



Wisdom as Unifying Theme: A Discourse-Syntactical Analysis of James 3-4

Philip Suciadi Chia

Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Indonesia Yogyakarta

E-mail: Pchia175@students.sbts.edu

Digital Object Identifier (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.33856/kerugma.v8i2.126>

Article history

Received	Revised	Accepted	Published
05 Desember 2024	25 September 2025	08 October 2025	19 September 2025

ABSTRACT

The literary coherence between James 3 and 4 has been debated among New Testament scholars, with some viewing chapter 4 as a disconnected ethical instruction. This study argues that wisdom ($\sigma\omega\phi\acute{\alpha}$) functions as the unifying theological-thematic thread connecting these chapters through a comprehensive discourse-syntactical analysis. Employing discourse analysis combined with Greek syntactical examination, this research traces semantic domains, verbal aspects, and rhetorical structures across James 3:1-4:17. The analysis reveals a deliberate progression: wisdom controls speech (3:1-12), determines community ethics (3:13-4:3), and shapes personal piety (4:4-17). James presents earthly versus heavenly wisdom as the fundamental choice determining all human conduct. The syntactical markers, thematic vocabulary, and argumentative flow demonstrate that chapters 3-4 form a unified discourse on wisdom's application to speech, social relationships, and personal submission to God.

Keywords: James; Syntactical Analysis; Wisdom Literature; Discourse Analysis; Greek Exegesis

Citation Style (APA): Chia, P. S. (2025). Wisdom as Unifying Theme: A Discourse-Syntactical Analysis of James 3-4. *Theological Journal Kerugma*, 8(2), 218–235. <https://doi.org/10.33856/kerugma.v8i2.126>

INTRODUCTION

The epistle of James has long been characterized by its seemingly disconnected ethical instructions, leading scholars to question its literary unity (Bauckham, 1999; Davids, 1982). Particularly problematic is the relationship between chapters 3 and 4, where James transitions from teaching about wisdom and the tongue (3:1-18) to discussions of worldliness, prayer, and future planning (4:1-17). This apparent disjunction has led some commentators to view James as a loosely organized collection of moral maxims rather than a coherent theological argument (Dibelius, 1976).

However, recent discourse-analytical approaches have challenged this fragmented reading, proposing that James exhibits sophisticated rhetorical structure and thematic coherence (Blomberg & Kamell, 2008; Varner, 2010; Cheung, 2003). Despite these advances, limited attention has been given to syntactical analysis as a method for demonstrating the structural and thematic connections between chapters 3 and 4.

While numerous studies have examined James's theology of wisdom (Baker, 2007; Hartin, 1991) and others have analyzed the book's discourse structure (Batten, 2010; Wachob, 2000), few have combined detailed Greek syntactical analysis with discourse-level observations to demonstrate the literary coherence of James 3-4.

Most syntactical studies remain atomistic, focusing on verse-by-verse grammatical parsing without integrating findings into larger thematic arguments.

Furthermore, the role of wisdom as a unifying concept beyond chapter 3 has been underexplored in syntactical studies. This gap prevents scholars from appreciating how James's wisdom discourse extends into chapter 4, shaping discussions of conflict, worldliness, and submission to God. This study aims to:

1. Demonstrate through syntactical analysis that wisdom functions as the theological-thematic thread unifying James 3-4
2. Identify grammatical markers and semantic patterns that connect these chapters
3. Trace the argumentative progression from wisdom's control of speech to its application in community ethics and personal piety
4. Contribute to understanding James's literary coherence and theological sophistication This research employs an integrated approach combining:

Discourse Analysis: Following the methodology of Porter (1992) and Runge (2010), this study examines how James structures his argument through discourse markers, topic transitions, and cohesive devices.

Greek Syntactical Analysis: Building on Wallace's (1996) exegetical syntax and McKay's (1994) aspectual theory, this research analyzes verbal aspects, genitive functions, participial constructions, and conditional sentences.

Semantic Domain Analysis: Utilizing BDAG and Louw-Nida's semantic domains, this study traces vocabulary clusters related to wisdom, speech, desire, and submission across both chapters. This research contributes to:

- ✓ Literary studies of James by providing syntactical evidence for the epistle's coherence
- ✓ Wisdom literature studies by demonstrating how early Christian authors adapted Jewish wisdom traditions
- ✓ Hermeneutical methodology by modeling the integration of grammatical and discourse analysis
- ✓ Practical theology by clarifying James's unified teaching on wisdom's application to Christian life

Literature Review

The debate over James's literary structure dates to Dibelius's (1976) influential commentary, which characterized the epistle as *Paränese* (paraenesis) loosely connected moral exhortations lacking logical progression. This view dominated Jacobean scholarship for decades, with Davids (1982) acknowledging that James "jumps from topic to topic with little apparent connection."

However, this consensus has been challenged. Bauckham (1999) demonstrated thematic patterns throughout James, while Blomberg and Kamell (2008) identified concentric structures. Most significantly, Varner (2010) and Cheung (2003) applied discourse analysis to reveal James's rhetorical sophistication. Yet these studies often rely on thematic observations rather than detailed syntactical evidence.

James's wisdom theology has received substantial attention. Hartin (1991) positioned James within the Jewish wisdom tradition, showing parallels with Proverbs and Sirach. Baker (2007) argued that James presents wisdom as practical knowledge for community life. Johnson (1995) emphasized wisdom's christological dimensions, connecting "the Lord" passages with wisdom incarnate. Most scholars recognize chapter 3's explicit wisdom discourse (3:13-18), where James contrasts earthly and heavenly wisdom. However, the extension of

wisdom themes into chapter 4 remains underexplored. McCartney (2009) briefly notes that 4:1-3 reflects the "wars" of earthly wisdom mentioned in 3:16, but does not develop this connection syntactically.

Greek syntactical analysis of James includes Adam's (2013) handbook and Vlachos's (2013) exegetical guide. These works provide verse-by-verse grammatical parsing but typically do not integrate syntactical observations into larger discourse arguments.

