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and of course Eusebius, who introduces it in a list of canonical and non-canonical writings. Eusebius has three main categories: The accepted books (ὅμολογούμενα), the disputed books (ἀντιλεγόμενα) to which category the Gos. Heb. belongs, and heretical writings. The gospel thus represents an interesting example of a writing that stood on the fringes of the canon, listed among such books as the Didache and most notably Revelations. The Gospel of Hebrews has strong ties with sapiental traditions and fragments 2 and 5 show correlations with Q texts, which James M. Robinson has argued are remnants of the Q community who refused to become absorbed into the Gentile Christianity of the Gospel of Matthew. James is the champion of this Christian trajectory and its highest authority.

The Pseudo-Clementines.

The Pseudo-Clementines are a body of writings that are preserved in two distinct sources pseudonymously attributed to Clement, bishop of Rome (died ca. 99 C.E.). These sources are the Homilies, and the Recognitions, both written in the 4th century C.E. These writings are believed to use a

---

502 Eusebius, Hist. eccl. III.39.
503 Irenaeus, Haer 3.11.8-9: “Irenaeus was the defender of the canon of four gospels and her argued that heretics erred precisely for the reason that they used either more or less then the four gospels. Eusebius’ description of the “second” group of the Ebionites is clearly based on Irenaeus (Haer. 1.26.2) with the exception that Eusebius replaces Matthew’s Gospel with the Gospel of the Hebrews.” Luomanen, Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels, 123.
506 Eusebius, Hist. eccl. III.25.
507 Luomanen, Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels, 120.
common source, a *Grundschrift* or *Basic Writing* (*BW*), which is an ancient Christian novel with Jewish Christian elements, most likely titled *Peridoi Petrou* or the *Circuits of Peter*.\textsuperscript{510} This Jewish Christian *BW* has received much scholarly attention, since the Tübingen scholar Adolf Hilgenfeld first proposed its existence in 1848, regarding *Recognitions* 1.27-71 to be a source which he named the *Kerygma Petrou*.\textsuperscript{511}

The *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* (*H*) were written in Greek and their work is preserved in two medieval manuscripts,\textsuperscript{512} as well as Syriac fragments from the beginning of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{513} The author of the *Homilies* betrays Arian tendencies, which along with the date of the Syriac manuscripts places the text in early fourth century Syria.\textsuperscript{514} The *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* (*R*) was composed independently of the *H*, but its original Greek text is lost apart from fragmentary quotations in patristic writers such as Eusebius.\textsuperscript{515} The *Recognitions* are preserved in a Latin translation made by Rufinus of Aquileia around 406 C.E., which has been transmitted in a large number of manuscripts from the 5\textsuperscript{th} to 15\textsuperscript{th} centuries.\textsuperscript{516} The *R* are also preserved in part in Syriac translations found in two manuscripts from the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 9\textsuperscript{th} century. The *R* also show traces of the Arian debate and are generally placed in mid-fourth century Syria.\textsuperscript{517}

The redactional tendencies between the *H* and the *R* vary markedly, with the *H* generally remaining more faithful to the *BW*. The *R* abbreviates the material of the *BW* and the redactor seems to exclude much of what he deemed heretical, including much of the Jewish anti-Pauline


\textsuperscript{512} The 11\textsuperscript{th}-12\textsuperscript{th} century Parisinus Graecus 930 (P) and the 14\textsuperscript{th} century Vaticanus Ottobonianus 443 (O).

\textsuperscript{513} Nicole Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines: Situating the 'Recognitions' in Fourth Century Syria* (WUNT 213; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2006), 13.

\textsuperscript{514} Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines*, 14.

\textsuperscript{515} Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines*, 15.

\textsuperscript{516} Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines*, 15.

\textsuperscript{517} Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines*, 15.
elements, although they are not entirely removed.\(^{518}\) Our knowledge of the R redactional tendencies is complicated by Rufinus’ translation activity, which most likely involved the alteration of materials he found objectionable, and the probability of later interpolations into the R, for example the Eunomian material in R 3.2-11.\(^{519}\)

The source critical presentation of Georg Strecker and Johannes Irmscher in Wilhelm Sneemelcher’s *New Testament Apocrypha*\(^{520}\) has become a scholarly standard in modern research, and remains to this day the most widely accepted hypothesis.\(^{521}\) In his 1955 Bonn dissertation, Strecker proposed that the BW contained a Jewish Christian source, *Kerygmata Petrou*,\(^{522}\) to which are prefixed three letters: The Epistula Petri, Contestatio and the Epistula Clementis. Alongside these sources stands the Clement Romance (CR), a prime example of a Christian writing in the genre of the ancient novel. The CR follows the motifs of the Hellenistic novel, although instead of the theme of tragically separated lovers that are reunited, Clement, the successor of Peter is reunited with his family after becoming a follower of the Apostle Peter.\(^{523}\) Strecker placed the *Kerygmata Petrou* in the beginning of the 3rd century, and claimed that it is Gnostic Jewish Christian in origin and not Ebionite as his predecessor Hans Johan Schoeps had proposed, following F. C. Baur.\(^{524}\)

---

519 Eunomians were a sect that upheld an extreme form of Arianism. Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines*, 16-17.
Schoeps revived interest in the Ps.-Clem. with his 1949 publication, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*, where he brought forth Tübingen arguments concerning the conclusion of the *Kerygma Petrou, R 1.66-71*, which contains a source entitled the *Ascents of James* (Ἀναβαϑαµοι Ιακωβου). This source is independently attested in Epiphanius’ *Panarion* (30.15.1 f) and on this basis does Schoeps associate the *Ascent of James* (AJ) to the Ebionites. The proposed AJ source was further developed by Strecker who argued that the two sources, *Panarion* 30.16.7-9 (AJ I) and R 1.33-44.4, 1.53.3-71 (AJ II) derive from a common archetype AJ, but do not share a common source. The AJ II shows traces of traditions of the Pella flight, and Strecker thus argues an origin from that area around 150 C.E.

A modern proponent of the AJ source is Robert W. Van Voorst, who based on Strecker’s source criticism reconstructs the *Ascends of James* and proposes a date of composition somewhere in the second half of the second century, which would make it the oldest source behind the Ps.-Clem. corpus.

Current study of the Ps.-Clem. has on the one hand focused on the *Recognitions* and *Homilies* as they appear in their final form, an approach long neglected due to interest in their Jewish-Christian sources, and on

---


526 Van Voorst, *The Ascent of James, .


530 Van Voorst, *The Ascent of James*, 80-81. “The earliest possible date of AJ is 135 [and] it must have been written before G (BW), which is usually dated ca. 260.”

