

Exegeting and Translating Jas 4,5b

Anthony Abela

The concluding piece of counselling with which I-Jin Loh and Howard A. Hatton bring their discussion of James 4, 5 to a close betrays a feeling of desperation: “Faced with the possibility of multiple translations, and none of them is clearly more appropriate and convincing than others, it is suggested that the translator follow one of the interpretations, perhaps that reflected in RSV or TEV, and give one or two other translations as alternative rendering(s) in a footnote.”¹ These are words of wisdom which not all versions of the Bible promoted by the United Bible Societies agencies have taken to heart. One may note that some Bible editions published by such Bible Societies before 1997 – Good News Bible (1992), Bibbia in Lingua Corrente (1985) and Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible (1995) – have followed this editorial line, but those published later to this date tend to opt for one course of exegesis and provide only one version of the text – Gute Nachricht Bibel (1997), Parole de Vie (2002), La Bible Expliquée (2004). This second option taken by these editions tends to obscure the fact that this text has been experienced, and it is still being experienced as a *crux interpretum*² because it offers difficult reading almost on every component of this half verse.

There are textual difficulties: shall we read *κατώκισεν* or *κατώκησεν* or, perhaps, *κατώκεισεν*³? Who is the subject of the verb *ἐπιποθεῖ* in the citation from Scripture which James presumably employs to drive home his point? Is it *τὸ πνεῦμα*, the only nominal close to the verb? Or is this nominal in the clause the object of the verb *ἐπιποθεῖ*? At the heart of the issue there is the meaning of the noun *τὸ πνεῦμα*: does it mean ‘human spirit’ or ‘the Holy Spirit’? And what is the real meaning and function in the sentence of the clause initial *πρὸς φθόνον* that intuitively we see it as qualifying the verb *ἐπιποθεῖ*? And we have also to touch upon the question

1. *A Handbook on the Letter of James*, United Bible Societies, New York 1997, 146.
2. Cfr. Pietro De Ambroggi, *Le Sacra Bibbia. Le Epistole Cattoliche di Giacomo, Pietro, Giovanni e Giuda*, Marietti, Roma 1967, 64.
3. Cfr. the critical apparatus of *The Greek New Testament*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 1998.

concerning the general punctuation of the sentence together with that of verse 5a. Shall we accept the punctuation introduced by the editors of *The Greek New Testament* 4th edition and that of Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece* 27th or shall we adopt that suggested by Luke Timothy Johnson in his Anchor Bible commentary?⁴ And there is one final question which should be addressed early in any exegesis effort, that is, the one concerning the immediate context of verse 5b: seeing that the Letter of James is discourse, where does its paragraph start and where does it begin? It is the opinion of the present author that many of these queries were not always answered satisfactorily by scholarship to date.

Establishing the text

It would appear to be stating the obvious, but this is where scholarship failed here: the first step in any exegetical enterprise is that of establishing the text one means to work upon.⁵ In our text this would entail a text critical and a discourse critical operation.

a) Looking at the critical apparatus of the two editions we are employing for our study, or if one wishes a more detailed text critical service, of the *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior, IV, Installment 1, James*⁶, one would immediately note that while we have no textual problems concerning verse 5a, verse 5b that presumes to offer an indirect (if one reads the text with Nestle-Aland's punctuation) or direct (if one reads with the punctuation of *The Greek New Testament*) citation from Scripture (ἡ γραφή) mentioned in verse 5a, offers no less than two main textual variations and two further variants of lesser import. Which could have been the original verb in the text: κατώκισεν, κατώκησεν or κατώκεισεν? The apparatus compiled by the editors of the *Novum Testamentum Graece* consider the testimonies carrying the third variant as *incerti* and therefore we may concentrate upon the first two readings.

The first lexeme is the aorist of the verb κατοικίζω, a transitive verb with the meaning 'to cause to dwell, establish, settle'; κατοικέω is used as an intransitive verb, 'to live, dwell, settle down' though it can also be used transitively.⁷ Eugene A.

4. *The Letter of James*, Anchor Bible 37A, Doubleday, New York 1995, 281-282.

5. Cfr. René Wellek & Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature*, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth,³1963, 57-72.

6. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 1997, 68-69

7. Cfr. William F. Arndt & F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1957.1974, 425.

Nida and Johannes P. Louw⁸ define κατοικέω as ‘to live or dwell in a place in an established manner – to live, to dwell, to reside’ and cite the instance of the verb in Acts 1,20. About κατοικίζω they write that our text constitutes its only instance of the verb in the NT; it is its figurative extension with the meaning ‘to cause to dwell, to cause to be in a place defined psychologically or spiritually- to put within, to cause to dwell’.⁹ What could have happened in this text: has James chose a rare lexeme to express a difficult meaning which in Hebrew is normally rendered through the hiphil¹⁰ to describe the inhabitation by the Holy Spirit in the Christian doctrine under the direction of ὁ θεός to be picked up from verse 4, or has James chosen quite a common intransitive verb to express the inhabitation by the human spirit referring to the creation narratives, or even by the Holy Spirit who chooses to dwell in the Christians in order to express their total consecration to God?

Bruce M. Metzger¹¹ states that: a) taking into account ‘external evidence, κατώκησεν is somewhat better attested....than κατώκησεν’; b) on the score of ‘transcriptional probability, since κατοικίζειν occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, copyists were more likely to replace with the much more common κατοικεῖν than vice versa’. This boils down to saying that very probably James may have written the causative κατώκησεν rather than the intransitive κατώκησεν. However, many modern translations, the criterion of the *lectio difficilior*¹² notwithstanding, opt for the intransitive κατώκησεν: NKJV: ‘The Spirit who dwells in us yearns jealously’¹³; *La Bibbia Edizione Paoline* (1983): ‘Lo Spirito che abita in voi vi ama fino alla gelosia’; *La Bible Chouraqui* (1989): ‘La soufle qui nous habite aspire à l’envie’. *Il-Bibbja* of the Malta Bible Society has opted to follow the Vulgate in the translation

8. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*, United Bible Societies, New York 1989, 85:69.

9. *Ibid.*, 85:82

10. On the possible causative meaning in some Greek verbs one should consult F. Blass & A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1961, art. 14

11. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, United Bible Societies, New York 1971, 683.

12. *Ibid.*, xxvi

13. The KJV reads: ‘The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy.’

of this text; the Vulgate reading runs as follows: ‘...ad invidiam concupiscit Spiritus qui inhabitat in nobis’¹⁴; *Il-Bibbja*’s translation reads:

L-Ispirtu li jghammar fina jhobb b’imhabba ghajjura
The Spirit who dwells in us loves with a jealous love.¹⁵

Of course, once textual criticism favours κατώκισεν as the verb of the relative clause ὁ κατώκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν in v.5b, the parsing of the other components in the clause is clarified. The surface subject of the clause is the relative pronoun ὁ which in turn is the object of the verb, while the deeper structure subject encoded in the morphology of κατώκισεν must be ὁ θεός of verse 4.

On the text critical side there would be two minor issues neglected by *The Greek New Testament*. One involves the sentence initial emphatic phrase πρὸς φθόνον which *The Greek New Testament* takes as opening the citation while the Nestle-Aland parses it as a reformulation of the citation. The other minor textual matter touches upon the concluding phrase ἐν ἡμῖν which a number of manuscripts read as ἐν ὑμῖν.¹⁶ For the former we have no less than eight different variants even though most of them concern the parsing of the clause in verse 5b as a whole. Just two instances: in the minuscule 1609 we read ὅτι πρὸς φθονον while in manuscript 1251 we have the variant πρὸς φθονον ὅτι. What is essential is that the sequence πρὸς φθόνον is constantly present which would explain the option of *The Greek New Testament* not to include these variants as worth mentioning from the point of view of translation. The variant reading with the personal pronoun ὑμῖν is not