Chia (2023) previously examined James 1:1-15 using syntactical analysis to demonstrate thematic coherence around Christian maturity. However, no comprehensive syntactical study has focused on demonstrating the wisdom-theme connection between chapters 3 and 4. This study fills the gap by providing systematic syntactical analysis that demonstrates how grammatical features, semantic patterns, and discourse markers establish wisdom as the unifying theme across James 3-4. Unlike previous studies, this research integrates micro-level syntax with macro-level discourse structure to prove literary coherence.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs qualitative textual analysis, specifically discourse-syntactical analysis, focusing on James 3:1–4:17 in the Greek New Testament (NA28). The primary data consists of the Greek text of James 3–4, examined through grammatical parsing of verbs, participles, nouns, and syntactical constructions, as well as the identification of discourse markers, cohesive devices, and semantic fields of key vocabulary. The analytical process unfolds in three integrated stages: micro-analysis at the verse level, which includes parsing sentences, identifying verbal aspects, analyzing participial functions, and examining genitive and conditional constructions; meso-analysis at the paragraph level, which traces discourse markers, topical progressions, semantic domains, and patterns of repetition; and macro-analysis at the chapter level, which synthesizes the syntactical findings to demonstrate thematic unity, trace the wisdom motif, and identify structural parallels across the two chapters.

Validation of the syntactical and discourse interpretations is conducted through consultation of standard Greek grammars (Wallace, 1996; Smyth, 1984; Robertson, 1934), lexical authorities such as BDAG and Louw-Nida, and a comparative reading of major scholarly commentaries on James. Additional reliability is ensured through a peer review process, strengthening the credibility of the analytical framework and supporting the conclusion that James 3–4 forms a coherent and unified discourse.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chapter 3

Verse 1

Text

Μή πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου, εἰδότες ὅτι μείζον κρίμα λημψόμεθα.

Analysis

μή . . . γίνεσθε] 'do not be'. Command. Imperfective aspect and state.

πολλοί] 'many (of you)'. Nominative subject.

διδάσκαλοι] 'teachers'. Predicate nominative.

ἀδελφοί μου] 'my brothers'. Simple address of vocative.

εἰδότες] 'because knowing'. Causal participle.

ὅτι] 'that'. Content.

μείζον κρίμα] 'greater judgment'. Accusative of direct object of λημψόμεθα.

λημψόμεθα] 'we will receive'. Predictive future. Perfective aspect and achievement.

Verse 2

Text

πολλά γὰρ πταίμεν ἅπαντες. εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὄλον τὸ σῶμα.

Analysis

πολλά] ‘many (ways)’. Accusative of direct object of πταίμεν.

γὰρ] ‘because’. Causal.

πταίμεν] ‘we stumble’. General present. Imperfective aspect and activity.

ἅπαντες] ‘all’. Nominative subject.

εἴ . . . οὐ πταίει] ‘if (someone) does not stumble’. This construction indicates the first-class condition: the assumption of truth for the sake of argument (Wallace 690).

τις] ‘someone’. Nominative subject.

ἐν λόγῳ] ‘in word’. Location.

οὗτος] ‘he (is)’. Nominative subject.

τέλειος ἀνὴρ] ‘a perfect man’. Predicate nominative. The noun ‘perfect’ appears 5 times in the book of James.

δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγῆσαι] ‘able to bridle’. Predicate nominative and complementary infinitive. Hapax legomenon.

καί] ‘also’. Additional idea.

ὄλον τὸ σῶμα] ‘all body’. Accusative of direct object of infinitive.

Verse 3

Text

εἰ δὲ τῶν ἵππων τοὺς χαλινοὺς εἰς τὰ στόματα βάλλομεν εἰς τὸ πείθεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἡμῖν, καὶ ὄλον τὸ σῶμα αὐτῶν μετάγομεν.

Analysis

εἰ . . . βάλλομεν] ‘if . . . we put’. This construction indicates the first-class condition: the assumption of truth for the sake of argument (Wallace 690).

δέ] ‘now’. Transitional.

τῶν ἵππων] ‘of horses’. Possessive genitive.

τοὺς χαλινοὺς] ‘bits’. Accusative of direct object of βάλλομεν.

εἰς τὰ στόματα] ‘into mouths’. Location.

εἰς τὸ πείθεσθαι] ‘so that obey’. Purpose.

αὐτούς] ‘they’. Accusative subject of the infinitive.

ἡμῖν] ‘us’. Dative of direct object.

καί] ‘then’. Transitional.

ὄλον τὸ σῶμα] ‘the whole body’. Accusative of direct object of μετάγομεν.

αὐτῶν] ‘of them’. Possessive genitive.

μετάγομεν] ‘we direct (guide)’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect.

Verse 4

Text

ἰδοὺ καὶ τὰ πλοῖα τηλικαῦτα ὄντα καὶ ὑπὸ ἀνέμων σκληρῶν ἐλαυνόμενα μετάγεται ὑπὸ ἐλαχίστου πηδαλίου ὅπου ἡ ὄρμη τοῦ εὐθύνοντος βούλεται.

Analysis

ἰδοὺ] ‘behold’. Attention.

καί] ‘also’. Additional.

τὰ πλοῖα] ‘the boats’. Nominative subject of μετάγεται.

τηλικαῦτα ὄντα] ‘although being so great’. Concessive participle.

καί] ‘and’. Connective.

ὑπὸ ἀνέμων σκληρῶν] ‘by hard (harsh) winds’. Means.

ἐλαυνόμενα] ‘being driven’. Concessive participle.

μετάγεται] ‘(the boats) are directed’. *Schema atticum*. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and accomplishment.

ὑπὸ ἐλαχίστου πηδαλίου] ‘by the smallest rudder’.
ὅπου] ‘wherever’. Location.
ἡ ὀρμή] ‘the desire’. Nominative subject.
τοῦ εὐθύνοντος] ‘of the pilot’. Subjective genitive.
βούλεται] ‘wants’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect.

Verse 5

Text

οὕτως καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα μικρὸν μέλος ἐστὶν καὶ μεγάλα αὐχεῖ. ἰδοὺ ἡλίκον πῦρ ἡλίκην ὕλην ἀνάπτει.