531 An example of this is Nicole Kelley’s study: Kelley, *Knowledge and Religious Authority in the Pseudo-Clementines* and Annette Yoshiko Reed, “‘Jewish Christianity’ after the "Parting of the Ways": Approaches to Historiography and Self-Definition in the Pseudo-Clementines,” in *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (ed. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 2007).
the other hand criticized Strecker’s source criticism. F. Stanley Jones provides an influential study of the proposed Jewish Christian source, *An Ancient Jewish Christian Source on the History of Christianity: Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions 1.27-71*, where he gives the Syriac and further Armenian texts due consideration.⁵³² In his preface he states that “the time has come to abandon a hypothesis that has long dominated and mired Pseudo-Clementine research, namely, the hypothesis that a writing entitled the *Kerygymata Petrou* was a (determinative) source for the *Ps.-Clem.*”⁵³³ Instead he proposes that the *BW*, originally entitled *Circuits of Peter (CP)*, can be recovered by comparison of the *H* and *R*, while the other proposed sources, the *AJ* and *KP*, are “turning out to be fantasies of scholarly imagination”.⁵³⁴ Jones has yet to publish his Synopsis with which he hopes to gain scholarly consensus about abandoning Strecker’s source criticism and the following discussion will thus be based on a combination of their textual presentations.⁵³⁵

The *Homilies* begins with the *Epistula Clementi*, three letters that introduce the content of the writing. The first is a letter from Peter to James which opens:

Peter to James, the lord and bishop of the holy church: Peace be with you always from the Father of all through Jesus Christ. Knowing well that you, my brother, eagerly take pains about what is for the mutual benefit of us all, I earnestly beseech you not to pass on to any one of the Gentiles the books of preachings which I (here) forward to you, nor to any one of our own tribe before probation. But if some one of them has been examined and found to be worthy, then you may hand them over to him in the same way as Moses handed over his office of a teacher to the seventy.⁵³⁶

James is addressed as lord (τῷ κυρίῳ) and bishop of the holy church (τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας). One should be careful not to read too much into such

---

⁵³² Jones, *Recognitions 1.27-71*.
⁵³³ Jones, *Recognitions 1.27-71*, xii.
⁵³⁵ “A complete synoptic English translation of the *Pseudo-Clementines*, which would allow this unique ancient Christian novel to step forth for the modern reader in it’s original glory, is a desideratum I would like to supply someday.” Jones, *Recognitions 1.27-71*, xii.
titles, but κύριος is usually reserved for Jesus Christ and the connection with the Jerusalem church is missing, implying that he is bishop of the whole of the Christian Church. There is an obvious anti-Pauline agenda behind the letter, which indicts “some from among the Gentiles” to “have rejected my lawful preaching and have preferred a lawless and absurd doctrine of the man who is my enemy?” Peter and James are thus brothers and James is entrusted with a secret teaching on which to base the church and which entails the correct understanding of “Law”, which “was made known by Moses and was confirmed by our Lord in its everlasting continuance. For he said: ‘The heaven and the earth will pass away, but one jot or one tittle shall not pass away from the law.’” The Jewish Christian elements are obvious and this text refers to Matt. 5.18, which belongs to the special ‘M’ source material, and reflects Jewish Christian concerns. Peter concludes his letter with the words “What seems to me to be necessary I have now indicated to you. And what you, my lord (κύριε μου) deem to be right, do you carry fittingly into effect.” James is entrusted with Peter’s teaching and Peter subjects himself to his authority by again calling him lord.

The H provide us with James’ reaction to Peter’s letter in the Contestatio, which describes how James carries out Peter’s instructions:

Now when James had read the epistle he called the elders together, read it to them and said: As is necessary and proper, our Peter has called our attention to the fact that we must be cautious in the matter of the truth, that we should pass on the books of his preachings that have been forwarded to us not indiscriminately, but only to a good and religious candidate for the position of a teacher, a man who as one who has been circumcised is a believing Christian, and indeed that we should not pass on all the books to him at once, so that, if he shows indiscretion in handling the first, he may not be entrusted with the others. He ought therefore to be proved for not less than six years.

537 Epistula Petri, 2.3. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 494.
538 Epistula Petri, 2.5. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 494.
539 Painter, Just James, 192. Cf. discussion on the Gospel of Matthew page 31.
540 Epistula Petri, 3.3. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 494.
541 Contestatio, 1.1-1.2. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 494-95.
The test of endurance entails many promises and stipulations in how to handle the teaching of Peter and failure to correctly hand on or preserve his teaching will result in divine retribution.

When James had said this, the elders were pale with fright. Accordingly observing that they feared greatly, James said, ‘Hear me, brethren and fellow-servants [...] if any one, after that he has made such a vow, does not adhere to it, then he will rightly suffer eternal punishment. [...] Then were the elders pleased with James’s conclusion and said, ‘praised be he who has foreseen all things and destined you to be our bishop.’

The authority entrusted to James will have dire consequences if not handled correctly and thus God is praised for having predestined him for leadership.

The third and final letter of the H introduces Clement to the narrative and attests his qualification for ascendance to the episcopacy of Rome. His letter opens with a salutation to James:

Clement to James, the lord and bishop of bishop, who governs the holy church of the Hebrews at Jerusalem and those which by the providence of God have been well founded everywhere, together with the presbyters and deacons and all the other brethren. Peace be with you always.

James is addressed as ἐπισκόπων ἐπισκόπῳ, a title that is a direct challenge to the primacy of the Roman church coming from Clement, the first Pope (sic) apart from Peter. James is thus the leader of the whole church and Clement, having received the episcopacy of Rome from the dying Peter, writes to confirm his succession with him. Clement is considered worthy on account of e.g. his unwillingness to accept the position and his chastity and is commanded to “not delay in sending to James the Lord’s brother a

---

542 Contestatio, 5.1, 5.3-4. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 496.
543 Epistula Clementi, 1.1. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 496-97.
544 “When he said this, I fell at his feet and besought him, seeking to decline the honour and authority of the chair. Epistula Clementi, 3.1. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 497.
545 “above all be concerned with chastity. For before God harlotry is accounted an exceedingly great evil” Epistula Clementi, 8.1. Irmscher and Strecker, “Ps.-Clem,” in NT Apocrypha: vol II (Schneemelcher), 499.
written summary both of your reflections since your youth" and teachings received from Peter.

Since the *Ascents of James*, as translated by van Voorst, and the *Ancient Jewish Christian Source*, as translated by Jones, correspond except where portions are omitted, the following discussion will be based on both. Jones’ translation is given primacy because of the wider textual evidence that he takes into account. James is first mentioned in R 1.43.3, where James is accredited with the success of the Jerusalem church’s ministry:

**R 1.43.3-1.44.1 (Syriac)**
Now, while they were frequently beseeching us and while we were looking for a convenient time, one week of years passed from the time of the passion of Jesus. The church in Jerusalem, which was established by our Lord, was growing while it was led uprightly and straightforwardly by James, whom our Lord appointed bishop.

"Therefore, as we twelve apostles were gathered in the days of the Passover with the greater part of the community at Jerusalem, we assembled together with the brethren in the day of the festival. Each of us was beseeching James to tell us the summaries of the things that had happened among the people, and he told us in a few words."

**R 1.43.3-1.44.1 (Latin)**
Now while they were frequently asking us about this and we were seeking an opportune moment, a week of years passed from the passion of the Lord, and the church of God established in Jerusalem was growing, having multiplied abundantly and being governed through most correct stewardship by James, who was ordained by the Lord as bishop there.

"But when we twelve apostles assembled for the day of the Passover with a great multitude and each of our brethren had entered the church, James asked what things had been done by us in the various localities, and we briefly explained while the people listened."

