

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

Synopsis

Many attempts have been made to understand the relationship between the theology of James and Paul. Whilst some have concluded there is no harmony between them others have forced a harmony through Pauline priority. This paper, in light of the current New Perspective debates, will demonstrate how a detailed investigation of the use of the three key terms πίστις, ἔργα and δικαιοῦν by both James and Paul reveals the way forward to a harmony that upholds the authority of Scripture and the uniqueness of both authors. The classic Protestant answer: 'Faith alone justifies but the faith that justifies is never alone' will be upheld. Three applications of this harmonization will also be presented.

Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?

Introduction

The Epistle of James has long been accused of being at odds with Paul - a view particularly heightened by the Reformation debates over Justification by Faith alone but which has continued through to the more recent 'New Perspective' debates concerning the covenantal status of the believer.

The issue concerns the supposed contradictions between the way James understands the relationship between faith and works in 2:14-26 and how Paul understands these in passages such as Romans 3:27-5:1 and Galatians 2:11-3:14 among others. More specifically James' conclusion that ἡ πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν.

(‘faith apart from works is dead’- 2:26) appears to be in stark contrast to Paul’s δικαιωθῆναι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου (‘justified by faith apart from works of the law’ - Rom 3:28). The matter is further complicated by the fact that both James and Paul use Abraham to back up their seemingly contradictory points by quoting Gen 15:6 ‘Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness’ (c.f. Jas 2:23 with Rom 4:3 & Gal 3:6).

Is James at odds with Paul? This paper will address various attempts to harmonize the writings of James and Paul but first a word of caution. As Douglas Moo observes forcing ‘harmonization of Scripture is both bad exegesis and bad theology’ and so it will be necessary to understand the exegesis along with the underlying theological principles of the key texts so that one might bring together texts that appear to be going in different directions (if indeed it is right that they are brought together).¹

For some scholars there is no harmony at all. At the time of the Reformation Erasmus rejected the apostolic origin of James insisting that the Greek was too advanced for the brother of Jesus to write. Luther famously doubted the apostolic status of the letter calling it a ‘right strawy epistle’² and relegated it to the end of his German New Testament. Luther’s objection was primarily theologically driven by his determination that ‘justification by faith alone’ was the guiding principle behind New Testament

¹ D.J Moo, *The Letter of James*, (Pillar, Leicester: Apollos, 2000) 41.

² Published in *Septembertestament* on 21st Sept 1522. LW35:363.

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

theology. His position led him to create a canon within a canon and separated out James along with Jude, Hebrews and Revelation from the more 'central' New Testament documents.³ Indeed Luther's stance has fueled the debate concerning James and Paul ever since.

More recently J.D.G Dunn has concluded that Paul and James can not be harmonized and do in fact present contradictory viewpoints concerning justification.⁴ His approach is to deal with each of the New Testament letters independently and he does not believe that the New Testament presents a united message of salvation. It is this view that also means Dunn will dispute the Pauline authorship of texts such as Ephesians.⁵

Understanding James

The New Testament claims to be the revelation from God and whilst each book is an independent writing they are part of the one canon of Scripture. Thus a unified view that finds a harmonized position without forcing the text to say something that it does not is required. Needless to say this task is not necessarily easy.

Before considering the attempts for harmonization there are two underlying questions that need to be answered. Should James be understood in the light of Paul? Then conversely, should Paul be understood in the light of James?

James' seemingly direct contradiction of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone has inevitably driven his critical reception and meant that his theology has so often been interpreted from a Pauline perspective. In fact, James was one of the latest books to be accepted as canonical and this may have been due to his apparent disagreement with the Pauline letters.⁶ Further, stylistically, James often appears to closely parallel the Pauline style of writing (c.f. Rom 12:9-21).

³ LW 35:397 as quoted in D. Moo, *The Letter of James*, 5.

⁴ J.D.G Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977), 251-52.

⁵ Dunn see Ephesians to be 'un-Pauline', the composition of a Paulinist sometime after Paul's death - J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1998), 371.

⁶ R. Baulkman, *James* (London: Routledge, 1999), 113-14.

