FAITH WITHOUT WORKS IS DEAD

James 2 and Sola Fide: Genuine Contradiction or Problem of Exegesis?

A Critical Examination from the Greek New Testament (NA28/UBS5)
with Pre-Nicene Patristic Evidence, Pauline Epistles, and the Gospel of John

ABSTRACT

The statement of James 2:26 — 'faith without works is dead' (ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστιν) — has been regarded by many, from Martin Luther to modern critics, as standing in irreconcilable tension with Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone (Sola Fide) as expressed in Galatians, Ephesians, Romans, and the Johannine Gospel. This paper conducts a systematic exegetical investigation using the Greek NA28 critical text to determine whether James constitutes a genuine theological contradiction to Sola Fide, or whether the apparent conflict is an artifact of improper exegesis — a failure to account for different audiences, different uses of the same Greek vocabulary, different rhetorical targets, and different moments in the salvation timeline. Pre-Nicene patristic sources are examined for their handling of the James-Paul tension, and the paper concludes with a synthesis that honors the full canonical witness.

PART I: THE PROBLEM STATED — WHAT IS THE APPARENT CONTRADICTION?

1.1 The Two Apparently Irreconcilable Positions

On the surface, Paul and James appear to teach opposite doctrines regarding faith and works in relation to salvation. The conflict can be stated with maximum sharpness by placing the key texts side by side:

PAUL — Faith Without Works	JAMES — Faith Without Works
'we know that a person is not justified from works	'You see that a person is justified from works and

of law except through faith in Jesus Christ' (Gal 2:16)	not from faith alone' (Jas 2:24)
'for by grace you have been saved through faith; and this is not from you, it is the gift of God; not from works, lest anyone should boast' (Eph 2:8–9)	'faith without works is dead' (Jas 2:26)
'we reckon that a person is justified by faith apart from works of law' (Rom 3:28)	'Was not Abraham our father justified from works when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar?' (Jas 2:21)
'the one who does not work but believes in him who justifies the ungodly — his faith is credited as righteousness' (Rom 4:5)	'For as the body apart from the spirit is dead, so also faith apart from works is dead' (Jas 2:26)

The conflict appears stark: Paul excludes works as the ground of justification; James includes works as necessary for justification. Both cite Abraham. Both use the same Greek vocabulary: δικαιόω (dikaioō — to justify), πίστις (pistis — faith), ἔργα (erga — works). If both authors are using these terms in identical senses, a genuine doctrinal contradiction exists within the New Testament canon — a conclusion with devastating implications for Sola Fide, for the coherence of Scripture, and for any systematic theology that treats the NT as a unified doctrinal deposit.

1.2 Luther's Radical Response: 'An Epistle of Straw'

Martin Luther (1483–1546), the father of the Reformation and the formulator of Sola Fide as a confessional doctrine, was sufficiently troubled by James 2 that he questioned its canonical status. In the Preface to the New Testament (1522), Luther wrote:

> *In a word, St. John's Gospel and his first epistle, St. Paul's epistles, especially Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians, and St. Peter's first epistle are the books that show you Christ and teach you all that is necessary and salutary for you to know, even if you were never to see or hear any other book or doctrine. Therefore St. James' epistle is really an epistle of straw [eine rechte stroerne Epistel], compared to these others, for it has nothing of the nature of the gospel about it.* **— Luther, Preface to the New Testament (1522)**

Luther never formally removed James from the canon, but he positioned it last in his German New Testament and expressed sustained skepticism about its apostolic authority. This response — however understandable given the high theological stakes — is now widely criticized by Lutheran scholars themselves as an overreach that created more problems than it solved. Luther was permitting his systematic theology to adjudicate the canon rather than allowing the canon to discipline his theology.

The question this paper addresses is more precise: Is Luther's alarm exegetically warranted? Does James 2 actually contradict Paul and the Sola Fide reading of the Greek NT? Or does the apparent contradiction evaporate under careful contextual, grammatical, and canonical analysis?