14. The *Vulgata Clementina* (1959) reproduces this text with one (though significant) change, instead of the capitalized *Spiritus* it writes *spiritus* interpreting τὸ πνεῦμα probably to mean the human spirit instead of the Holy Spirit though in the marginal note the editors refer to 1Cor 6,19 and 2Cor 6,16 which discuss the inhabitation of the Christian by the Holy Spirit. The *Nova Vulgata* (1998) returns to the capitalization of *Spiritus* but maintains the same textual critical option notwithstanding criticisms as early as 1942 by Theophilus Ab Orbiso in *Verbum Domini* 22(1942)211. On the basis of Ab Orbiso’s study De Ambroggi suggested that the Vulgate’s text should be changed to ‘Ad invidiam concupiscit [Deus] spiritum quem habitare fecit in nobis’
15. Other Maltese translations: Saydon (1977): ‘*Jixtieq bil-ghajra r-ruh li hu qiegħed fina*’ (Desires jealously the spirit which he put in us); Zammit (1980): ‘*Jixtieq bil-ghira l-ispirtu li jghammar fina*’ (Desires jealously the spirit who dwells in us); Schembri (2004): ‘*L-Ispirtu li jghammar fina jhobbna b’imhabba ghajjura*’ (The Spirit who dwells in us loves with a jealous love). It is intuitively evident that Zammit followed Saydon (see their focus strategy, though Zammit then follows the KJV for the translation of the verb under study), while Schembri follows MBS.
16. Cf. *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 68-69.

reflected in the translation of the *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*¹⁷, but it is reflected in the *Clementina Vulgata* though not in the *Nova Vulgata*. This means that the text we have to exegete is as it appears in the Nestle-Aland^{27th} and the *Greek New Testament*^{4th}.

Segmentation of the Literary Unit

Under the rubric 'reconstruction of the text' one has also to include the issue of its segmentation, which in our text is not of marginal importance. Segmentation in this case depends as well on how we understand the literary genre of this writing as a whole. How have Eberhard & Erwin Nestle, and the later editorial committee headed by Kurt Aland, who gave us the *Novum Testamentum Graece*, the 27th edition, understood the text of James 4? From the segmentation of the text in this edition one may infer that they understood the text as consisting of three thematic units that subsist beneath the present text which hence may be divided into three unequal paragraphs: vv. 1-10, 11-12, 13-17. The same understanding is to be found in *The Greek New Testament*^{4th}, and a number of versions: the PdV, TOB, and REB. In various other Bibles or NT's we encounter different segmentation patterns, and hence different understanding of what the text is saying. The more detailed segmentation is to be found in NIV, BJ, NV and CCB. The NIV divides the text in five thematic units (paragraphs): vv. 1-3, 4-6, 7-10, 11-12, 13-17. Ahead of the last paragraph a subtitle is introduced. Is such 'pulverisation' of the text possible or at least acceptable? It would appear that such segmentation of the text accords with the Letter of James' literary genre (*Gattung*).¹⁸ What kind of literature is this 'letter'? If one follows the discussion of the genre of this scripture offered by Luke Timothy Johnson¹⁹ one notices that there is some agreement among scholars that labelling this writing 'letter', at least as understood by A. Deissmann²⁰, is the least adapt definition. Others have described this γραφή as a *diatribe* or as a *paraenesis*. The present writer would rather see James as a simple compendium of sententiae each

17. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 1969, 1994.

18. On the need of identifying the text's genre in exegesis (and translation) cf. Ernst Wendland, "A Literary Approach to Biblical Text Analysis and Translation" in Timothy Wilt (ed.), *Bible Translation. Frames of Reference*, St Jerome Publishing House, Manchester UK & Northampton MA 2003, 200-208.

19. *Letter of James*, 16-26

20. *Light from the Ancient East*, trans. L. R. M. Strachan, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids 1978, 161, 166-251.

of which should be interpreted atomistically.²¹ Such sententiae are at times very short, sometimes of considerable length, but hardly ever very long; they are sapiential in character and tendentiously moralistic.²² In a number of these sententiae his targeted readers or listeners are addressed directly through the vocative (see 1,2.16.19; 2,1.5.14.20; 3,1.12; 4,4.11.13; 5,1.7.12.19). In the majority of these instances of the vocative, the first clause is verb-initial, but on three occasions (2,1; 4,4; 5,19) the vocative comes first in the clause. One should investigate further whether the use of the vocative does not mark the opening of a sententia as we may provisionally say of μοιχαλίδες in 4,4. But where does this sententia end: at verse 5 or at verse 10? In other words, is the particle δὲ in verse 6 a real link word so that 'the greater gift' mentioned in initial question mark of verse 6 in contrast to something in verse 5?