As these texts show, both versions emphasise that Jesus himself appointed James bishop and bear witness to a rapid growth of the Jerusalem church. The relationship of James to Jesus is never stated in the *AJ*, and the time of ordination is not specified but the *AJ* implies that James has always been the
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547 Van Voorst, *The Ascent of James*.
549 R 1.43.3-1.44.1., Jones, *Recognitions* 1.27-71, 73-74.
bishop of the Church.\(^{550}\) James has the twelve apostles report to him once a year, showing the undisputed primacy of James among the other figureheads of Christianity, and elsewhere in the *Ps.-Clem.* James has them write annual reports.\(^{551}\)

A second appearance of James in the *AJ* is following a chapter where Gamaliel, the head of state, has perceived the anger among the Jewish priests regarding the Christian ministry. Gamaliel was according to *AJ* a secret follower of Jesus and their “brother in the matter regarding faith”.\(^{552}\) He gives a speech, where he urges the priests to listen to James:

\[ R 1.66.5 \text{(Syriac)} \]

[Gamaliel] spoke first wisely as if he were our enemy. Through his argument he attempted to persuade the people to listen in the love of truth to the words being spoken. He looked towards James the bishop and began with his discourse as follows. [...]\(^{553}\)

After a lengthy speech where Gamaliel urges his countrymen and priests to heed the truth, the high priest presses James to argue his case for belief in Jesus Christ based on the Jewish scriptures:

\[ R 1.68.2-1.69.1 \text{(Syriac)} \]

Now the high priest quietly sought, as if he were ridiculing Gamaliel and James the archbishop, that they make an inquiry and debate on the basis of scripture concerning Christ so that he might know whether Jesus truly is the one who was anointed or not. James said, ‘First, let us inquire as to the place where it is proper for us suitably to inquire. After being pressed for a long time, as was appropriate, he was constrained and concluded that we should make inquiry from the law. Then James spoke in his discourse also concerning those who were prophets. He showed that they received from the law everything that they had said and that they truly spoke things that are in agreement with it [...]\(^{554}\)

---


\(^{552}\) *R 1.65.2* (Syriac), Jones, *Recognitions 1.27-71*, 100.

\(^{553}\) Latin: “this one then, acting as if he were against us, first of all looking toward the bishop James, spoke in this manner” *R 1.66.5, Recognitions 1.27-71*, 102.

\(^{554}\) Latin: “For smiling at what Gamaliel had said, the chief of priests requested from James the chief of the bishops that the discussion regarding Christ be made on the basis of no other source than the scriptures, ‘so hat we might know,’ he said, ‘whether Jesus himself is the Christ or not.’ Then James said, ‘First of all, let us ask on which scriptures it is particularly appropriate for the discussion to be based.’ After much time and difficulty, he was overcome by reason itself and responded that it should be based on the law, and after that he added a mention also of the prophets. Our James began to show him that even what the prophets say, they took from the law and spoke in harmony with the law.” *R 1.68.2-1.69.1*, Jones, *Recognitions 1.27-71*, 104.
James is in the narrative called archbishop, in Syriac literally the “head bishop” (ῥυφ ’ṣqwp) and in Latin literally “chief of the bishops” (episcoporum princeps).\(^{555}\) Van Voorst cautions against interpreting this on the basis of the office of archbishop, which was first given in the fourth century to the prelates of important sees, one of which was Jerusalem, and argues that throughout AJ James is the “only leader” in the “only church” and that no other bishop is mentioned.\(^{556}\) This striking phrase has been interpreted in various ways; Bernhard Rehm attributed this section to a fourth century Eunomian interpolator,\(^{557}\) Strecker et al. assigns the title to a redaction of the BW and believes it to be a narrative imitation of the high priest\(^{558}\) and Jones suspects that the author might have been a Jewish-Christian bishop, who was submitted to the authority of an ‘archbishop’ in his time, but “does not look at the current development of incorporation into the larger church without some trepidation”.\(^{559}\) James’ argument with the high priest is meant to portray his rhetorical skills and the supremacy of Christian exegesis of Jewish scripture to their own, and James importantly argues on the basis of the Law, the Prophets and the Writings, i.e. the whole of scripture.\(^{560}\) James speaks for seven days, succeeding in convincing his audience and preparing them for baptism, only to have it undone:

\[R\ 1.70.1-4\ (Syriac)\]

Then a certain man who was the enemy entered the temple near the altar with a few others. He cried out and said, ‘What are you doing, O men, the children of Israel? How have you been carried off so quickly by wretched men who have strayed after a magician?’ He said things such as these, and he listened to counterarguments, and, when he was overcome by James the bishop, he began to create a great commotion so that the matters that were rightly being said in calmness would neither be put to the test nor be understood and believed. For this purpose, he let forth an outcry over the foolishness and feebleness of the priests and reproached them.

\(^{559}\) Jones, Recognitions 1.27-71, 167.
He said, ‘Why are you delaying? Why are you not immediately seizing all those
who are with him?’ When he had said these things, he rose first, seized a firebrand
from the altar, and began to smite with it. Then, also the rest of the priests, when
they saw him, followed his example. Then, in the great flight that ensued, some
fell upon others and others were smitten. There were not a few who died so that
much blood poured forth from those who had been killed.

Now the enemy threw James from the top of the stairs. Since he fell and was as if
dead, he did not smite him a second time.\textsuperscript{561}

This enemy of the \textit{AJ} is never explicitly named, but his persona is an
obvious reference to Paul.\textsuperscript{562} This anti-Paulinism is focused on the loss of
the Jewish nation to the church as summed up by van Voorst:

Paul is charged with sabotaging the believers’ mission to their Jewish kin. It would
have succeeded, and the Jewish nation been turned from sacrifice to baptism, were
it not for his enemy. Therefore, Paul is by implication responsible for the
continued disbelief of the Jews, which led to the tragic events of war, captivity and
exile.\textsuperscript{563}

The theme of sacrifice and the understanding that the temple was destroyed
because the people were reluctant to cease sacrificing, which Jesus
abolished, is unique within early Christian tradition and is only found in the
\textit{AJ} and the \textit{Gospel of Ebionites}.\textsuperscript{564} The \textit{AJ} argues that the abolition of
sacrifices by Jesus was predicted by Moses, and warned that those who do
not obey will be destroyed. The destruction of Jerusalem is thus a

\textsuperscript{561} Latin: “When the matter had reached the point that they should come and be baptized, a
certain hostile person entered the temple with only a few others and began to shout and say,
‘What are you doing O Israelite men? Why are you so easily duped? Why are you led
headlong by the most miserable persons who have been deceived by a magician?’ When he
had said these things, listened to responses, and was overcome by James the bishop, he
began to stir up the people and to instigate disturbances so that the populace would not be
able to hear the things that were being said. He thus began to stir up everything with
outcries, to undermine what had been arranged with great labor, and simultaneously to
reproach the priests, to aggravate with both abuse and rebukes, and like a maniac to incite
each person to murder, saying, ‘What are you doing? Why are you dallying? O slack and
sluggish, why don't we seize all these [people] with our hands and tear them to shreds?’
When he had said these things, he grabbed a brand from the altar and first initiated the
massacre. When the others saw him, they, too, were carried away with similar madness. (8)
There was a clamour of all, of the smiting as well as of the smitten. Very much blood was
shed. A confused flight ensued. When in the meantime that hostile person had made his
way to James, he pushed him from the highest flight of stairs. Since he believed him to be
dead, he made no effort to mishandle him further.” Jones, \textit{Recognitions} 1.27-71, 106-7.

\textsuperscript{562} Van Voorst, \textit{The Ascent of James}, 161.

\textsuperscript{563} Van Voorst, \textit{The Ascent of James}, 161.

\textsuperscript{564} Epiphanius, \textit{Panarion} 30.18.4. Luomanen, \textit{Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and
forewarned consequence of refusing to obey this command\textsuperscript{565} and James a doomsday prophet who because of Paul was not able to prevent the impending calamity.