PART II: THE GREEK TEXT OF JAMES 2 — A LINE-BY-LINE ANALYSIS

2.1 The Literary Unit: James 2:14–26

Before any verse can be isolated, the pericope (literary unit) must be identified. James 2:14–26 constitutes a unified rhetorical argument introduced by a diatribe question in 2:14. The entire unit must be read together. Its structure:

1. 2:14–17 — The diatribe question: What profit (ὄφελος) is faith without works?
2. 2:18–19 — An imaginary interlocutor is introduced; the faith of demons is cited
3. 2:20–24 — Abraham as proof: works justified him at Moriah (Genesis 22)
4. 2:25 — Rahab as a second proof
5. 2:26 — The concluding analogy: body/spirit :: faith/works

2.2 James 2:14 — The Opening Question

> *Τί τὸ ὄφελος, ἀδελφοί μου, ἐὰν πίστιν λέγῃ τις ἔχειν ἔργα δὲ μὴ ἔχῃ; μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶζειν αὐτόν;* *"What is the profit, my brothers, if someone claims to have faith but does not have works? Can that faith save him?"* **— James 2:14, NA28**

Critical Greek observations:

6. The verb is λέγῃ (legē — present active subjunctive of λέγω): 'if someone says/claims to have faith.' The subjunctive mood introduces a hypothetical conditional (ἐάν + subjunctive = third-class condition, uncertain reality). James is not asserting that this person has genuine faith; he is positing a hypothetical claim.
7. The phrase πίστιν λέγῃ τις ἔχειν (someone claims to have faith) uses an infinitive ἔχειν (to have) governed by λέγῃ (claims). The emphasis on λέγῃ (the saying/claiming) rather than simply ἔχῃ (has) is a subtle but important marker that James is targeting professed, claimed, verbal faith — not necessarily actual faith in the Pauline sense.
8. The article in the final question — μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶζειν αὐτόν (can THAT faith save him?) — is definite and anaphoric. ἡ πίστις (that faith, the faith just described — barren, workless) is the specific faith in question. James is not asking whether 'faith' in the abstract saves, but whether this particular kind of dead, workless, claim-without-fruit 'faith' saves.

2.3 James 2:17 — 'Faith Without Works is Dead'

> *οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις, ἐὰν μὴ ἔχῃ ἔργα, νεκρά ἐστιν καθ' ἑαυτήν.* *"So also faith, if it does not have works, is dead by itself."* **— James 2:17, NA28**

The key word is νεκρά (nekra — dead, lifeless, inert). In the Greek world, the antonym of νεκρός is ζωντανός (living) or ἐνεργής (active, working). A body that is νεκρός performs no functions; it is not partially alive. James's analogy in 2:26 makes this explicit: as a body without a spirit (σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος) is dead — meaning it is not a body at all in any functional sense, merely a corpse — so 'faith' without works is not genuine saving faith but a corpse wearing the label 'faith.'

The phrase καθ᾽ ἑαυτήν (kath' heautēn — by itself, in itself, considered on its own) is a philosophical qualifier: viewed in isolation, this kind of faith reveals itself as dead. It is not that works are added to faith as an external supplement; it is that the presence of works is the diagnostic proof of whether something called 'faith' is genuinely alive. A living faith is self-evidently alive because it produces fruit. A dead 'faith' is self-evidently dead because it produces nothing.

2.4 James 2:18–19 — The Imaginary Interlocutor and the Demons

> *Ἀλλ᾽ ἐρεῖ τις· Σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις κἀγὼ ἔργα ἔχω. δεῖξόν μοι τὴν πίστιν σου χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων, κἀγώ σοι δείξω ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου τὴν πίστιν.* *"But someone will say, 'You have faith and I have works.' Show me your faith apart from your works, and I will show you faith from my works."* **— James 2:18, NA28**

This is the rhetorical pivot of the passage. James introduces a diatribal interlocutor (ἐρεῖ τις — someone will say) — a literary device common in ancient philosophical discourse (cf. Paul's use of the same device in Romans 2:1, 9:19). The interlocutor attempts to separate faith and works into two independent gifts, possessed by different people. James's counter is epistemological: faith is invisible and can only be demonstrated — δείξω (I will show) — through the evidence of works. Works are not the root of faith; they are its visible fruit, the only available evidence of an otherwise invisible interior reality.

James 2:19 is the most theologically significant verse in the chapter for understanding what kind of 'faith' he is targeting:

> *σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός· καλῶς ποιεῖς· καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν.* *"You believe that God is one — you do well! Even the demons believe — and tremble."* **— James 2:19, NA28**

This verse defines the specific target of James's polemic: the faith he is critiquing is the kind possessed by demons — πιστεύουσιν (they believe). The Greek verb πιστεύω here means intellectual assent to a proposition (in this case, Jewish monotheism — εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός, citing the Shema of Deuteronomy 6:4). The demons' response — φρίσσουσιν (they shudder, they tremble) — reveals that this intellectual recognition produces terror but no transformation, no allegiance, no love, no obedience. Demons know God exists; they do not trust him, love him, or serve him.