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

Yet this subordination of James to Paul comes at a cost. First it gives prominence to 2:14-26, indirectly making it the heart of James' theological message. By doing so both the flow of argument in the whole letter as well as the context from Chapter 1 where James sets up what he means to be a 'doer of the word' (1:22) are rejected.⁷

Second, it means that James has not been allowed to speak for himself because he is always understood in the light of Paul. James does have his own contribution to make. It is possible that James is simply different and instead of understanding James in contrast to Paul there is value in allowing him to stand alone before any such comparison is made.⁸

Third, although the language James uses often seems to reflect that of Paul, he actually depends more on the specific teachings of Jesus than any other New Testament author. The topics addressed by James and the manner in which they are addressed mimic Jesus' emphasis, particularly that of the Gospel of Matthew.⁹ Of course this argument adds weight to the authorship being that of James the brother of Jesus because he would have been so exposed to Jesus teaching that he reflects it almost unconsciously. Further it may also help explain the apparent contradiction with Paul. Despite Paul's earlier date, James need not have written polemically against Paul because he was writing due to his direct and ongoing contact in the life of Jesus – something that Paul did not experience as one 'abnormally born' (1 Cor 15:8).

This leads to the second question – Should Paul be understood in the light of James? The general assumption is that Paul is historically or canonically primary to James. A moment of reflection on the doctrine of Scripture should lead to a reconsideration of this view to ensure that a 'canon within the canon' is not being created. Certainly early Christians accorded canonical status on James which should encourage modern scholars to value its distinctive contribution to theology and practice. Calvin argued that as James and Paul wrote under the power of the same Spirit that it must be sure

⁷ In a similar way Lutheran tradition has made 'justification by faith alone' the guiding principle behind Pauline theology – a point debated by some.

⁸ R. Baulkman, *James*, 118.

⁹ D.J Moo, *The Letter of James*, 7.

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

that the two are not in conflict.¹⁰ To accept anything less would undermine the unity of Scripture.¹¹

And so recognizing the equal status of both James and Paul in the canon of Scripture this paper will turn to suggesting proposals for understanding the harmony between them. The dilemma is that on the one hand the theology of each should not be understood through the theology of the other, but on the other hand they must not be treated in isolation.

Moo has suggested a way forward by approaching each in turn. He starts with James allowing his theology and practice to be heard before then considering the Pauline critique. In doing so Moo is attempting to correct the historical imbalance of giving priority to Paul.¹²

The argument of James

To understand James 2:14-26 properly it is necessary to return to the letter as a whole. Doing so shows that it needs to be understood in the light of Chapter 1. James starts his letter by describing what it looks like for a man to live in faith – the man of faith is not one who doubts but rather is secure in what God has given him (1:5-8). It is plain that all perfect gifts come from the Father above through the ‘word of truth’. It is this ‘implanted word’ which saves (1:21). His challenge then is to be ‘doers of the word and not hearers only’ (1:22).

It is in this context that James presents what it means to live by faith (2:14-26). The believing acceptance of the Word must be put into practice in life situations.¹³ James sees the works of a person as a mark of his faith. If a person has no works James concludes that that person may not have faith (2:14, 17, 18, 21-22, 24, 26). These are not saying that it is by works that one is saved which is often the accusation leveled at

¹⁰ J. Calvin, *Institutes of Christian Religion*. (Edited by J. T. McNeill; translated by F. L. Battles, 2 vols. Library of Christian Classics; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960), III.xvii.11.

¹¹ J. Calvin, *Institutes*, III.xvii.12.

¹² D.J. Moo, *The Letter of James*, 5.

¹³ T. Laato, ‘Justification according to James: A comparison with Paul’ in *TrinJ* 18 (1997), 51.

Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?

James. The following discussion of terminology will show why this accusation is false.

The New Perspective on Justification

Before investigating the use of three key terms, it will be helpful to further outline the current debates regarding ‘Covenantal Nomism’ and the ‘New Perspective on Paul’ for which this question is significant. E.P. Sanders suggested that the Jewish ‘pattern of religion’ was not legalistic or concerning with earning salvation by works.¹⁴ Israel’s salvation was based on God’s gracious election. Obedience to the law was the response to God’s grace rather than a means for earning a Jew’s standing before God. Disobedience may forfeit that standing. As such ‘righteousness’ refers to the maintaining of a person’s status within the covenant people.¹⁵

The view has been evolved by J.D.G Dunn who has suggested that Paul (especially in Romans and Galatians) was more focused on the issue of Gentile membership in the people of God. He rejects the idea that Israel’s privileged position was restricted to full observance of ‘works of the law’ which marks out the Jew from the Gentile. And so when Paul speaks against justification by ‘works of the law’ he is not opposing the notion of self achievement through obedience of the law, but ‘works of the law’ being essential markers of Israel’s covenantal status.¹⁶

There are helpful correctives offered by the New Perspective but adjustments need to be made particularly when it comes to understanding salvation and works of the law. Jewish thought suggested that being born into the covenant was not a guarantee of salvation, and that in fact obedience to the law was needed to be saved on the last day. James’ account of justification seems to follow this pattern.¹⁷ Or does it?