Jones has argued that this narrative is based on Acts and that the author utilizes historiographical devices to correct or replace the pro-Pauline Lukan narrative.\textsuperscript{566} A few of these parallels are: Acts 21.27 where Paul engages in seven days of purification before an uproar and \textit{R} 1.69.8 has James continue to speak for seven days before the enemies’ disruption.\textsuperscript{567} Baptism is the goal of James’ speech, as is Peter’s in Acts 2.38, and the shouting of Paul in \textit{R} 1.70.1-2 runs parallel to the shouting before the attack on Stephen in Acts 7.57 and Paul’s entrance to the temple in Acts 21.26-28.\textsuperscript{568} Other examples are e.g. the scattering of the church in Acts 8.1 and the burial of Stephen in Acts 8.2, which are reflected in the Jerusalem church’s flight to Jericho in \textit{R} 1.71.2 and the burial of two brothers in \textit{R} 1.71.5 (Syriac), respectively.\textsuperscript{569}

The martyrdom of James is of course incomplete since he survives the fall from the “highest flight of stairs”\textsuperscript{570} and is subsequently left alone because he looked dead. Most commentators have proposed a common source behind the Hegesippus account and this narrative\textsuperscript{571} or as Lüdemann proposes, a common archetype,\textsuperscript{572} but Jones argues that the narrative, like all redactions of the Martyrdom of James, is based on Hegesippus’

\begin{footnotes}
\item[570] \textit{R} 1.70.8, Jones, \textit{Recognitions 1.27-71}, 107.
\item[572] Lüdemann, \textit{Opposition}, 176-77.
\end{footnotes}
To argue his case Jones supplies 13 similarities between the narratives and being unconvinced Painter counters these similarities with three obvious differences; that Paul is the perpetrator and not the high priest, that he is pushed from the temple stairs and not the pinnacle, and that James survives. Jones argues that the author responsible for R 1, probably the author of the BW, transformed the story of James’ martyrdom into a preliminary encounter and “was thus able to preserve James for the framework of his rather ingenious novel”. The contrast between Paul and James is apparent; while James successfully argues his position based on scripture, Paul resorts to violence lacking arguments, and is not even successful in murdering James although he is blamed for sealing the fate of Jerusalem.

Studies of the sources thought to underlie the Pseudo-Clementine Homilies and Recognitions have dominated discussion of these writings and few have sought to discuss their Sitz im Leben in the fourth century. This is according to Annette Yoshiko Reed because of the scholarly framework of Jewish Christianity, which was invented as a category through the influence of F. C. Baur as “the modern study of the Pseudo-Clementine literature and the very concept of “Jewish Christianity” emerged hand-in-hand on the scholarly scene”. This framework presupposes a split between Christianity and Judaism in nascent Christianity, which is not supported by the data pertaining to Jewish Christians, most of which comes from the 3rd to the 5th centuries. The categories of Jewish and Christian were as

---

575 Painter, Just James, 197.
578 Reed, ““Jewish Christianity” after the “Parting of the Ways”,” 200.
579 Reed, ““Jewish Christianity” after the “Parting of the Ways”,” 193.
heatedly debated in the fourth century as Arianism,\(^{580}\) and in the 4\(^{th}\) and 5\(^{th}\) centuries we see an increase in polemics against Jewish Christian sects and “a rise in the violent tenor of Christian anti-Judaism.”\(^{581}\)

The \(H\) and the \(R\) present differing salvation-historical narratives, that share common Jewish Christian elements. The author of the *Homilies* promotes a vision of Judaism and Christianity as two equal paths to salvation, where the ideal Christian is Torah observant and the ideal Jew recognizes Jesus as a teacher alongside Moses.\(^{582}\) Conversely the author of the *Recognitions* in \(R\) 4-6 argues the equality of the Torah and the Gospel, in striking contrast to \(R\) 1.27-71, on the grounds that Jesus is the teacher of the Gentiles, as Moses is teacher of the Jews.\(^{583}\) There is a subtle difference in their references to James, in \(R\) 4.35 Peter admonishes that one should only believe teaching that has been tested by James, and in \(H\) it is emphasized that all true followers of Jesus stem from James “to whom was entrusted to administer the church of the *Hebrews* in Jerusalem”.\(^{584}\) James is thus the litmus test to determine the truth of Christian teaching and its claim for authority.

---


\(^{581}\) Reed, “‘Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways’,” 228.

\(^{582}\) Reed, “‘Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways’,” 228-29.

\(^{583}\) Reed, “‘Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways’,” 214-15.

\(^{584}\) Ἰακώβῳ τῷ λαχείτιν ἀδελφῷ τοῦ κυρίου μου καὶ πεπιστευμένῳ ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ τὴν Ἑβραίων διέστη ἐκκλησίαν. \(H\) 11.35. Reed, “‘Jewish Christianity’ after the ‘Parting of the Ways’,” 214-15.
Part II: Masculinity and authority in the image(s) of James.

The episcopate itself he neither asked for nor desired, still less did he – like others whose self-importance is swollen with arrogance and pride – thrust himself into it. He was quiet and humble as ever, and such as those are wont to be who are chosen by God for this post. With the natural modesty of his virginal chastity, and with his inborn humility and habitual modesty, so far from resorting to violence, as some do, in order to be made bishop, it was only under pressure that he reluctantly accepted the episcopate.  

The success of Christianity as an institutional religion is astounding and unparalleled in its expansion and number of adherents. Twentieth century scholarship has made the diversity of religious writing, that shaped the beginnings of Christian thought, abundantly clear,  replacing the idealized paradigm of a group of twelve bearers of a single, albeit complicated truth, which was created by the New Testament gospels and Acts and sealed with the closing of the canon by an institutional church. The question how the teachings of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant, became the foundation of a new Roman state religion under Constantine is one of the most persistent and pertinent tasks of early Christian scholarship. One set of answers can be found embedded in the production of Christian writings, which are modelled e.g. on popular Greco-Roman genres, such as the Hellenistic novel, historiography and epic and another from sociological and psychological issues they were able to address, such as imperial oppression, social dislocation and moral values.

586 This has of course been aided by the Nag Hammadi findings, especially the Gos. Thom., the reconstruction of the Sayings gospel Q and works on the different traditions found in the Gospel of Mark. Cf. e.g. the works of: Helmut Koester, Burton Mack, John Dominic Crossan, Gregory J. Riley and Jonathan Z. Smith.  
589 Cf. Sterling, Historiography and Self-Definition.  
590 Cf. Bonz, The Past as Legacy.  
The study of authority and masculinity has been important in this regard and thanks to the gendered models of feminist biblical criticism, gender ambiguity has become a fruitful avenue to explore the success of Christianity among Roman men.\footnote{594} Although the spread of Christianity was exponential in the late first and early second centuries, it was only after the conversion of Constantine (312 C.E.), that Christianity began to assert itself as the dominant religion of the Roman Empire. In the fourth century adherence to Christ grew by leaps and bounds. It is estimated that in the beginning of that age about a tenth of the Empire’s population was Christian and by the end paganism had been outlawed.\footnote{595} This success can, as Matthew Kuefler has shown, in part be explained by the way in which the church offered an increasingly marginalized Roman aristocracy a way to assert manly power and authority.\footnote{596} These elements of authority and masculinity can shed a light on the images of James in early Christianity we have discussed.

4.1 Authority and the image(s) of James.

Bengt Holmberg’s seminal study \textit{Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as reflected in the Pauline Epistles}, is based on Max Weber’s definitions of power and authority.\footnote{597} Weber differentiates between power (Macht) and domination (Herrschaft), where power “is the probability that [an] actor within a social relationship will be

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{592} Cf. Bengt Holmberg, \textit{Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal} (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1990), 118-44.
\item \footnote{595} Jacob Neusner, \textit{Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine: History, Messiah, Israel and the Initial Confrontation} (ed. Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Calvin Goldscheider; CSJH; Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 15-17.
\item \footnote{596} Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 209.
\item \footnote{597} Holmberg, \textit{Paul and Power}, 125-35.
\end{itemize}
in a position to carry out his will despite resistance” and domination the “probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons”. Authority in Weber’s terminology can signify a form of power that differentiates from domination in that while domination is a quality that pertains to a social system, authority is a quality pertaining to a person or a group of persons. In Holmberg’s study of Pauline authority he utilizes Weber’s threefold distinction, and argues that for the study of Paul, charismatic authority is most relevant, the “legitimation of which rests on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative pattern or order revealed or ordained by him”. Holmberg then traces the development of Paul’s charismatic authority which became the foundation of the ecclesiae founded by him. This process is described by Weber as the “routinization of charisma” (Veralltäglichung des Charismas) “whereby a charismatic group [...] develops into a systematized body of doctrine, cult and organization”.