This is decisive for the entire argument: James is not targeting Pauline πίστις (trust, reliance upon, entrusting oneself to God in Christ). He is targeting the hollow, intellectualist, content-less claim of 'believing' that amounts to nothing more than cognitive assent to theological propositions. The Greek verb πιστεύω has a broad semantic range: from mere intellectual acknowledgment (James's

target) to full personal trust and self-entrustment (Paul's subject). Luther later made exactly this distinction between fiducia (trust) and assensus (assent) — the very distinction James himself is making in the Greek.

2.5 James 2:20–24 — Abraham: The Central Exegetical Puzzle

> *Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη ἀνενέγκας Ἰσαὰκ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον;* *"Was not Abraham our father justified from works [ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη] when he offered Isaac his son upon the altar?"* **— James 2:21, NA28**

James then quotes the same Genesis 15:6 text that Paul uses in Romans 4 and Galatians 3:

> *καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα· ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, καὶ φίλος θεοῦ ἐκλήθη.* *"And the Scripture was fulfilled which says, 'Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness,' and he was called the friend of God."* **— James 2:23, NA28**

The identical text — Genesis 15:6 — is used by both Paul and James to support opposite-sounding conclusions. This is the crux of the apparent contradiction. Paul uses it to prove that Abraham was justified by faith apart from works (Rom 4:3–5); James uses it to demonstrate that Abraham's faith was completed/perfected by works (Jas 2:22–23). How can the same text support two different conclusions?

The resolution lies in the chronological relationship between the two events James references:

Genesis Text	Event	Theological Significance
Gen 15:6	Abraham believed God — credited as righteousness. Paul's justification event (Rom 4:3, Gal 3:6; Jas 2:23)	JUSTIFICATION by faith. Occurred approximately 25 years before Moriah. Abraham is here declared righteous by God on the basis of his faith.
Gen 22	Abraham offers Isaac on the altar. James's works event (Jas 2:21)	DEMONSTRATION of faith. Occurs ~25 years after Gen 15:6. Abraham's already-established faith is PROVEN genuine by the supreme act of obedience.

This chronological sequence is the key. In James 2:22, the verb is ἐτελειώθη (eteleiōthē — was completed, perfected, brought to its intended end): 'his faith worked together with his works (ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ), and by works the faith was completed (ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἐτελειώθη ἡ πίστις).' The verb τελειόω (teleioō) does not mean 'created' or 'generated' — it means brought to completion, matured, shown to be what it truly was. The faith was already there, declared righteous in Genesis 15. Genesis 22 completed it, demonstrated it, vindicated it.

Paul is answering: On what basis was Abraham declared righteous before God? Answer: Faith, not works.

James is answering: How do we know Abraham's faith was genuine and not mere verbal claim? Answer: His works proved it.

The questions are different. The Greek vocabulary overlaps but the referent of δικαιόω differs, as we examine next.

PART III: THE CRUX — TWO SEMANTIC USES OF δικαιόω (DIKAIOŌ)

3.1 The Forensic Use (Paul)

In classical and Koine Greek, δικαιόω (dikaioō) has a well-established forensic/legal semantic domain. In a law court context, δικαιόω does not mean to make someone righteous (that would be ἁγιάζω — to sanctify, or δικαιόω with an ontological sense). It means to declare someone righteous, to pronounce a verdict of acquittal, to reckon as standing in a right relationship. The related noun δικαίωσις (dikaiōsis) appears in Romans 4:25 and 5:18 in precisely this forensic sense: 'justification,' the act of declaring righteous.

The standard Greek-English lexicon (BDAG) defines δικαιόω in the Pauline context: 'to put in a right relationship, to declare righteous, to acquit.' This is judicial language — the language of a verdict — not of moral transformation. When Paul writes in Galatians 2:16 that 'a person is not justified (δικαιοῦται) from works of law,' he means: no one receives God's favorable forensic verdict on the basis of law-keeping. The verdict is rendered on the basis of faith.

3.2 The Demonstrative Use (James)

The same verb δικαιόω carries a second semantic range in Greek usage: to vindicate, to demonstrate as righteous, to show oneself to be right, to be proven correct. This demonstrative/vindicatory use is well attested:

- Luke 7:29 — πᾶς ὁ λαὸς... ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν: 'all the people... justified (vindicated, acknowledged as righteous) God' — they did not make God righteous; they recognized and declared his righteousness publicly.
- Luke 7:35 — καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς: 'Wisdom is justified by all her children' — wisdom is vindicated/proven right by its fruits.
- Matthew 12:37 — ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ: 'for by your words you will be justified' — vindicated, proven righteous before a human audience.