If James’ ‘works’ were to be understood in relation to the law then this account of justification would follow the pattern of religion suggested by Covenantal Nomism. What has been shown is that James’ ‘works’ were understood in the context of faith –

¹⁴ E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

¹⁵ R. Baulkham, *James*, 132.

¹⁶ J.D.G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 379.

¹⁷ R. Baulkham, *James*, 132.

Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?

not faith determined by covenantal selection, nor faith achieved by obedience to works of the law, but faith brought forth by the word of truth (1:18).

As Dunn reads Romans 4:4-5 he takes the underlying context to be the Jewish Pharisaism and covenantal exclusiveness marked by legal observance. Effectively this means he misunderstands Paul's use of Genesis 15:6 in Romans 4 (and Galatians 2). He fails to take into account the salvation historical context of the two texts and he does not see how Paul rebukes those who see 'works of the law' playing a role in their salvation.

Ironically, in what follows it will be seen that James is the corrective. As he seemingly contradicts Paul he would be an obvious person to appeal to in order to back up covenantal nomism theology, but his interest in works of the law are not applied to issues of justification by faith.

Understanding terminology

Considering three important terms James uses, specifically πίστις (faith), ἔργα (works) and δικαιόω (justify), will help clarify as well as set a solid foundation on which to find possible harmonization.

Faith

First, James speaks of πίστις in two different ways. The term is used 14 times and all but four occur in 2:14-26. Elsewhere to the book he has used the term to express *trust placed in God* (1:3, 6; 2:5; 5:15), but in 2:14-26 his usage is distinctly different. Faith is used to describe *the belief that 'God is one'* (2:19) – something even the demons believe.¹⁸ To that end it is understood as a form of intellectual assent.¹⁹ For James the resulting obedience motivated by faith is the proof for the sincerity of a living (as opposed to dead) faith. Deeds then are the necessary result of commitment to Christ.²⁰

¹⁸ P.H. Davids, *The Epistle of James – A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC, Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1982), 50.

¹⁹ R. Baulkman, *James*, 128.

²⁰ Moo suggests that given the context, James understands faith as expressed in love – not unlike Paul in Galatians 5:6. D.Moo, *The Letter of James*, 38.

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

Paul's use of the term reflects that of James' first usage rather than of the second. Paul does not make a distinction in the way he uses the term and sees only one type of faith. For Paul there is not living or dead faith, but instead a faith that one either has or does not. Faith as mere intellectual assent is never under consideration in Paul's discussion.²¹

Historically scholars have seen that James (James 2) and Paul (Romans 4 & Gal 3) use the example of Abraham in support of seemingly opposite conclusions. However this does not recognize the different ways that both authors are using Genesis 15:6. Both Paul and James are relying on Jewish tradition. James uses traditional Jewish exegesis while Paul changes the terminology for didactic purposes.

In Genesis 15:6 it appears to say that Abraham is justified on account of his faith in the promise of God. Then in Genesis 22 the promise is repeated after Abraham passes his test, trusting God and not withholding his son Isaac – *the Aqedah* (Gen 22:16). Thus it appears that Abraham is seen to be righteous for his obedience in faith. James' link of Genesis 15:6 to the Aqedah, where Abraham's faith is seen in his works, is consistent with Jewish exegetical tradition.²² This suggests that Abraham's righteousness is reckoned on the basis of his faith which is expressed in his works, thus supporting James' point in James 2:22.

Abraham's faith, that is one completed by works, is the exemplar of the faith of which James has been writing.²³ James is in agreement with the Old Testament in justification being an indivisible whole. He places the emphasis on faith but does not eliminate works.²⁴

Paul is dependent on similar Jewish exegetical tradition but uses the terminology to make a different point. He emphasizes that Abraham is already justified in the promise before he is commanded to circumcise his household in Genesis 17. In Romans 4 and Galatians 3 Paul is using Abraham's status as a man of faith, marked

²¹ R. Baulkman, *James*, 128.

²² R. Baulkman, *James*, 131.

²³ 2:25 he also uses Rahab to make the same point.

²⁴ T. Laato, *TrinJ* 18, 71

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

by the promise that God has bestowed on him before he performs any works, to make the point that righteousness has been achieved by God and so Abraham has nothing to boast about (Rom 4:2).