Analysis

οὕτως] ‘therefore’. Inferential.
καί] ‘also’. Additional idea.
ἡ γλῶσσα] ‘the tongue’. Nominative subject.
μικρὸν μέλος] ‘small member (of the body)’. Predicate nominative.
ἐστίν] ‘is’. Impersonal verb.
καί] ‘and’. Additional idea.
μεγάλα] ‘great things’. Accusative of direct object.
αὐχεῖ] ‘Boast’. Hapax legomenon. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and activity.
ἰδοὺ] ‘behold’. Attention.
ἡλίκον] ‘how small a fire’. Nominative subject.
ἡλίκην ὕλην] ‘how great a forest’. Hapax legomenon.
ἀνάπτει] ‘kindles’. Gnomic present. Imperfective and accomplishment.

Verse 6

Text

καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ. ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας ἡ γλῶσσα καθίσταται ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν ἡ σπιλοῦσα ὄλον τὸ σῶμα καὶ φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως καὶ φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης.

Analysis

καί] ‘and’. Connective.
ἡ γλῶσσα] ‘the tongue’. nominative subject.
πῦρ] ‘fire’. Predicate nominative.
ὁ κόσμος] ‘the world’. Predicate nominative.
τῆς ἀδικίας] ‘of wrongdoing’. Descriptive genitive.
ἡ γλῶσσα] ‘the tongue’. nominative subject.
καθίσταται] ‘is set (reflect)’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect.
ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν] ‘among (our) members’. Location.
ἡμῶν] ‘our’. Possessive genitive.
ἡ σπιλοῦσα] ‘that defiles’. Adjectival participle.
ὄλον τὸ σῶμα] ‘the whole body’. Accusative of direct object of ἡ σπιλοῦσα.
καί] ‘and’. Connective.
φλογίζουσα] ‘that sets on fire’. Adjectival participle. Hapax legomenon.
τὸν τροχόν] ‘the course’. Accusative of direct object of ἡ φλογίζουσα. Hapax legomenon.
τῆς γενέσεως] ‘of life’. Genitive of reference.
καί] ‘and’. Connective.
φλογιζομένη] ‘that being burned’. Adjectival participle. Hapax legomenon.
ὑπὸ τῆς γεέννης] ‘by hell’. Means.

Verse 7

Text

πᾶσα γὰρ φύσις θηρίων τε καὶ πετεινῶν, ἐρπετῶν τε καὶ ἐναλίω δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ,

Analysis

πᾶσα . . . φύσις] ‘every species’. Nominative subject of δαμάζεται καὶ δεδάμασται.

θηρίων τε καὶ πετεινῶν] ‘of beasts and birds’. Genitive of reference.
έρπετων τε καὶ ἐναλίων] ‘reptiles and sea creatures’. Genitive of reference. Hapax legomenon.
δαμάζεται] ‘is subdued’. Gnomic present. Imperfective and state.
καί] ‘and’. Connective.
δεδάμασται] ‘has been tamed’. Consummative perfect. State.
τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ] ‘by human species’. Dative of agency.

Verse 8

Text

τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων, ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστή ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου.

Analysis

τὴν . . . γλῶσσαν] ‘the tongue’. Accusative of direct object.
δέ] ‘but’. Adversative.
οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων] ‘no one of human beings’. Nominative subject.
δαμάσαι] ‘to subdue’. Complementary infinitive.
δύναται] ‘is able’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and state.
ἀκατάστατον κακόν] ‘restless evil’. Predicate nominative. Hapax legomenon. Cf. 1:8.
μεστή ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου] ‘full of deathly poison’. Predicate nominative. Hapax legomenon. Genitive of content.

Verse 9

Text

ἐν αὐτῇ εὐλογοῦμεν τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ καταρώμεθα τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ γεγονότας.

Analysis

ἐν αὐτῇ] ‘with it’. Instrument.
εὐλογοῦμεν] ‘we praise’. General present. Imperfective aspect and activity.
τὸν κύριον] ‘the Lord’. Accusative of direct object.
καί] ‘and’. Connective.
πατέρα] ‘Father’. Accusative of direct object.
καί] ‘but’. Adversative.
ἐν αὐτῇ] ‘with it’. Instrument.
καταρώμεθα] ‘we curse’. General present. Imperfective aspect and activity.
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους] ‘men’. Accusative of direct object.
τούς] ‘who’. Relative pronoun function.
καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν] ‘in the likeness’. Standard.
θεοῦ] ‘of God’. Attributed of genitive.
γεγονότας] ‘have been made’. Attributive participle.

Verse 10

Text

ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα. οὐ χρῆ, ἀδελφοί μου, ταῦτα οὕτως γίνεσθαι.

Analysis

ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος] ‘out of the same mouth’. Source.
ἐξέρχεται] ‘comes out’. General present. Imperfective aspect and activity.
εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα] ‘blessing and curse’. Nominative subject.
οὐ χρῆ] ‘ought not to’. General present. Imperfective aspect.
ἀδελφοί μου] ‘my brothers’. Simple address of vocative.
ταῦτα] ‘these things’. Schema atticum. Nominative subject.
οὕτως] ‘so’. Explain what precedes (BDAG).
γίνεσθαι] ‘happen’. Complementary infinitive.

Verse 11

Text

μήτι ἢ πηγὴ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ὀπῆς βρύει τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρὸν;

Analysis

μήτι] ‘Does’. Expect a negative response.

ἢ πηγὴ] ‘the spring’. Nominative subject.

ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ὀπῆς] ‘out of the same opening (hole)’. Source.

βρύει] ‘pours forth’. Hapax legomenon. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and activity.

τὸ γλυκὺ καὶ τὸ πικρὸν] ‘sweet and bitter (water)’. Accusative of direct object. Bitter is hapax legomenon.

Verse 12

Text

μὴ δύναται, ἀδελφοί μου, συκῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι ἢ ἄμπελος σῦκα; οὔτε ἄλυκόν γλυκὺ ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ.

Analysis

μὴ δύναται] ‘Can’. Expect a negative answer.

ἀδελφοί μου] ‘my brothers’. Simple address of vocative.

συκῆ] ‘fig tree’. Nominative subject.