This is how Johnson²³ parses this particle. For this exegete the subject of the clause is τὸ πνεῦμα, the spirit, understood as the human spirit, who is the subject of the verb ἐπιποθεῖ, and as the referent of the relative pronoun ὃ. Johnson translates verse 5 as follows: "Or do you suppose that the Scripture speaks in vain? Does the spirit which he made to dwell in us crave enviously? Rather, he gives a greater gift...." Regarding the interpretation of the particle δὲ in verse 6 Johnson comments: "The translation (his) renders the adversative *de* with maximum strength in an attempt to capture the abrupt turn. God's way of acting (that is God's *aphthonia*) is contrasted with the 'craving enviously' of the human spirit dominated by earthly/demonic wisdom..."²⁴

It is not difficult to formulate objections against this parsing. Johnson parses verse 5b as a rhetorical question expecting a negative answer (p. 280). But as he himself later admits, "The major objection to this reading is the absence of the particle *mj* which usually introduces questions expecting a negative response." I-Jin-Loh and Howard A. Hatton, in their handbook on the Letter of James (pp. 144-145) allow

21. Cf. also M. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York 1936, 5-6.

22. "Il suo vero genere è di ordine parenetico, come quello di molti libri sapienziali dell'Antico Testamento (Pr, Sir, Sap)," J. Cantinat "La Lettera di Giacomo" in Augustin George & Pierre Grelot (eds), *Introduzione al Nuovo Testamento*, 3, *Le Lettere Apostoliche*, Borla, Roma 1977, 219. Cf. also Sophie Laws, "Epistle of James" in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 3, Doubleday, New York 1992, 621-628 especially p. 626.

23. *Letter of James*, 282.

24. *Ibid.*

that this parsing is linguistically possible but at the same time “It is grammatically awkward to have ‘the spirit’ as the subject of the main verb ‘to yearn over’ and to have ‘God as the subject of ‘to make to dwell’, the verb of the subordinate clause.” Besides, if ‘the spirit’ is understood as the human spirit, prone to jealousy and sinful longings, it would be strange for the author to underline the fact that it is made to dwell in us by an act of God; in other words, James’ whole argument here would appear to be pointless. Then, one should ask whether the clause μέλζονα δὲ δίδωσιν formulated as a question mark by some exegetes is not ‘cataphoric’ rather than ‘anaphoric’, that is, whether it is not oriented towards what comes after it rather than towards what went before?²⁵ At least the expression δίδωσιν χάριν is met with in the explicit citation from the Septuagint version of Prov 3,34 in verse 7. If the clause μέλζονα δὲ δίδωσιν is cataphoric the particle δὲ cannot be interpreted as adversative but as a simple connecting particle²⁶ and carries in this context no particular semantic value (against Johnson). Usually it is left untranslated. This exegesis would reflect the general *Gattung* disposition of the Epistle of James as a sequence of unconnected short *sententiae* at least where chapter four is concerned, which would then be divided in these vv.1-3.4-5.6-10.²⁷

Exegesis of verse 5

a) *Some general remarks* Though we shall concentrate on some sentence components from verse 5, one should keep in mind that the grammar itself of this verse demands that verse 5 be taken as forming one *sententia* together with the previous verse 4. This *sententia* is addressed to the sentence initial μοιχαλίδες. The entire *sententia* consists of two rhetorical questions and two statements; the second statement in v.5b constitutes the reconstructed γραφή. One should notice that this description entails a slightly different punctuation from the one chosen by the editors of the

25. For the two terms cfr. Gillian Brown & George Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1983, 192-193; M.A.K. Halliday, & R. Hason, *Cohesion in English*, Longman, London 1976.

26. Cf. Jeremy Duff, *The Elements of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2005, 106-107. Of course, the adversative sense in this particle exists, cf. Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Sheffield Academic Press, 1994, 208; Maximiliano Zerwick, *Graecitas Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma 1966, art. 467.

27. Thanks goes to my friend and colleague Prof Sabin Preda of the Orthodox Faculty of Theology in Bucharest, who in a verbal communication informed me how the text could be divided differently with vv. 4-5 going to the subsequent paragraph ending at verse 10. The present writer thinks instead that from the point of contents and genre the segmentation being offered here better suits the context.