Chilton and Neusner’s exploration of the Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism addresses the formation of church authority in a similar vein, distinguishing between “institutional authority”, “charismatic authority” and “scriptural authority”. Their discussion of charismatic authority is unsurprisingly based on the Pauline epistles, but James is prominent in the discussions of institutional and scriptural authority. Chilton and Neusner argue that there was in the early church a

599 Holmberg, Paul and Power, 127.
601 Holmberg, Paul and Power, 137.
603 Bruce Chilton and Jacob Neusner, Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism (New York, N.Y.: Routledge, 1999).
604 Chilton and Neusner, Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism, Chapter 4: “Charismata of Guidance in Primitive and Early Christianity”, 100-22.
dichotomy of authority that arose between apostles and bishops and that the
tensions between them mark the “principal polarity of tension within the
institutional understanding of the Church in its classical form”. 605 While
apostles, an authority Paul could claim, generally travelled to spread the
gospel, 606 the office of ἐπίσκοπος was local and based on scriptural
interpretation rather than a commission from Christ. 607 This office was
based on the position of James in the Jerusalem community, to become
elevated above other models of authority by the end of the first century and
this change is for example reflected in the household codes of the deutero-
Pauline 1, Timothy. 608

The title ἐπίσκοπος, as James is titled in Eusebius and later traditions,
is admittedly an anachronism 609 and an odd title for an Aramaic-speaker due
to its Hellenistic origin, but Chilton and Neusner present similarities with
the Qumran office of mebaqer, which also means overseer. 610 Joachim
Jeremias’ Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus explores the office of mebaqer,
an administrative head; he who held it had to be over 30 years old and “a
scribe, who could inform on the exact meaning of the Law”. 611 James’

605 Chilton and Neusner, Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism, 38.
606 Chilton and Neusner, Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism, 52. Cf.
1 Cor 9.1-2: “Am I not free? Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord? Are you
not my work in the Lord? If I am not an apostle to others, at least I am to you; for you are
the seal of my apostleship in the Lord.” (1 Cor 9.1-2, NRSV).
607 Chilton and Neusner, Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism, 62.
608 “By the time of this letter, a sense of the institution of being a bishop had become explicit: “The word is reliable, If anyone aspires to the episcopate (episkope), he desires a
good work” (1 Tim 3.1). What follows is not an enumeration of duties, however, but a set
of qualifications. A bishop is to be of good repute, and that means that corrupt behavior
disqualifies one from the office. Addressing the issue of qualification more positively, 1
Timothy insists a bishop should be monogamous, in control of his own house (including his
children), and mature (1 Tim 3.2-7). The emphasis upon control of one’s household is
helpful in inferring the episcopal functions which are in mind. The importance of the house
(oikos) in defining the church, the local congregation, has been increasingly recognized in
recent research.” Chilton and Neusner, Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and
Judaism, 57.
609 Cf. Eusebius, Hist. eccl. II.1.23; II.7.19.
610 Chilton and Neusner, Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism, 63.
611 Joachim Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and
position is reflected in Acts 15 where the issue of purity is resolved through his authority, in opposition to both Paul and Peter, and on the basis of scripture. Chilton and Neusner thus conclude that the Episcopal office was founded on James’ leadership:

> The conditions of the church in Jerusalem, the most stressful in the Church as a whole prior to the great revolt which culminated in the destruction of the Temple, occasioned the appearance of a new institution. James, the brother of Jesus, whose devotion to the Temple brought him both respect and antagonism in Jerusalem, became the mebagger of a group whose teaching in regard to the Torah, whose practice of purity, and whose dedication to the sacrificial worship of Israel made for uniqueness. Transferred to a Hellenistic and Christian environment, the Jacobean institution became the episcopate, and saw Christianity through its formative period and beyond.

Their discussion of scriptural authority begins where the discussion of institutional authority left off, with James’ role and authority as mebagger or ἐπίσκοπος in Acts 15. The presentation of Acts of the Apostolic council of Jerusalem, which is not only romanticized but self-consciously so, displays a conference of the two major strands of power, apostolic and episcopal, the latter represented by the persona of James. James’ authority is asserted ahead of Paul’s (Acts 15.16–21), based on scriptural interpretation (Acts 15.15–21) and with the approval of the Holy spirit (Acts 15.28). This image of scriptural authority is according to Chilton and Neusner in accordance with the Essene prototype of halakhic interpretation found in Qumran, and reinforced by images of holiness attributed to
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612 Chilton and Neusner, *Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism*, 64-65.
613 Chilton and Neusner, *Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism*, 69.
616 Chilton and Neusner, *Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism*, 157.
617 “Acts is very plain: whatever may be acceptable of Paul’s theology, his claim that believers become Israel without remainder is jettisoned in favor of James’ conviction, that Gentile belief is meant to restore the fortunes of the family of David, consonant with the prophecy of Amos.” Chilton and Neusner, *Types of Authority in Formative Christianity and Judaism*, 158.
618 Cf. the Sibylline Oracles.
James as a Nazarite. More importantly it became the prototype for the calling of ecumenical councils from the time of Constantine, as an attempt to resolve complex ecclesiastical and political situations. Eusebius “established the precedent of political theory and the generation of global history within the church by directly comparing Constantine and Christ”, and in shaping and reporting the Council of Nicaea the episcopacy of James at the apostolic council provided a “normative model of ecclesiastical authority, as well as normative ruling”.

4.2 Masculinity and the image(s) of James.

The presentation of public authority is an intrinsically gendered phenomenon as studies of feminist and masculinity studies have shown and the very idea of a public office is in the Greco-Roman context reserved for males. We have from our sources discernible women that held many offices both secular and within the church, even female bishops, but the expression of authority is male. This is in line with Judith Butler’s central idea in the seminal *Gender Trouble*, where she rejects the dichotomy of sex as biological and gender as culturally constructed, and argues that all gender is performative: “There is no gender identity behind the expressions of gender; that identity is performatively constituted by the very “expression” that are said to be its results.” The abovementioned household codes in 1 Timothy 3, setting the criteria for bishops and deacons in the Church, are based on Greco-Roman gender stereotypes of the three social venues in which males belonged, the private (περὶ τὸν ἱδίον), the open camaraderie of


other males (περὶ τῶν κοινῶν) and finally the political sphere (πρὸς τὸ δημόσιον). The private duties of males include: 1) control of children; 2) procurements of dowries; 3) proper use of patrimony; 4) funeral rites for parents; 5) concern for the reputation of the women of the household; 6) and ruling over slaves. These are criteria for assuming a position as bishop, as “if someone does not know how to manage his own household (τὸ ἴδιον ὁλκοῦ προστήναι σὺν ὁλέν), how can he take care of God’s church” (1 Tim 3.5, NRSV). Women, and lower classes of men, generally “enjoy no civic roles and so have no public space”.

Matthew Kuefler’s *The Manly Eunuch* describes a crisis of masculine ideals among Roman upper class men, that followed the end of the Republican era and the military defeats of the Roman army. In Greco-Roman ideals, men and women were considered opposite, not only in sex and gender, but also in moral attributes, where men (*vir*) were considered *vir*-tuous and women not. Men displayed the four cardinal virtues: self-control, wisdom, justice and courage, whereas women displayed the corresponding vices being: dissolute, foolish, capricious and cowardly. The display of masculine splendour thus involved displaying these virtues and if they were lacking according to authors, such as in the anonymous *Historia Augusta*, they were invariably connected to feminine attributes.