ἐλαίας] ‘olives’. Accusative of direct object.

ποιῆσαι] ‘produce’. Complementary infinitive.

ἢ] ‘or’. Alternative.

ἄμπελος] ‘vine’. Nominative subject.

σῦκα] ‘figs’. Accusative of direct object.

οὔτε] ‘Neither’. Alternative.

ἄλυκόν] ‘salt (water)’. Nominative subject.

γλυκὺ . . . ὕδωρ] ‘sweet water’. Accusative of direct object.

ποιῆσαι] ‘produce’. Complementary infinitive.

The word of the whole body appears three times in chapter 3 (2, 3, 6).

Verse 1 is the future reason.

Verse 2 is the present reason.

Verse 3 is the illustration (horse). The power of the mouth

Verse 4 is the illustration (boats). The size of the mouth.

Verse 5a is the explanation of the size of the mouth.

Verse 5b is the illustration (fire) of the size of the mouth.

Verse 6 is the illustration (fire) of the impact (power) of the mouth.

Verse 7-8 is the illustration (creatures) of the power of the mouth.

Verse 9-10 is the contradiction of the mouth.

Verse 11-12 is the questions related to the contradiction of the mouth (source?).

Verse 13

Text

Τίς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν; δεῖξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας.

Analysis

Τίς] ‘who’. Nominative subject.

σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων] ‘wise and understanding’. Hapax legomenon.

ἐν ὑμῖν] ‘among you’. Location.

δειξάτω] ‘show’. Command.

ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς] ‘out of good behavior’. Source.

τὰ ἔργα] ‘works’. Accusative of direct object.

αὐτοῦ] ‘of him’. Subjective genitive.

ἐν πραΰτητι] ‘in the gentleness’. Instrument.

σοφίας] ‘of wisdom’. Attributed of genitive.

Verse 14

Text

εἰ δὲ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐριθείαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν, μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας

Analysis

εἰ . . . ἔχετε] ‘if you have’. This construction indicates the first-class condition: the assumption of truth for the sake of argument (Wallace 690).

δέ] ‘but’. Adversative.

ζῆλον πικρὸν] ‘bitter jealousy’. Accusative of direct object of ἔχετε. The word bitter is hapax legomenon.

καὶ ἐριθείαν] ‘and selfish ambition’. Connective conjunction. Accusative of direct object of ἔχετε.

ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν] ‘in your heart’. Location.

μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε] ‘do not triumph over (boast)’. Imperfective aspect. This verb appears in 2:13, 3:14, 4:16.

καὶ ψεύδεσθε] ‘and do not lie’. Imperfect aspect. Perhaps, bitter jealousy vs do not lie and selfish ambition vs boast.

κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας] ‘against the truth’. Opposition.

Verse 15

Text

οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη ἀλλ’ ἐπίγειος, ψυχική, δαιμονιώδης

Analysis

οὐκ ἔστιν] ‘is not’. Impersonal verb. Imperfective aspect and state.

αὕτη ἡ σοφία] ‘this wisdom’. Nominative subject.

ἄνωθεν] ‘from above’. Location.

κατερχομένη] ‘coming down’. Attributive participle.

ἀλλ’ ἐπίγειος] ‘but earthly’. Predicate nominative.

ψυχική] ‘soulish’. Contrast to spiritual. Predicate nominative.

δαιμονιώδης] ‘demonic’. Predicate nominative. Hapax legomenon.

Verse 16

Text

ὅπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ ἀκαταστασία καὶ πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα.

Analysis

ὅπου] ‘where’. Location.

γὰρ] ‘for’. Causal for the previous verse.

ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία] ‘jealously and selfish ambition’. Nominative subject. Both words appear in 3:14.

ἐκεῖ] ‘there’. Location.

ἀκαταστασία] ‘disorder’. Nominative subject.

καὶ πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα] ‘and every evil thing’. Nominative subject.

Verse 17

Text

ἡ δὲ ἄνωθεν σοφία πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή ἐστίν, ἔπειτα εἰρηνική, ἐπιεικής, εὐπειθής, μεστή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν, ἀδιάκριτος, ἀνυπόκριτος.

Analysis

ἡ . . . σοφία] ‘the wisdom’. Nominative subject.

δέ] ‘but’. Adversative.

ἄνωθεν] ‘from above’. Location.

πρῶτον] ‘first’. Sequence.

μὲν] ‘on one hand’. Expect conjunction δέ in verse 18.

ἀγνή] ‘pure (holy)’. Predicate nominative.

ἐστίν] ‘is’. Impersonal verb.

ἔπειτα] ‘then’. Sequence.
εἰρηνική] ‘peaceable’. Predicate nominative.
ἐπιεικής] ‘gentle’. Predicate nominative. Not insisting on every right of letter of law or custom.
εὐπειθής] ‘obedient’. Predicate nominative. Hapax legomenon.
μεστή ἐλέους] ‘full of mercy’. Predicate nominative.
καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν] ‘and good fruits’. Connective. Predicate nominative.
ἀδιάκριτος] ‘divisive (impartial)’. Predicate nominative. Hapax legomenon.
ἀνυπόκριτος] ‘without hypocrisy’. Predicate nominative.

Verse 18

Text

καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην.

Analysis

καρπὸς] ‘the fruit’. Nominative subject.
δέ] ‘and’. Connective.
δικαιοσύνης] ‘of righteousness’. Genitive of product.
ἐν εἰρήνῃ] ‘in peace’. Manner
σπείρεται] ‘is sown’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and achievement.
τοῖς ποιοῦσιν] ‘by those who make’. Substantival participle.
εἰρήνην] ‘peace’. Accusative of direct object of participle.
Verse 13 is a request. No dualism. Wisdom is related to manner or behaviors.
Verse 14 is negative behaviors.
Verse 15-16 is the source of positive (15) and negative (16) behaviors.
Verse 17-18 is the result of wisdom
Source – Wisdom – Behavior

Chapter 4

Verse 1

Text

Πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ πόθεν μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν; οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν;

Analysis

Πόθεν] ‘from where’. Source.
πόλεμοι] ‘wars’. Nominative subject.
καί] ‘and’. Connective.
Πόθεν] ‘from where’. Source.
μάχαι] ‘disputes (fighting)’. Nominative subject.
ἐν ὑμῖν] ‘among you’. Location.
οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν] ‘is not from a source’. Expect the answer yes.
ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν] ‘out of your pleasures’. Source. Subjective genitive.
τῶν στρατευομένων] ‘which battling’. Attributive participle.
ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ὑμῶν] ‘among your member (parts of the body)’. Location.