Novum Testamentum Graece^{27h} of Nestle-Aland, in that in verse 5b comes to a close the second rhetorical question that enframes the second statement, that is the Scripture citation. With the comparative μείζονα δὲ in verse 6 there starts the third *sententia* in chapter four of the Epistle.

b) *The vocative μοιχαλίδες* The choice of this lexeme by James²⁸ has been deliberate and the alteration in a number of manuscripts to μοιχὶ καὶ μοιχαλίδες or some other variation²⁹ is unjustified. These tradents and some exegetes³⁰ thought that James was addressing the issue of adultery within Christian communities. But “all the major commentators otherwise agree that James is using the symbolism found in the Torah for the covenant relationship between Yahweh as groom and Israel as bride.”³¹ Through the feminine of the vocative μοιχαλίδες the writer programmes the semantics of the entire *sententia* (vv.4-5), especially of the verbal clause πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ in verse 5, and possibly the choice of the concept φίλος in the contrast God/world in verse 4(cf. 1Jn 2,15).³²

c) *The subject of the verb ἐπιποθεῖ* Who is the subject of the main verb ἐπιποθεῖ in the presumed citation reconstructed by James in v.5b? Some critics and translations have taken τὸ πνεῦμα to be this subject. Johnson (p. 267) makes this option and translates verse 5b as a rhetorical question: “Does the spirit which he made to dwell in us crave enviously?” On pp. 281-282 he argues his case. He says that the phrase πρὸς φθόνον read adverbially can be understood only negatively because in Greek usage φθόνος, envy, is always a vice and it was practically impossible for James to predicate it to God which is the subject of ἐπιποθεῖ; likewise the verb ἐπιπόθειν which is often used in the NT³³ “can easily bear the more negative connotation of crave”; Johnson then cites a number of texts especially from the OT like Deut 13,9;Ps 61,11;Wis 15,19;Sir 25,21.

28. Without wanting to enter the issue of the authorship of the Epistle for which the present writer would refer the reader to general introductions.

29. Cf. *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior*, 67.

30. Cf. for instance F. J. A. Hort, *The Epistle of St James*, Macmillan & Co., London 1909, 91.

31. Johnson, *Letter of James*, 278.

32. Cf. *Ibid.*, 279. For an instance in the prophets where the people is addressed as a female character the present writer refers the reader to his essay “Who were the Cows of Bashan in Amos 4,1-3?” in Anthony Abela(ed.), *In Joyful and Serene Service of his Lord's Word*. In Memory of Rev Dr Joseph Calleja OFM Conv, Melita Theologica Supplementary Series, 5; Malta 2003, 213-223.

33. Cf. W. F. Moulton et alii(eds.), *Concordance to the Greek Testament*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh 1978,370.

The present writer has three objections to this reading, two of which have already been formulated in Loh's and Hatton's *A Handbook on The Letter from James* (p.144): It would make awkward exegesis to take 'the human spirit' the subject of 'crave jealously' and God the subject of the verb 'to make to dwell'. For what would have been the point James wants to make if it is God making to dwell in men a spirit who is never satisfied with its desires? Why should then James criticise human beings and describe them as 'adulterers' if they could do nothing else since this craving endlessly is part of the human spirit's life? The *sententia* in vv.4-5 would be pointless. Besides, from concordances and dictionaries one may notice that ἐπιτόθειν is a transitive verb whose object is always made explicit, something which would not happen if τὸ πνεῦμα is not taken as the object in our text. If on the other hand ὁ θεός, gleaned from verse 4, is taken as the subject of the main verb ἐπιτοθεῖ, and the nominal τὸ πνεῦμα is parsed as the object of the verb, we would have a regular clause constituents sequence. God yearns up to being jealous for the 'spirit' whether it is human or divine. The clause initial positioning of πρὸς φθόνον indicates its emphatic role within the clause. And this is linked within the Jewish tradition to the matrimonial analogy present especially in prophetic literature.³⁴