Roman men traditionally had three modes or spaces to perform and thus prove their masculinity, in the military (*vita militarias*), by participation in politics and as the head of their homes (*Paterfamilias*). All of these spaces were in crisis in the imperial era, a crisis which Christian authors

---

addressed by appealing to a subordinated image of masculinity, which eventually gained hegemony in the church.\textsuperscript{631}

Militarism was an important part of Roman culture and the army provided a venue for Roman men to show their masculinity and to gain influence in the Roman Army.\textsuperscript{632} The lofty ideals of the life of a soldier (\textit{vita militaris}) were frequently reiterated by Roman authors and generally contained a reference to the glorious conquests of the army and the measure of masculinity involved in the frugal discipline, easy comradeship and exceeding courage of Roman soldiers.\textsuperscript{633} Roman emperors all utilized military imagery to propagate their power, and even Hadrian (117-138 C.E.) who surrendered Roman territory, displayed himself in cuirass on coins.\textsuperscript{634} The lofty military ideals never decreased in the panegyrics, but the reality was very different. Already in the advent of the imperial period there were in the army numerous non-Romans and in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century the majority of Roman aristocrats paid to be exempt from service, being replaced with North-African, Asian and Balkan mercenaries.\textsuperscript{635} In the 4\textsuperscript{th} century Germans that had settled within the Roman boarders, formed the backbone of the army.\textsuperscript{636} This fact, along with frequent uprisings and defeats, contributed to the demilitarization of the Roman elite in the Later Empire, which Cassius Dio (155-235) lamented as a crisis of the manliness of Roman men.\textsuperscript{637}

\begin{itemize}
\item men insolent, unjust, insatiable, impious, -if, indeed, we ought to term those people men who bathe in warm water, eat artificial dainties, drink unmixed wine, anoint themselves with myrrh, sleep on soft couches with boys for bedfellows, - boys past their prime at that [\textit{μαλακός ... μετὰ \textit{μαλακῶς}}] and are slaves to a lyre-player and a poor one too.\textsuperscript{638}
\end{itemize}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{631} Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 11.
\textsuperscript{632} Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 37.
\textsuperscript{633} Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 38-39.
\textsuperscript{635} Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 39.
\textsuperscript{636} Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 39.
\textsuperscript{637} Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 40.
\end{footnotes}
The indictment is that the love of luxury had made men effeminate and soft, and diverted them from the noble vita militaris to its opposite a vita mollitiae, or life of effeminacy.639

A similar crisis of masculinity ensued with the imperial period, when the seat of power moved from the senate to the imperial families. In the Republican era the balance of power was negotiated between the Roman elite in a hierarchy of ranks known as the cursus honorum, while in the imperial age the old nobility was excluded from political power except through imperial service.640 Men of the upper classes still emphasized those qualities that set them apart from women, education and the camaraderie of peers, but a new political landscape limited their influence in government to the favour of the emperor.641 “Rome itself, where the Senate met, became somewhat of a political backwater in the last centuries of the Roman Empire.”642 A substitute to political influence in displaying masculinity became the show of wealth and luxury, which left men vulnerable to the charge of unmanliness.643

The status of men as Paterfamilias came under threat in the imperial period with laws that restricted the authority (patria potestas) of men over their wives and children.644 By the second century women had earned the rights to initiate divorce and the rights of the paterfamilias to enforce an unwanted marriage were restricted, and in the later empire women were granted the right to control property and make binding agreements.645 These increased women’s rights were also reflected in sexual ethics, with a definitive blurring of boundaries between the sexes. Roman writers classically used the terms pudicitia (sexual modesty) and impudicitia (sexual immodesty) to define sexually appropriate behavior for both sexes

640 Kuefler, The Manly Eunuch, 49.
644 Kuefler, The Manly Eunuch, 70.
but in very different ways: A *pudica* woman kept her virginity before marriage, reserved her sexual behavior to her husband and abstained from sex in widowhood, while men were allowed much more freedom with adultery being only considered a crime for women. In the imperial period these definitions belonged to both sexes and men asserted their manliness by sexual restraint. This period also saw the rise of a negative view towards sex for men, from a medical and philosophical standpoint, rejecting pederasty and glorifying abstinence and celibacy.

Christian authors took advantage of this threefold crisis of masculinity by stating it in subversive ways and rejecting the shipwrecked ideals of the *vita militaris, cursus honorum* and *patria potestas*. Judith Butler, building on the thinking of Mary Douglas outlined in her *Purity and Danger*, claims that the boundaries of the body have been drawn to instate certain taboos about limits and possibilities of exchange. These limits can be deliberately destabilized, such as by cross-dressing or drag, which demonstrates that all gender is in fact scripted, rehearsed, and performed.

---

647 “Oribasius believed that a man who engaged in ‘continual sexual excess’ would drain this vital fluid from every part of the body.” Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch*, 80. “This draining process does not stop ... so if it is constantly repeated ... the result will be that all the parts of the animal ( or the living' creature) are [...] drained not just of seminal fluid but also of their vital spirit ... It is hardly surprising, therefore, that those who lead a debauched life become weak, since the purest part of both substances is removed from their body.” Oribasius, *Collectio medica*, 2.2.20-22, cited in Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch*, 80.
648 “Iamblichus credited the Pythagoreans with the belief that sexual activity should begin late in life, be enjoyed only infrequently, and be committed always only with the purpose of procreation in mind. Any other sexual activity was mere self indulgence, which was the opposite of manly self-control and from which had come all of the vices.” Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch*, 79. Cf. Iamblichus, *De Vita Pythagorica*, 17; 31.
650 “The author of the *Historia Augusta* said admiringly if wishfully of Pescennius Niger that ‘as far intercourse with women, he abstained from it wholly save for the purpose of begetting children?’ Some refused even procreative sex after Constantine repealed the laws denying inheritances to unmarried and childless persons. Ammianus complained that in his day the childless and unmarried were easily the most popular individuals at Rome, he concluded, because everyone wanted to be remembered in their wills.” Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch*, 80.
These gender borders were deliberately challenged by Christian authors to replace a gender hegemony that had failed to serve the noble classes, and their efforts were definitively “politics” and not “parody.”

Drawing on military vocabulary Tertullian asserted the manliness of Christians by declaring them to be soldiers of Christ (miles Christi), who enrolled in the ranks through the sacramentum of baptism and died as martyrs for the cause without resisting with violence. Not all authors denied military service for Christians but nonviolence was much preferred and set the standard for a new ideal of masculinity for e.g. Hippolytus, Tertullian and Augustine.

The Christian ambivalence toward military service, permitting it but recommending against it, stemmed in part from the reluctant reconciliation of Christian ideology to a militaristic society. But the ambivalence can also be better understood by placing it within the context of the tension between traditional and emerging ideals of masculinity. Military identity was seen as a sign of Roman manliness, but the Christian ideal of nonviolence—the virtue known as patientia—usually blandly translated as “patience” but from the Latin patiri “to endure, suffer, submit to”—was in a real sense based on an ideal of passivity and of being a victim. Again, if we return to the earliest days of Christianity in the western Mediterranean, we see how central a theme this quality of patience was to Christians and how it was defended. Tertullian, who devoted a whole treatise to the encouragement of patientia called it “the height of virtue and manliness” (summa virtus).

As soldiers of Christ, Christians fought an invisible enemy, in the form of the devil and temptations, such as lust, love of luxury, wrath and pride. In the 3rd century the renunciation of the Devil became an important part of the rite of baptism.