Verse 2

Text

ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε, φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν, μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς,

Analysis

ἐπιθυμεῖτε] ‘you desire’. General present. Imperfective aspect. State.
καί] ‘but’. Adversative.
οὐκ ἔχετε] ‘you do not have’. General present. Imperfective aspect. State.
φονεύετε] ‘(so) you murder’. General present. Imperfective aspect and achievement.

καὶ ζηλοῦτε] ‘and you are jealous’. Connect with desire.

καὶ οὐ δύνασθε] ‘but you are not able’. Adversative. General present. Imperfective aspect. State.

ἐπιτυχεῖν] ‘to obtain’. Complementary infinitive.

μάχεσθε] ‘you fight’. General present. Imperfective aspect. Activity.

καὶ πολεμεῖτε] ‘and you battle’. General present. Imperfective aspect. Activity.

οὐκ ἔχετε] ‘you do not have’. General present. Imperfective aspect. State.

διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι] ‘because do not ask’. Causal.

ὑμᾶς] ‘you’. Accusative subject of infinitive.

Why does James have to mention ‘you do not have because you do not ask’? To escalate the tension. Asking the wrong thing is worse than not asking anything.

Verse 3

Text

αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε.

Analysis

αἰτεῖτε] ‘you ask’. General present. Imperfective aspect. Activity.

καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε] ‘but you do not receive’. Adversative. General present. Imperfective aspect. Accomplishment.

διότι] ‘because’. Causal.

κακῶς] ‘wrongly (wrong motives)’. Manner.

αἰτεῖσθε] ‘you ask’. General present. Imperfective aspect. Activity.

ἵνα . . . δαπανήσητε] ‘so that you may spend’. Purpose.

ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς] ‘on your pleasure’. Manner.

ὑμῶν] ‘of you’. Subjective genitive.

Verse 4

Text

μοιχαλίδες, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν; ὃς ἐὰν οὖν βουληθῆ φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσταται.

Analysis

μοιχαλίδες] ‘oh adulteresses’. Simple address of vocative.

οὐκ οἴδατε] ‘do you not know’. This construction expects the answer yes. Perfect with a Present Force. State aspect.

ὅτι] ‘that’. Content.

ἡ φιλία] ‘the friendship’. Nominative subject.

τοῦ κόσμου] ‘with the world’. Genitive of association.

ἔχθρα] ‘hostility’. Nominative subject.

τοῦ θεοῦ] ‘against God’. Objective genitive.

ἐστίν] ‘is’. Impersonal verb.

ὃς] ‘whoever’. Nominative subject.

ἐὰν . . . βουληθῆ] ‘if . . . wishes’. Third class condition: uncertain of fulfillment, but still likely (Wallace, 696).

οὖν] ‘therefore’. Inferential.

φίλος] ‘a friend’. Nominative subject.

εἶναι] ‘to be’. Complementary infinitive.

τοῦ κόσμου] ‘of the world’. Genitive of relationship.

ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ] ‘the enemy of God’. Predicate nominative and Genitive of relationship.

καθίσταται] ‘makes himself’. General present. Imperfective aspect.

Verse 5

Text

ἢ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφή λέγει· πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατώκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν,

Analysis

ἢ] ‘or’. Alternative.

δοκεῖτε] ‘do you think’. General present. Imperfective aspect.

ὅτι] ‘that’. Content.

κενῶς] ‘in vain’. Manner.

ἡ γραφή] ‘the writing’. Nominative subject.

λέγει] ‘says’. Perfective present. Imperfect aspect. Achievement.

πρὸς φθόνον] ‘with jealousy’. Association.

ἐπιποθεῖ] ‘(the Spirit) longs’. Habitual present. Imperfective aspect. State.

τὸ πνεῦμα] ‘the Spirit’. Nominative subject.

ὃ] ‘that’. Relative pronoun.

κατώκισεν] ‘He (God) causes to dwell’. Constativ aorist. Perfective aspect and achievement.

ἐν ἡμῖν] ‘in us’. Location.

Verse 6

Text

μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν; διὸ λέγει· ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν

Analysis

μείζονα . . . χάριν] ‘greater . . . grace’. Accusative of direct object.

δέ] ‘Now’. Transitional.

δίδωσιν] ‘he gives’.

διὸ] ‘therefore’. Inferential.

λέγει] ‘it says’. Perfective present. Imperfective aspect and achievement.

ὁ θεός] ‘God’. Nominative subject.

ἀντιτάσσεται] ‘(God) opposes’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and accomplishment.

ὑπερηφάνοις] ‘the proud ones’. Dative of indirect object.

ταπεινοῖς] ‘to the humble ones’. Dative of indirect object.

δέ] ‘but’. Adversative.

δίδωσιν] ‘He gives’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and accomplishment.

χάριν] ‘grace’. Accusative of direct object.

Verse 7

Text

ὑποτάγητε οὖν τῷ θεῷ, ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ’ ὑμῶν

Analysis

ὑποτάγητε] ‘submit’. Perfective aspect.

οὖν] ‘therefore’. Inferential.

τῷ θεῷ] ‘to God’. Dative of indirect object.

ἀντίστητε] ‘oppose (resist)’. Perfective aspect.

δέ] ‘but’. Adversative.

τῷ διαβόλῳ] ‘to the devil’. Dative of indirect object.

καί] ‘then’. Connective.

φεύξεται] ‘he will flee’. Predictive future. Perfective aspect.

ἀφ’ ὑμῶν] ‘from you’. Separation.

Verse 8

Text

ἐγγίσατε τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐγγιεῖ ὑμῖν. καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, ἁμαρτωλοί, καὶ ἀγνίσατε καρδίας, δίψυχοι.