d) τὸ πνεῦμα What does James mean by the phrase 'the spirit', which as we have seen is the object of the verb κατῳκίσεν that has ὁ θεός as subject? Is he referring to the doctrine of creation as expressed in such texts as Gen 2,7; 7,15; 45,27 that professes that God made the spirit indwell in the human body, or to the other Christian doctrine of the Indwelling of the Holy Spirit in Christians? Johnson (p.280) sees no reason to suppose that James through τὸ πνεῦμα is referring to the Holy Spirit. Instead he contemplates three possible meanings for this lexeme: i) "The *pneuma* that God gave to humans as their life-breath in creation(see Gen 7,15; 45,27)"; ii) "The *pneuma* that God gives as a gift to humans by way of prophecy or wisdom(see especially LXX Exod 31,3;35,31; Deut 34,9; Is 11,2)"; iii) Together with some rabbinic authors James seems to be using *pneuma* here to refer to an 'impulse' "not entirely to be identified with individual psychology but equally with cosmic powers called 'spirits' like 'spirit of truth' 'spirit of falsehood'." "James places on one side the 'earthbound, unspiritual demonic wisdom from below (3:15) sponsored by the devil (4:7) which operates on the basis of envy and makes those who choose it

34. On the theme of divine jealousy bibliography is never ending. Besides dictionaries, the present writer would signal only a handful of works: B. Renaud, *Je suis un Dieu jaloux*. Evolution sémantique et signification théologique de qīn"āh, Paris 1963; C.D. Gross, " 'Jealous' in the OT", *The Bible Translator*, 48/2(1997)228-235; and *The Bible Translator* 48/4(1997)418-432; C. Mèzange "Simon le Zélote était-il un révolutionnaire?" *Biblica* 81(2000)489-506.

enemies of God. On the other side, James places those who live by the 'wisdom from above' (3:7), which derives from 'the spirit God made to dwell' in humans(4:5) and operates on the basis of purity of heart and peace(3:17-18). Human freedom, then, is seen as operating in allegiance to one or the other of these 'spirits'." ³⁵

Probably, anyone of these interpretations of τό πνεῦμα is possible and may not be excluded a priori. But the reason adduced for excluding that the word may be referring to the Holy Spirit cannot be accepted either: "This would be the only instance in the book where a reference is made to the Holy Spirit, and this is therefore considered to be unlikely by some scholars."³⁶ As if James is expected to offer a systematic treatment of every aspect of the Christian message. On the other hand, for a Christian writer not to have at least one *sententia* to refer to such central theme as the Holy Spirit would really sound strange! This interpretation of τό πνεῦμα here fits the context to perfection: "The verb 'to make dwell' which appears nowhere else in the New Testament, makes better sense if the reference is to the Holy Spirit. What James seems to be saying here, then, is that Christians are indwelt by God's Spirit, and therefore God has a special claim on them. This indicates that the indwelling of the Spirit is incompatible with the sinful desires and yearnings that disrupt the peace and harmony of the community."³⁷

ε) ἡ γραφή "The main issue here has to do with what James might be referring to. Does he mean 'Scripture as a whole' (see 2:8) or a specific passage (2:33)? If a specific passage, which one? There certainly is no passage in the OT, as we now have it, containing any such verse as we find it here in 4:5... Is James, then, referring to a lost passage or one otherwise unknown to us....? Or is he making a broad allusion to the 'sense' of Scripture...?"³⁸ Johnson solves the problem by changing the colon as found in the Nestle-Aland^{27th} to a question mark, translating the verb λέγει as meaning 'to speak', a meaning he found in Rom 3, 5; 4, 3; 11, 4 and some other texts, and in this way the parts of verse 5 become two rhetorical questions: "Or do you suppose that the Scripture speaks in vain? Does the spirit which he made dwell in us crave enviously?"

35. Cf. *Letter of James*, 281.

36. Loh & Hatton, *A Handbook on the Letter of James*, 144.

37. Ibid.

38. Johnson, *Letter of James*, 280.

The present author considers this solution as an unhappy one. The ἡ γραφή in this verse is not referring to a written text but to a biblical traditional teaching which James had to transform because of the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit's identity and indwelling in the Christians; this doctrine was no absolute novelty vis-à-vis Old Testament tradition; James could cite no explicit OT text though he could refer to an OT doctrine. In view of this authorial desire, one should treat verse 5b as a quotation even if it is not a verbatim citation.

Department of Holy Scripture
University of Malta
Msida, Malta