- Romans 3:4 (citing Ps 51:4) — ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου: 'so that you might be justified/vindicated in your words' — God shown to be right.

These non-forensic uses of δικαιόω all carry the sense of public demonstration, visible vindication, or acknowledgment of righteousness — not the legal declaration of status before a divine tribunal. The BDAG lexicon lists this as a separate semantic entry: 'to demonstrate to be morally right, to vindicate.'

3.3 Which Use Does James Employ?

The entire contextual weight of James 2 supports the demonstrative/vindicatory use:

9. James's audience is human observers: 'Show me your faith apart from your works' (2:18, δεῖξόν μοι — show me). The entire argument operates in the realm of visible, interpersonal demonstration. Who can see a person's inner faith? Only God. But works are visible to all. James is operating on the horizontal plane (human observation) while Paul operates on the vertical plane (God's declaration).
10. The interlocutor challenge (2:18) is epistemological, not soteriological: the question is not how is a person made right with God? but how do we know that someone's claimed faith is real? James's answer: by the works that faith produces.
11. The Abraham example supports this reading: James says his faith was 'completed' (ἐτελειώθη, 2:22) at Genesis 22 — but Genesis 15:6, which he quotes in 2:23, had already declared Abraham righteous decades earlier. The offering of Isaac completed, demonstrated, vindicated the already-existing righteousness of Genesis 15.
12. The Rahab example (2:25) confirms it: 'Was not Rahab the prostitute likewise justified from works (ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη) when she received the messengers and sent them out another way?' Rahab's 'justification' here refers to her being vindicated and saved by the visible act of sheltering the spies (Joshua 2) — a demonstrable act that proved the genuineness of her faith in the God of Israel (cf. Hebrews 11:31, where she is listed by faith).

3.4 Summary: The Two-Audience, Two-Question Framework

Category	PAUL (Gal, Eph, Rom, Phil)	JAMES (James 2)
Question asked	On what BASIS is a person declared righteous before God?	How do we DEMONSTRATE / PROVE that professed faith is genuine?
Audience for δικαιόω	God — the divine tribunal; vertical relationship (coram Deo)	Human observers — visible demonstration; horizontal plane (coram hominibus)
Use of δικαιόω	Forensic: declare righteous, acquit, render favorable verdict	Demonstrative: vindicate, prove right, show genuine
Target of polemic	Jewish Christians / Judaizers insisting on Torah works as basis of standing before	Antinomian Christians claiming verbal faith while living in moral indifference

	God	
Meaning of 'works'	ἔργα νόμου — works of the Mosaic law; law-keeping as meritorious achievement	ἔργα — visible deeds of mercy, obedience, and love that flow from living faith (cf. Jas 2:15–16)
Abraham passage	Genesis 15:6 — 'believed God and it was credited as righteousness.' Proves faith precedes and grounds justification.	Genesis 22 (Moriah) — proves that 25 years later, the Genesis 15 faith was real, not empty, because it produced the supreme act of obedience.
Conclusion	Righteous standing before God is granted by grace through faith, apart from meritorious works	Genuine saving faith always produces works; professed faith without works is dead — it is not real faith at all

PART IV: PAUL'S DOCTRINE IN FULL — FAITH, WORKS, AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP

4.1 Galatians — The Forensic Exclusion

The Epistle to the Galatians was written against Judaizers demanding Torah observance as a supplement to faith for full justification. Paul's argument is categorical:

> *εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ... ὅτι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ.* *"Knowing that a person is not justified from works of law except through faith in Jesus Christ... because from works of law no flesh will be justified."* **— Galatians 2:16, NA28**

Paul's ἐξ ἔργων νόμου (from works of law) appears three times in one verse — rhetorical anaphora that renders the exclusion emphatic and absolute. The phrase refers to Mosaic law-observance as a basis of standing before God. But crucially, Paul also demands works from those justified by faith:

> *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη.* *"...faith working through love [pistis di' agapēs energoumenē]."* **— Galatians 5:6, NA28**

The participial phrase ἐνεργουμένη (energoumenē — active, working, operative) is the same root as ἐνεργής (energēs — working, active). Paul is not describing a faith that sits idle; he describes a faith that operates through love. Galatians 5:22–23 lists the fruit of the Spirit — love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control — as the necessary product of Spirit-filled life after justification. These are the works James is calling for.