Analysis

ἐγγίσατε] ‘Draw near’. Perfective aspect.

τῷ θεῷ] ‘to God’. Dative of indirect object.

καὶ] ‘and’. Connective.

ἐγγιεῖ] ‘he will draw near’. Predictive future. Perfective aspect. Achievement.

ὑμῖν] ‘to you’. Dative of indirect object.

καθαρίσατε] ‘cleanses’. Perfective aspect.

χεῖρας] ‘hands’. Accusative of direct object.

ἁμαρτωλοί] ‘oh sinners’. Simple address of vocative.

καὶ] ‘and’. Connective.

ἀγνίσατε] ‘purify’. Perfective aspect.

καρδίας] ‘hearts’. Accusative of direct object.

δίψυχοι] ‘double-minded man’. Simple address of vocative. Double-minded appears also in James 1:8.

Verse 9

Text

ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε. ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς κατήφειαν.

Analysis

ταλαιπωρήσατε] ‘Be miserable’. Perfective aspect. Hapax legomenon.

καὶ] ‘and’. Connective.

πενθήσατε] ‘mourn’. Perfective aspect.

καὶ] ‘and’. Connective.

κλαύσατε] ‘weep’. Perfective aspect.

ὁ γέλως] ‘laughter’. Nominative subject. Hapax legomenon.

ὑμῶν] ‘of you’. Subjective genitive.

εἰς πένθος] ‘into mourning’. Result.

μετατραπήτω] ‘let turn’. Command. Hapax legomenon.

καὶ] ‘and’. Connective.

ἡ χαρὰ] ‘the joy’. Nominative subject.

εἰς κατήφειαν] ‘into gloominess’. Result. Hapax legomenon.

Verse 10

Text

ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς.

Analysis

ταπεινώθητε] ‘humble yourselves’. Perfective aspect.

ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου] ‘before the Lord’. Location.

καὶ] ‘and’. Connective.

ὑψώσει] ‘he will lift’. Predictive future. Perfective aspect and achievement.

ὑμᾶς] ‘you’. Accusative of direct object.

Verse 11

Text

Μὴ καταλαλεῖτε ἀλλήλων, ἀδελφοί. ὁ καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἢ κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ κρίνει νόμον· εἰ δὲ νόμον κρίνεις, οὐκ εἶ ποιητὴς νόμου ἀλλὰ κριτὴς.

Analysis

Μὴ καταλαλεῖτε] ‘do not speak evil’. Imperfective aspect.

ἀλλήλων] ‘against one another’. Objective genitive.
 ἀδελφοί] ‘brothers’. Simple address of vocative.
 ὁ καταλαλῶν] ‘he who speaks evil’. Substantival participle.
 ἀδελφοῦ] ‘brother’. Objective genitive.
 ἢ] ‘or’. Alternative.
 κρίνων] ‘(he) who judges’. Substantival participle.
 τὸν ἀδελφόν] ‘(his) brother’. Accusative of direct object.
 αὐτοῦ] ‘of him’. Genitive of relationship.
 καταλαλεῖ] ‘speaks evil’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and achievement (or accomplishment?).
 νόμου] ‘the law’. Objective genitive.
 καί] ‘and’. Connective.
 κρίνει] ‘judges’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect and achievement (or accomplishment?).
 νόμον] ‘the law’. Accusative of direct object.
 εἰ . . . κρίνεις] ‘if . . . you judge’. This construction indicates the first-class condition: the assumption of truth for the sake of argument (Wallace 690).
 δὲ] ‘so’. Inferential.
 νόμον] ‘law’. Accusative of direct object.
 οὐκ εἶ] ‘you are not’. Impersonal verb. State.
 ποιητής] ‘doer’. Predicate nominative.
 νόμου] ‘law’. Descriptive genitive.
 ἀλλά] ‘but’. Adversative.
 κριτής] ‘judge’. Predicate nominative.

Verse 12

Text

εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης καὶ κριτὴς ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι· σὺ δὲ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον;

Analysis

εἷς] ‘one’. Predicate nominative.
 ἐστὶν] ‘is’. Impersonal verb. State.
 ὁ νομοθέτης] ‘law giver’. Nominative subject.
 καί] ‘and’. Connective.
 κριτής] ‘judge’. Nominative subject.
 ὁ δυνάμενος] ‘(he) who is able’. Nominative of simple apposition.
 σῶσαι] ‘to save’. Complementary infinitive.
 καί] ‘and’. Connective.
 ἀπολέσαι] ‘to destroy’. Complementary infinitive.
 σύ] ‘you’. Nominative subject. Emphasis.
 δὲ] ‘but’. Adversative.
 τίς] ‘who’. Predicate nominative.
 εἶ] ‘you are’. Impersonal verbs. State.
 ὁ κρίνων] ‘that judges’. Attributive participle.
 τὸν πλησίον] ‘your neighbor’. Accusative of direct object.

Verse 13

Text

Ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες· σήμερον ἢ αὔριον πορευσόμεθα εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν καὶ ποιήσομεν ἐκεῖ ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ ἐμπορευσόμεθα καὶ κερδήσομεν,

Analysis

Ἄγε] ‘Come’. Imperfective aspect. Appears again in 5:1.
 νῦν] ‘now’. Temporal marker.
 οἱ λέγοντες] ‘those who say’. Substantival participle.
 σήμερον] ‘today’. Temporal marker.

ἢ] ‘or’. Alternative.
 αὔριον] ‘tomorrow’. Temporal marker.
 πορευσόμεθα] ‘we will go’. Predictive future. Perfective. Achievement.
 εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν] ‘into such (and) such city’. Location.
 καί] ‘and’. Connective.
 ποιήσομεν] ‘we will do (spend)’. Predictive future. Perfective. Achievement.
 ἐκεῖ] ‘there’. A location marker.
 ἐνιαυτόν] ‘a year’. Temporal marker.
 καί] ‘and’. Connective.
 ἐμπορευσόμεθα] ‘we will engage in business’. Predictive future. Perfective. Achievement.
 καί] ‘and’. Connective.
 κερδήσομεν] ‘we will make a profit’. Predictive future. Perfective. Achievement.