Justify

Second is the use of δεικναι, key because both James and Paul refer to the righteousness that is reckoned to Abraham. Although James only uses the term three times, the use of Genesis 15:6 in his argument that faith must be living and shown in deeds makes it important. For James he uses this word group as he argues that those who have faith must *show themselves to be righteous*²⁵. James is then using the term in complete agreement with the Old Testament and speaks of a Christian works-righteousness.²⁶

Paul is a much more prolific user of the term. It is used in both the negative and positive way. The negative shows that justification takes place by faith and *not* by works (Rom 4:2) or by works of the law (Romans 3:20, 28; Gal 2:16). This use is also picked up by Ephesians and the Pastorals where God offers salvation quite apart from the ‘deeds of righteousness’.²⁷ Additionally Ephesians and the Pastorals insist that although not saved *by* good works, believers have been saved *for* good works. (Eph 2:8-10, 2 Tim 1:9 or Titus 3:4-7).

In the positive, Paul uses the term to demonstrate that the man of faith has been ‘justified’ – in other words ‘declared righteous’ (Rom 2:13; 3:24, 5:1, 8:30). He stresses the living character of faith for the purposes of justification but unlike James never relates a works-righteousness to Christians presumably to avoid Jewish misunderstanding.²⁸

When Paul speaks of Abraham’s belief being ‘credited to him as righteousness’ (Rom 4:3; Gal 3:6) he is using it in a different sense to James. Paul is stating the basis for

²⁵ P.H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 51.

²⁶ T. Laato, *TrinJ* 18, 76.

²⁷ S. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul – the ‘Lutheran’ Paul and his Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns Publishing, 2004), 406 – notably these verses are not dealt with in any length by Sanders, Dunn, or Wright on the grounds that Ephesians is not an authorized text.

²⁸ T. Laato, *TrinJ* 18, 76.

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

one's justification, James is stating the necessary result of one's justification – that it shows itself in good works.

Works

Third, James' and Paul's use of ἔργα should be considered. They use 'works' in clearly different ways. James to describe moral deeds as distinct from the law whilst Paul essentially uses the term negatively in relation to ceremonial works of the law.

James refers to 'works' 13 times and always in the plural. For James, works are moral deeds that flow from true faith.²⁹ Furthermore 10 of the references come from 2:14-26 making it clear that faith and works are integrally linked for James. It is clear that James does not disregard the importance of the law, as he mentions it in three separate passages - 1:25, 2:8-12 and 4:11-12. His treatment of the law however seems to have no interest in ceremonial aspects of the Old Testament, but simply as the moral imperative similar to that of the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:17-20).³⁰ What is interesting is that James is not a legalist. His whole discussion of the law is held in the context of the 'implanted word' (1:18, 21) and is not connected to our key passage of James 2:14-26.³¹ In fact, as seen, whilst the concentration of the references to 'work' fall in Chapter 2:14-26, there is no mention of the law. James does not seem concerned with aspects of Jewish obedience to the law or obedience to the law as a condition of faith – but instead works in general, in which obedience to God or even human decency is on show, which is why Abraham and Rahab are mentioned.³²

In contrast Paul explicitly and implicitly links 'works' with 'law'. It is not that he rejects the value of moral deeds, in fact he commands them (c.f. Gal 6:6, 10; 2 Cor 9:8; Col 1:10; 1 Cor 15:58). However Paul does not use the 'works' terminology to make his point.³³ He consistently criticizes 'works of the law' in relation to those who attempt to win their salvation through such works. At a simple level this can be seen by his preferred use of the phrase 'works of the law' in contrast to James' simpler

²⁹ P.H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 50-51.

³⁰ P.H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 47-48.

³¹ Davids suggested that James is influenced not by the Gospel tradition, but rather from the very words of Jesus thus presenting a 'new law' – P.H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, 50.

³² S. Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul – the 'Lutheran' Paul and his Critics*, 407.

³³ T Laato, *TrinJ* 18, 74.

Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?

‘works’.³⁴ At a deeper level in Galatians and Romans, Paul discusses justification with reference to the issue of Gentile membership in the people of God. The question is whether they must, in addition to faith in Christ, do ‘works of the law’ – that is Jewish customs such as circumcision, food laws and the Sabbath. James never mentions these customs despite his treatment of the law.³⁵

It is the positive side of James’ formulation ‘justified by works’ (2:21) that is the most problematic for the Pauline perspective. The key question is whether Abraham’s ‘works’ could be understood as achievements on which he could rely in relation to God, thus compromising faith as total and unconditional trust in God.³⁶ When considered, as suggested, in the light of James 1:6-7 (a faith that is secure and without doubt) then the answer should be negative. James does not have in mind works of self-reliance which comprises faith. When Paul says that justification is not by works he does not have in mind work done in faith (like James), but rather work done out of faith. James and Paul are using the same terminology to make two different points.