---

655 “In Rome, the soldiers swore an oath (the sacramentum) to obey the commands of their general. It reinforced the consul’s power of coercion (coercitio), which allowed him to punish citizens summarily when on campaign (up to and including the death penalty).” “In addition to the sacramentum, Roman soldiers also appear to have sworn an oath (coniuratio) more informally among themselves, “not to flee the battlefield or to abandon their place in the battle-line”.” Louis Rawlings, “Army and Battle During the Conquest of Italy (350–264 B.C.),” in A Companion to the Roman Army (ed. Paul Erdkamp; Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2007), 51. Cf. T. Livius, Ad urbe condita 10.38; 22.38.2–5.
The church became an important venue for Roman aristocratic males to assert authority, without having to win favour with the emperor. The tone was set in the New Testament, where both the gospels and Paul used imperial rhetoric to oppose worldly rule, and the noble classes constructed through the church a new social hierarchy that allowed for positions of power, such as the episcopacy, without appeal to the emperor. The rhetoric used for the legitimating of this new noble class, involved a striking use of gender ambiguity and saw the emergence of humility (humilitas) as the highest mark of social distinction and prerequisite for authority. Christian nobility competed in showing their submission to God by asserting a reversal of gender roles, calling themselves brides of Christ and using erotic metaphors where they were feminine towards God. This feminine submission became the justification for masculine authority towards the church laity, strong enough in some cases to defy even the emperor. Bishops became a new noble class and their competition for positions allowed them to employ their rhetorical skills and aristocratic

660 Crossan, God and Empire.
661 Crossan and Reed, In Search of Paul.
662 Crossan and Reed, In Search of Paul, 151.
665 Kuefler, The Manly Eunuch, 139-40.
666 Cf. Ambrose bishop of Milan (340-397 C.E.). “His claim to authority as bishop of Milan sparked several conflicts with the western emperors; four incidents are usually mentioned. The first was in 382, when Ambrose successfully prevented the restoration of a pagan altar to the goddess of victory in the Senate at Rome, something suggested to the young emperor Valentinian II (who resided in Milan) as a concession to the pagan population. The second incident occurred in 385, when Ambrose had his supporters successfully prevent with a human blockade the return of one of the basilica-churches in Milan to the worship of Arian Christians (a substantial sect within the empire and one that included Valentinian and his mother Jusrina among its adherents). The third incident was in 389, when Ambrose persuaded the new emperor Theodosius I to rescind an order he had given, obliging Christians in the eastern town of Callinicum to rebuild the Jewish synagogue they had previously destroyed. The fourth happened a year later in 390, after Theodosius had ordered the massacre of a large number of persons in Thessalonica, when Ambrose managed to oblige the emperor to beg forgiveness for the killing in a public rite of penance lasting several months. In each conflict, Ambrose successfully asserted the strength of his position as bishop over that of the emperor.” Kuefler, The Manly Eunuch, 130.
influence to gain authority by displaying their humility and unwillingness to assume the position in question.\textsuperscript{667}

A final mark of Christian masculinity became the new sexual ethics of Roman culture, to which they had surprisingly little to add.\textsuperscript{668} Christian authors, such as Jerome, celebrated celibacy as an angelic and holy life (\textit{vita angelica}), and devalued marriage as a secondary, albeit necessary life.\textsuperscript{669} The denouncement of sex was shrouded in military images, with Jerome stating that the married life was effeminate (\textit{animumque virilem effeminat}) and celibacy manly, as “no soldier marches into battle with a wife”.\textsuperscript{670} This military celibacy also had its martyrs as Jerome narrates:

When everyone had gone away, a beautiful prostitute came up to him and began to stroke his neck with gentle caresses, and (what is improper even to relate) to touch his private parts with her hands: when his body was roused to lust as a result, this shameful conqueress lay down on top of him. The soldier of Christ did not know what to do or where to turn: he who had not yielded to tortures was being overcome by pleasure. At last, by divine inspiration, he bit off his tongue and spat it out in her face as she kissed him; and so the sense of lust was overcome by the sharp pain that replaced it.\textsuperscript{671}

While Christian authors elevated celibacy above married life, they reinforced dominance of husbands over their wives, with reference to a divine order, as husbands should subject to Christ so should wives be submissive to their husbands.\textsuperscript{672} Even when women and men chose lives of sexual renunciation, men’s authority remained over them as spiritual fathers.\textsuperscript{673} Men of the ecclesiastical hierarchy were anxious to defend their manliness and Jerome poignantly exclaims: “My seed is a hundred times more fertile”, than that of those who waste it.\textsuperscript{674}

The image of James in early Christianity develops in accordance with the changes in masculine ideals, described by Matthew Kuefler. James

\begin{thebibliography}{9999}
\item Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 152-54.
\item Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 161.
\item Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 190-93.
\item Kuefler, \textit{The Manly Eunuch}, 190-93.
\end{thebibliography}
displays masculine virtues in the portraits presented in the various traditions that draw on his persona, to assert authority for their position. In line with the military imagery of martyrdom, which became the supreme display of the masculine virtue of *patientia*,\(^675\) the martyrdom of James became a display of his manliness. If his death, as described in Josephus,\(^676\) is a historical fact then it is surprising that none of the New Testament authors mention it, as they do Stephen’s martyrdom.\(^677\) In none of the martyrdom accounts does James resist or struggle, thus displaying *patientia* as Cyprian describes when discussion the martyrdom of Stephen: “who, in preceding by his most fitting death the martyrs that were to come, was not only a preacher of the Lord’s suffering but also an imitator of His most patient (*patientissima*) gentleness.”\(^678\) This radical reorientation of masculine ideals, from asserting manliness through aggression to asserting manliness through non-resistance, also had the important effect of depicting the persecutors as unmanly.\(^679\) The high priest, a symbol of Jews that did not accept and/or killed Jesus, is accordingly unmanly\(^680\) as is Paul in the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognition*.\(^681\)

The authority of James is reflected in his position as bishop, which becomes more elaborate in later traditions such as in the *Recognition*\(^s\) where he is called archbishop or *episcoporum princeps*.\(^682\) Humility is the mark of a bishop as Eusebius’ quotations from Clement’s *Hypotyposes* shows, where he is selected without there being a “struggle for glory”.\(^683\) As bishops competed to display their humility in the battle for positions within the

\(^676\) Cf. discussion on pages 50-52.
\(^677\) Cf. Acts 7.55-58
\(^680\) Cf. discussion of Eusebius, page 55
\(^681\) Cf. discussion of the *Ascent of James*, page 102.
\(^682\) Ps.-Clem. *R* 1.68.2-1.69.1, cf. discussion on page 101.
\(^683\) Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* II.1.5 (Lake and Oulton, LCL). Cf. discussion on page 61.
church, so did their role models display such attributes.\textsuperscript{684} In preparation for assuming authority in the church, noblemen would rely on classic skills of Roman politics, such as “formal education and the rhetorical skills that it provided for men, the importance of decorum in public, and the reliance on a wide network of friends and allies and the old system of patronage”, although they replaced other elements, such as reading the Bible instead of pagan texts and advocating for the poor in order to gain heavenly favour.\textsuperscript{685} The image of James as competing in rhetoric against Paul in the Recognitions displays a classic test of Roman masculinity, where the superior rhetorician prevails against an adversary that is “overcome”\textsuperscript{686} and James thus establishes masculine dominance over Paul. Ironically even Paul’s attempt to assert physical aggression fails in his attempted assassination of James.\textsuperscript{687}

The elevation of celibacy as superior to married life is evident in the images of James. In 1 Corinthians, Paul laments that he does not have equal privileges to the other apostles and states that he does “not have the right to be accompanied by a believing wife, as do the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?”(1 Cor 9.5, NRSV). James is not specifically stated, although he certainly belongs to the “brothers of the Lord”, but the implication is that celibacy is not a prerequisite for leadership in the church. In Hegesippus’ account\textsuperscript{688} James’ sexual restraint is attested by his refusal to attend bathhouses\textsuperscript{689} and his celibacy in hinted at by stating

\textsuperscript{684} Cf. e.g. Ambrose who performing his humility declared: "O Lord, preserve this office (munus, a public posting) of yours, keep this gift that you have conferred even to one who fled from it. For I knew that I am not worthy to be called bishop, since I gave myself to this world. But thanks to you I am what I am, even though I am the least of all the bishops and lowest in merit." Ambrose, De paenitentia 2.8.73. Kuefler, The Manly Eunuch, 129.