Verse 14

Text

οἵτινες οὐκ ἐπίστασθε τὸ τῆς αὔριον ποία ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν- ἀτμίς γάρ ἐστε ἢ πρὸς ὀλίγον φαινομένη, ἔπειτα καὶ ἀφανιζομένη-

Analysis

οἵτινες] ‘Whoever’. Nominative subject.
 οὐκ ἐπίστασθε] ‘you do not know’. Gnomic present. Imperfective aspect. State.
 τό] ‘the thing’. Accusative of direct object.
 τῆς αὔριον] ‘of tomorrow’. Subjective genitive.
 ποία] ‘what kind’. Predicate nominative. Indirect question (BDAG).
 ἡ ζωὴ] ‘life’. Nominative subject.
 ὑμῶν] ‘of you’. Subjective genitive.
 ἀτμίς] ‘vapor’. Predicate nominative.
 γάρ] ‘because’. Causal.
 ἐστε] ‘you are’. Impersonal verbs.
 ἢ . . . φαινομένη] ‘which appears’. Attributive participle.
 πρὸς ὀλίγον] ‘for a little while’. Temporal.
 ἔπειτα] ‘then’. Temporal.
 καί] ‘and’. Connective.
 ἀφανιζομένη] ‘vanishes’. Attributive participle.

Verse 15

Text

ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς· ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσομεν καὶ ποιήσομεν τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο.

Analysis

ἀντί] ‘Instead’. Replacement idea.
 τοῦ λέγειν] ‘saying’. Articular infinitive. Genitive after certain preposition.
 ὑμᾶς] ‘you’. Accusative of subject infinitive.
 ἐὰν . . . θελήσῃ] ‘if . . . he wishes’. Third class condition: uncertain of fulfillment, but still likely (Wallace, 696).
 Protasis.
 ὁ κύριος] ‘the Lord’. Nominative subject.
 ζήσομεν] ‘we will live’. Predictive future. Perfective aspect and accomplishment.
 καί] ‘then’. Apodosis.
 ποιήσομεν] ‘we will do’. Predictive future. Perfective aspect and achievement.
 τοῦτο] ‘this’. Accusative of direct object.
 ἢ] ‘or’. Alternate.
 ἐκεῖνο] ‘that’. Accusative of direct object.

Verse 16

Text

νῦν δὲ καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις ὑμῶν· πᾶσα καύχησις τοιαύτη πονηρά ἐστιν.

Analysis

νῦν] 'now'. Temporal marker.

δέ] 'but'. Adversative.

καυχᾶσθε] 'boast'. Habitual present. Imperfective aspect and activity. Cf. 1:9

ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονείαις] 'in arrogances'. Manner.

ὑμῶν] 'of you'. Subjective genitive.

πᾶσα καύχησις τοιαύτη] 'all such boast'. Nominative subject.

πονηρά] 'evil'. Predicate nominative.

ἐστιν] 'is'. Impersonal verb.

Verse 17

Text

εἰδότες οὖν καλὸν ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι, ἁμαρτία αὐτῷ ἐστιν.

Analysis

εἰδότες] 'to the one knows'. Substantival participle.

οὖν] 'therefore'. Inferential.

καλόν] 'good'. Accusative of direct object.

ποιεῖν] 'to do'. Apposition.

καί] 'but'. Adversative.

μὴ ποιοῦντι] 'not to do'. Substantival participle.

ἁμαρτία] 'sin'. Nominative subject.

αὐτῷ] 'to him'. Dative of reference.

Literary Implications

This syntactical analysis challenges Dibelius's (1976) characterization of James as unsystematic paraenesis. The grammatical markers, vocabulary links, and argumentative progression demonstrate deliberate literary architecture. James 3-4 forms a unified wisdom discourse where each section builds upon and develops the previous. The discourse markers (γάρ, δέ, οὖν, Πόθεν, Ἄγε νῦν) guide readers through logical transitions. The first-class conditions throughout both chapters maintain consistency in rhetorical strategy. The repetition of key terms (μέλη, καρδία, καυχόμαι) creates semantic networks binding the text together.

Wisdom as Comprehensive Ethical Framework

James presents wisdom not as intellectual knowledge but as practical discernment determining all behavior. This aligns with Old Testament wisdom literature (Proverbs, Sirach) while applying it distinctly to Christian community life. The two-wisdom schema (3:13-18) provides the theological infrastructure for understanding disparate ethical issues. Whether discussing speech (3:1-12), community conflict (4:1-3), or personal planning (4:13-17), the fundamental question remains: Are you operating by earthly or heavenly wisdom?

Integration of Vertical and Horizontal Dimensions

James integrates relationship with God (vertical) and relationships with others (horizontal) through the wisdom theme. True wisdom manifests in both submission to God (4:7-10, 15) and peaceable community life (3:18, 4:11). This challenges any privatization of faith or reduction of Christianity to mere social ethics.

Speech as Ethical Litmus Test

The extended tongue teaching (3:1-12) identifies speech as the primary indicator of inner wisdom. This elevates speech ethics beyond mere politeness to theological significance. What we say reveals which wisdom governs our hearts (3:14; 4:8).

Value of Syntactical Analysis for Discourse Understanding

This study demonstrates that micro-level grammatical analysis, when integrated with macro-level discourse observations, strengthens arguments for textual coherence. Syntactical features like verbal aspect, genitive functions, and participial constructions provide objective data for tracing thematic development.

Importance of Semantic Field Analysis

Tracking vocabulary clusters (wisdom terms, body language, pride/humility contrasts) reveals conceptual networks invisible to superficial reading. The recurrence of μέλη, καρδία, and cognates of καυχάομαι across chapters 3-4 signals intentional thematic connection.

Discourse Markers as Structural Indicators

The study confirms that Greek particles and conjunctions function as structural signals. The γάρ in 3:2, 16; 4:14 marks causal explanations. The δέ in 3:3, 14; 4:4, 16 signals transitions or contrasts. The οὖν in 4:4, 7, 17 draws inferential conclusions. Attending to these markers clarifies argumentative flow.