Proposals for Harmony

And so it is with this exegetical backdrop that we can consider three proposals for harmonizing James and Paul. The first two fit well with the outcomes of the investigation of the argument and terminology of James however the third, double justification, needs to be treated with more caution.

1) Understanding agenda

First, given the way that James and Paul appear to use the same terms differently it is likely that they are simply addressing different agendas. There is no hint in James of a personal conflict with Paul or a polemic attack on Paul and so James is not running an anti-Pauline agenda as some have suggested. Instead the issues that each are addressing may provide an explanation for bringing the two together.

³⁴ D.J. Moo, *The Letter of James*, 38.

³⁵ R. Baulkman, *James*, 128.

³⁶ R Baulkman, *James*, 134.

Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?

James attacks moral laxity, refuting the attempt of some to minimize the gospel demand for putting faith into action.³⁷ Further James appears to be addressing principles for putting faith into action – principles in a sense that are timeless.

Paul attacks those who appear to assume faith can be earned by doing good works – specifically those concerning the Jewish law. He is addressing specific principles of ethnicity, racism and national pride that have become confused with faith.³⁸

Paul and James are at different points in the *ordo salutis*. Both agree theologically but start at a different point. Paul, operating from first principles, is concerned with what it means for someone to enter into the Christians life, not relying on works of the law, but being saved through faith as a gift from God (Eph 2:8-9). James is later and operating under later principles is concerned for professing Christians who are falling into complacency or wrong-doing and need a reminder that genuine faith must be issued in good works which are not salvific but still necessary.³⁹

And so the mediating position is that both James and Paul theologically agree but yet start from different positions.

2) Understanding intended audience

Second, James and Paul have different audiences in mind.⁴⁰ There are several references in the New Testament where we find James and Paul in communion (Acts 15, 21; Gal 2). The most notable is Acts 15 where they jointly address the Council of Jerusalem. The issue they address is a debate over whether Gentiles should be circumcised. James and Paul in that context are united in their position on Gentiles entering into the people of God. With the possible exception of Galatians 2:12, James in the New Testament never rejects the reception of Gentiles.⁴¹ Paul of course, as the apostle to the Gentiles, is actively fighting for their cause. In the Letter of James there

³⁷ P.H. Davids, 21.

³⁸ S. Westerholm, 407.

³⁹ R.P Martin, *James* (WBC, Waco: Word, 1988), 82.

⁴⁰ R.P. Martin, *James*, 82.

⁴¹ Although James' rejection of the Gentiles may not have been to their reception, but rather in reaction to pressure from the 'circumcision group'.

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

is no mention of the Gentiles and the letter is addressed specifically to the ‘twelve tribes in the Dispersion’ (1:1). So it is fairly reasonable to suggest that James was written to a Jewish audience. Furthermore given what has been discussed concerning James view of ‘faith’ it is likely that that audience was also Christian.

Paul’s intended audience is not so specific as he writes to the churches in different locations. Within those churches he appeals to a fairly broad range of people – who may have been Jews or Gentiles. Furthermore given what has been discussed concerning Paul’s view of ‘faith’ it is likely that his audience included both Christian and non-Christian - and this later group would have included Jews who thought themselves to be Christian on the basis of their ‘works of the law’.

With different audiences the difference in emphasis between James and Paul can be understood. James takes aim at Jewish Christians particularly those who thought their belief was enough to guarantee their salvation (2:19). Their error is rebuked (complacency or laziness) and they are told to do good works so that their faith would be seen and valid.⁴² A slight variation on this audience, although still Christian, could be that James was addressing a disagreement among Christians and so his rebuke aims to clarify how they might live as Christians.⁴³ Either way James’ concern is for a true Christianity as opposed to idle worship.

James is often accused of being a legalist – in part because of his command to ‘fulfill the royal law according to Scripture’ (2:8). If his argument was to receive faith by keeping the law (what Paul was against), then why would he write legalistically to the Jewish Christians who no doubt held the same position?⁴⁴ James’s argument is against quietism.