\textsuperscript{685} Kuefler, The Manly Eunuch, 155-56.

\textsuperscript{686} Ps.-Clem. R 1.70.3 (Latin): "He said things such as these, and he listened to counterarguments, and, when he was overcome by James the bishop, he began to create a great commotion so that the matters that were rightly being said in calmness would neither be put to the test nor be understood and believed." Jones, Recognitions 1.27-71, 106-7.

\textsuperscript{687} Ps.-Clem. R 1.70.8.

\textsuperscript{688} Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. II.23.4-8.

\textsuperscript{689} Cf. discussion on page 60-61.
that he was “holy from his mother’s womb”. This becomes an important characteristic in Epiphanius’ description in order both to emphasize James’ authority and moral superiority, as well as supporting the perpetual virginity of Mary. Sexual purity was an important part of Jewish Christianity, although Epiphanius’ description of the Ebionites is interesting in this regard.

This sect now forbids celibacy and continence altogether, as do the other sects which are like it. For at one time they prided themselves on virginity, presumably because of James the Lord’s brother, <and so> address their treatises to “elders and virgins”.

James is thus a model of celibate piety, which Epiphanius assumes was behind their supposed previously held position. While 1 Timothy describes the attributes a bishop must have in such terms as almost disqualifying those that have not managed a household in marriage, Jerome all but disqualifies those that are not celibate and unmarried: “When compared to marriage, celibacy was like gold to silver, the fruit of the tree to its root or leaf, or the grain of the field to the stalk or stubble of the plant.”

---

690 Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl. II.23.5*, (Lake and Oulton, LCL).
691 Epiphanius, *Pan.* 78.13.4-14.2. Cf. discussion on page 71.
694 Epiphanius, *Pan.* 30.2.6 (Williams, NHMS).
695 “The saying is sure: whoever aspires to the office of bishop desires a noble task. Now a bishop must be above reproach, married only once, temperate, sensible, respectable, hospitable, an apt teacher, not a drunkard, not violent but gentle, not quarrelsome, and not a lover of money. He must manage his own household well, keeping his children submissive and respectful in every way - for if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how can he take care of God’s church? He must not be a recent convert, or he may be puffed up with conceit and fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must be well thought of by outsiders, so that he may not fall into disgrace and the snare of the devil.” (1 Tim 3.1-7, NRSV)
5. Conclusion

In the preceding discussion I have shown how the persona of James is portrayed in texts where his authority is displayed, and then interpreted those portraits in light of the claim to his authority and masculinity. The sources we have are sparse, compared to more prominent personae in early Christianity, but they do bear witness to James’ importance within the earliest church and show him as a champion of rivals to the emerging orthodoxy that either placed themselves closer to the Jewish heritage or presented James as a Gnostic teacher directly appointed by Jesus. The discussion has not been exhaustive and there are other references to his persona, such as in the *Protevangelium of James* and supposedly in the Qumran documents, but these writings do not deserve separate discussion for the task at hand.

James the Just was undoubtedly a towering figure in early Christianity, whose voice did the New Testament authors lower and whose prominence was lost with the disbanding of the Jerusalem community in the wake of the Jewish war. Scholars have only recently begun to study James’ legacy with the attention it deserves and this thesis, although limited, is to my knowledge the first attempt to view his persona in light of the study of masculinity. Like many other personae from the narrative (and historical) world of nascent Christianity, James was portrayed as a champion of faith, legitimizing the religious authority of divergent groups from a Jewish-Christian, Gnostic and proto-orthodox milieu. These portraits, of the second through fourth centuries C.E. differ from the earliest sources in their emphasis on his piety in death, his established office as bishop of Jerusalem and his celibate asceticism. The central thesis is that these portraits of James’ authority reflect changing ideals of masculinity in Greco-Roman culture.

---

Two valid objections come to mind: (1) that James is inherently a Jewish-Christian symbol and should thus reflect the concerns of Semitic Christians more than Greco-Roman ideals of masculinity, and (2) that Matthew Kuefler’s analysis of Christian authors is limited to the western half of the Roman Empire and the writings for discussion here are many from the eastern half.

To these objections I would reply firstly that the Semitic peoples of the Roman Empire had been saturated with Greco-Roman ideals from the conquests of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.E. Jerusalem was from the 3rd century B.C.E. Greek speaking and Aramaic was the language of the illiterate698 as upper class males were educated in the tripartite educational system established by the Hellenistic rulers.699 The events of the first and second centuries C.E., the Jewish war (66-73 C.E.) and the Bar Kokba revolt (132-136 C.E.) which resulted in the destruction of Jerusalem, meant that all Judaism became Diaspora Judaism. The works of Philo (20 B.C.E.-50 C.E.), an Alexandrian Jew, show that Jewish portraits of masculinity were based on Hellenistic ideals, such as the Life of Moses where Moses surpasses any Greek philosopher and is modeled on the ideal Hellenistic King.700

Secondly, Keufler’s study focuses on Christian authors in the western half of the Roman Empire, but we have ample reason to believe that these two halves were not isolated despite cultural and language differences.701 Origen was known in the west and it is largely due to his

698 Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period, esp. 58-106.
701 "The two halves of the empire, west and east, also roughly followed the linguistic dominance of Latin and Greek, respectively, although there can be no real hard and fast distinctions between Latin and Greek writers. Some Western writers wrote in Greek, especially in the third century (for example, Cassius Dio), some Latin writers wrote from the eastern Mediterranean (for example, Jerome), certain important Greek texts were
influence that the Epistle of James was admitted into the western New Testament canon and Eusebius was read and admired by Christians in the east and west alike. Rufinus’ translation of the *Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions* shows that even Jewish-Christian texts from Syria were known and distributed in the Latin speaking half of the Roman Empire.

In the beginning of Part II, the discussion about authority and masculinity in early Christianity was connected to the fundamental question of “how the teachings of a *Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*, became the foundation of a new Roman state religion under Constantine.” The answers sought by scholars of early Christianity are neither simple nor uniform, but the crisis of masculinity among the Roman noble classes and the alternative masculine ideals presented by Christian authors, were an important contribution to the success of Christianity in the Roman Empire:

The cultural and demographic success of Christian ideology in late antiquity lay in the ability of the shapers of that ideology to recognize men’s concern for manliness, which also accorded with their own concerns as men, and to incorporate it into their beliefs. As men of the Roman aristocracy converted to Christianity, they introduced into Christian ideology their own desire to appear manly and their own fear of being unmanly.

This shift of masculine ideals can, as I have shown, also be found in the portraits of James the Just as a champion of early Christian faiths.

---

Translated into Latin in order to circulate in the West (Rufinus’ translation of Eusebius’ history of early Christianity, for instance), and certain works were intended to be read in both the western and eastern halves (such as the *Theodosian Code*).” Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch*, 9.


704 Cf. discussion page 100.

705 Cf. discussion page 102.
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