Comparative Analysis with Other Studies

Varner's (2010) discourse analysis identified James 3:1-4:12 as a single unit but did not provide detailed syntactical grounding. This study corroborates his macro-structure while adding grammatical precision. McCartney (2009) noted thematic connections but treated chapters 3-4 as loosely related sections. The syntactical evidence presented here demonstrates tighter coherence than McCartney acknowledged. Blomberg and Kamell (2008) proposed concentric structures in James. While this study does not argue for concentricity, it confirms that 3:1-4:17 forms a unified discourse block centered on wisdom.

For Biblical Preaching

Preachers should treat James 3-4 as unified wisdom instruction rather than isolated ethical topics. Sermon series should develop the two-wisdom framework as the interpretive key for specific applications.

For Christian Formation

Discipleship curricula should present James's teaching holistically: controlling speech, managing conflict, resisting worldliness, and planning humbly all flow from cultivating heavenly wisdom.

For Community Ethics

Churches facing conflict should recognize that James diagnoses the problem theologically (wrong wisdom) before prescribing behavioral changes. Sustainable transformation requires heart-level wisdom transformation (4:8), not merely behavioral modification.

Limitations

This study focuses exclusively on James 3-4, leaving questions about how these chapters relate to James 1-2 and 5. A comprehensive discourse analysis of the entire epistle would strengthen conclusions about James's overall coherence. The analysis prioritizes Greek syntax, giving limited attention to intertextual connections with Old Testament wisdom literature, Jesus's teaching, or Hellenistic ethical traditions. These comparative dimensions deserve fuller treatment.

Future Research Directions

Proposed Studies:

1. Syntactical analysis extending to James 1-2 and 5 to demonstrate epistle-wide coherence
2. Comparative analysis of James's wisdom theology with Proverbs, Sirach, and Wisdom of Solomon
3. Examination of James's wisdom discourse in relation to Matthean Jesus tradition
4. Sociological analysis of how wisdom language functioned in early Christian community formation
5. Reception history of James 3-4 in patristic interpretation

CONCLUSION

This discourse-syntactical analysis establishes that wisdom (*σοφία*) functions as the unifying theological-thematic thread connecting James 3 and 4. The grammatical evidence vocabulary repetition, discourse markers, syntactical parallels, and argumentative progression demonstrates deliberate literary architecture rather than random compilation. James presents a coherent argument: The tongue's power (3:1-12) reveals heart-level wisdom orientation (3:13-18), which determines community dynamics (4:1-3) and relationship with God (4:4-6). The solution requires repentance (4:7-10) manifesting in transformed speech toward others (4:11-12) and humble submission to God in planning (4:13-17). The two-wisdom framework (3:13-18) provides the hermeneutical lens through which all specific instructions should be understood. Earthly wisdom characterized by jealousy, selfish ambition, and disorder produces relational chaos and divine opposition. Heavenly wisdom pure, peaceable, and gentle produces righteousness and peace.

This study contributes to Jacobean scholarship by providing syntactical grounding for the epistle's literary coherence, enriching understanding of James's sophisticated wisdom theology, and modeling integration of grammatical and discourse analysis for exegetical methodology.

The ultimate pastoral implication is clear: Christian communities must cultivate wisdom from above through submission to God, purification of heart, and humility before the Lord—wisdom that transforms speech, relationships, and life orientation.

REFERENCES

- Adam, A. K. M. (2013). *James: A handbook on the Greek text*. Baylor University Press.
- Baker, W. R. (2007). *Personal speech-ethics in the Epistle of James*. Mohr Siebeck.
- Batten, A. J. (2010). Friendship and benefaction in James. *Emory Studies in Early Christianity*, 11.
- Bauckham, R. (1999). *James: Wisdom of James, disciple of Jesus the sage*. Routledge.
- Bauer, W., Arndt, W. F., & Danker, F. W. (Eds.). (2000). *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* (3rd ed.). University of Chicago Press.
- Blomberg, C. L., & Kamell, M. J. (2008). *James*. Zondervan.
- Cheung, L. L. (2003). *The genre, composition and hermeneutics of James*. Paternoster.
- Chia, Philip. 2021. Greek Review. Yogyakarta: Stiletto Indie Book.
- Chia, P., & Eveline, S. (2023). An exegesis of teaching about Christian maturity in James 1:1-15. *Journal Didaskalia*, 6(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.33856/didaskalia.v6i1.295>
- Dauids, P. H. (1982). *The Epistle of James: A commentary on the Greek text*. Eerdmans.
- Dibelius, M. (1976). *James: A commentary on the Epistle of James* (H. Greeven, Ed.). Fortress Press.
- Hartin, P. J. (1991). *James and the Q sayings of Jesus*. Sheffield Academic Press.
- Johnson, L. T. (1995). *The Letter of James: A new translation with introduction and commentary*. Doubleday.
- Louw, J. P., & Nida, E. A. (1989). *Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament based on semantic domains* (2nd ed.). United Bible Societies.
- McCartney, D. G. (2009). *James*. Baker Academic.
- McKay, K. L. (1994). *A new syntax of the verb in New Testament Greek: An aspectual approach*. Peter Lang.
- Porter, S. E. (1992). *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield Academic Press.
- Robertson, A. T. (1934). *A grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of historical research* (4th ed.). Broadman Press.
- Runge, S. E. (2010). *Discourse grammar of the Greek New Testament: A practical introduction for teaching and exegesis*. Hendrickson Publishers.
- Smyth, H. W., & Messing, G. M. (1984). *Greek grammar* (Rev. ed.). Harvard University Press.
- Varner, W. C. (2010). *The book of James: A new perspective—A linguistic commentary applying discourse analysis*. Kress Biblical Resources.
- Vlachos, C. A. (2013). *James: Exegetical guide to the Greek New Testament*. B&H Academic.
- Wachob, W. H. (2000). *The voice of Jesus in the social rhetoric of James*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, D. B. (1996). *Greek grammar beyond the basics: An exegetical syntax of the New Testament*. Zondervan.
- Young, R. A. (1994). *Intermediate New Testament Greek*. Broadman & Holman.