Paul with his broader group in mind is concerned that people, Jew and Gentile, approach faith on God’s terms rather than on their own. The Jewish Pharisaic traditions constantly taught that special ceremonies and customs needed to be performed to ensure that you were accepted into the faith. Paul’s message is ‘by no

⁴² R. Baulkman, *James*, 127.

⁴³ T. Laato, *TrinJ* 18 , 65.

⁴⁴ P.H. Davids, 20.

Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?

means' – no works of the law will on an individuals effort win them a place at God's table. Paul's argument is against legalism.

3) Double Justification

The third proposal for harmonization is the suggestion that there are 'two justifications'. This is a view that has been taught by both Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians.⁴⁵ The first justification is the initial act of acceptance (Paul) based on faith alone. The second justification is the final vindication (James) based on works in addition to faith.

This distinction may not be fair on Paul as theologians have also debated the apparent conflict in Paul regarding his teaching of 'justification by faith' and 'judgment by works' – but what can be said is that Paul is clear that justification is by God's grace and that Christians must respond to God's grace. Their 'works' are themselves the 'work' of God (Phil 2:13), the 'fruit' that the Spirit produces (Gal 5:22).⁴⁶

Is James saying the same? By viewing 'justify' in James as we have discussed, a demonstration of righteousness, it is important not to stress the division too strongly as faith could end up separated from works completely. An unbiblical wedge would be driven between salvation and justification as salvation would become a feature of faith and justification a feature of righteousness.

A way forward may be to consider what James says is 'works' and Paul says are 'Christians works'. James is quite clear that a person will be held in account, 'justified' by his works. This is not a foreign idea for Paul for on the day of wrath when God's righteous anger is revealed 'he will render to every man according to his works' (Rom 2:6). Both believe that judgment according to works takes place. A cautious harmony between James and Paul may rest in the fact that it is in Faith alone that one is brought into a salvation relationship with God through Christ, but due to the intimate connection between faith and works, that faith generates the works that

⁴⁵ Two examples: Robert Bellarmine (Roman Catholic) and Martin Bucer (Protestant)
⁴⁶ D. J Moo, *The Letter of James*, 42.

Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?

God will judge.⁴⁷ Works then have a role in securing God's vindication in the judgment.⁴⁸

Conclusion

This paper has shown that Paul and James are in theological agreement. The perceived disagreement between the two has evolved from their different use of terminology. Although there will be ongoing debate concerning the place of justification by faith in relation to works the investigation of the terms πίστις, ἔργα and δικαιόω has shown that readers of the New Testament are able to acknowledge the unity of thought and yet the unique use of language between these two authors. These different uses are appropriate given they were writing for different agendas and addressing different audiences. Thus the classic Protestant answer: 'Faith alone justifies but the faith that justifies is never alone' is seen to be upheld and the harmony of James and Paul is found in their theology concerning the justification of a sinner.

⁴⁷ A. Hoekema, *The Bible and the Future*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1979), 261.

⁴⁸ D.J. Moo, *The Letter of James*, 43.

***Is James at odds with Paul?
Is there a way forward in understanding harmony between them?***

Bibliography

- Baulkman, R., *James*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Calvin, J., *Institutes of Christian Religion*. Edited by J. T. McNeill; translated by F. L. Battles, 2 vols. Library of Christian Classics; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1960.
- Davids, P.H., *The Epistle of James – A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC, Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1982.
- Dibelius, M., *James*. Edited by H. Koester. Translated by M.A. Williams. Hermeniaia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Dunn, J.D.G., *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.
- _____, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1998.
- Hoekema, A., *The Bible and the Future*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1979.
- Laato, T., 'Justification according to James: A comparison with Paul' in *TrinJ* 18 (1997), 43-84.
- _____, 'Paul's Anthropological Considerations: Two Problems' in *Justification and Variegated Nomism Volume 2 – The Paradoxes of Paul*. eds. D.A. Carson, P.T. O'Brien, M.A. Seifrid; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004, 343-60.
- Lodge, J.D., 'James and Paul at Cross-Purposes? James 2:22' in *Biblica* Vol 62 (1981), 195-213.
- Martin, R.P., *James*. WBC, Waco: Word, 1988.
- Moo, D.J., *The Letter of James*. Pillar, Leicester: Apollos, 2000.
- _____, *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT, Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns, 1996.
- Sanders, E.P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- Schreiner, T.S., *Romans*. ECNT, Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.
- Westerholm, S., *Perspectives Old and New on Paul – the 'Lutheran' Paul and his Critics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmanns Publishing, 2004.