4.2 Ephesians 2:8–10 — The Complete Formula

Ephesians 2 contains the most comprehensive single-passage expression of the Paul-James synthesis because Paul himself addresses both poles in three consecutive verses:

> *τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι διὰ πίστεως· καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ὑμῶν, θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον· οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, ἵνα μή τις καυχήσηται. αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν.* *"For by grace you have been saved through faith — and this is not from you, it is the gift of God — not from works, lest anyone should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand so that we might walk in them."*
> **— Ephesians 2:8–10, NA28**

The structure of these three verses encapsulates the entire Paul-James relationship:

13. v.8 — Salvation is by grace (χάρις), received through faith (διὰ πίστεως), entirely a gift of God (θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον). Works are excluded as the basis (v.9: οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων — not from works).
14. v.10 — Good works (ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς) are the sphere and purpose of the new creation: we were created for them, God prepared them in advance, we are to walk in them.

Paul thus teaches: works excluded as ground → works required as fruit. James teaches: faith required as root → works required as proof. They are describing two sides of the same organic reality. Works saved no one; works prove and complete genuine faith in the one who is saved.

The grammatical point about v.9 is worth reinforcing: the purpose clause *ἵνα μή τις καυχήσηται* (lest anyone should boast) uses the aorist subjunctive *καυχήσηται* — indefinite and absolute. The reason works are excluded from the ground of justification is that their inclusion would generate **καύχησις (boasting)** — the opposite of the humility of receiving a gift. This is not arbitrary; it reflects the nature of grace as grace.

4.3 Romans 3:21–28 and 4 — The Detailed Forensic Argument

Romans 3:28 contains Paul's most explicit statement: λογιζόμεθα γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου — 'we reckon that a person is justified by faith apart from works of law.' The verb λογίζομαι (logizomai) is an accounting/reckoning term. Romans 4 deploys it eleven times in the Abraham discussion: God credits (λογίζεται) faith as righteousness — a forensic accounting transaction, not a moral transformation.

Romans 6:1–2 proves that this forensic reading does not license moral indifference: 'Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? May it never be (μὴ γένοιτο)! How shall we who died to sin still live in it?' Paul anticipates the antinomian misreading of Sola Fide — the very error James is also combating — and categorically rejects it. The justified person has died to sin (Romans 6:3–11) and is now a slave of righteousness (δοῦλοι... τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, 6:18). Paul requires the works of

righteousness that James is calling for; he merely denies that those works are the ground of the righteousness that justified the person.

4.4 Titus 2:14 and 3:5 — The Works-Salvation Boundary

Titus 2:14 states that Christ 'gave himself for us to redeem us from all lawlessness and to purify for himself a people of his own possession, zealous for good works (ζηλωτὴν καλῶν ἔργων).' The redeemed are characterized as zealous for good works — but the works flow from the redemption, not into it.

Titus 3:5 excludes works from salvation's basis: 'not from works of righteousness which we ourselves did (οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς), but according to his mercy he saved us' — and then in 3:8 immediately calls for those saved to 'be careful to devote themselves to good works (καλῶν ἔργων προΐστασθαι).' The pattern is identical: works excluded as ground; works required as fruit.

PART V: JOHN 3:16 AND THE JOHANNINE WITNESS

5.1 The Grammar of John 3:16

> *Οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ᾽ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.* *"For God so loved the world that he gave his one and only Son, so that everyone who believes in him might not perish but have eternal life."* **— John 3:16, NA28**

The condition for eternal life in John 3:16 is a participial phrase: πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτόν (pas ho pisteuōn eis auton — everyone who believes in him). The participle πιστεύων is:

15. Present active — continuous, ongoing believing. Not a one-time intellectual event but a sustained orientation of trust.
16. Articular (ὁ πιστεύων — the one who believes) — making it a substantival participle describing a class of persons characterized by this ongoing believing.
17. Constructed with εἰς (into) + accusative — the Greek idiom for personal trust directed toward, self-entrustment into the sphere of a person. This is stronger than πιστεύω + dative (to believe a fact) or πιστεύω + ὅτι (to believe that). Πιστεύω εἰς denotes personal, relational trust and commitment, not merely cognitive assent.

This Johannine πιστεύω εἰς is precisely the faith that James's demons do NOT have. They πιστεύουσιν ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός (believe that God is one — cognitive assent to a proposition). They do not πιστεύουσιν εἰς (personally entrust themselves into) God. John 3:16 describes exactly the kind of faith James says DOES save.

5.2 The Johannine Pattern: Faith and Its Fruit

John's Gospel consistently maintains that genuine saving faith (pisteuō eis) produces visible fruit:

- John 15:5 — 'I am the vine, you are the branches. Whoever abides in me and I in him, he it is that bears much fruit (καρπὸν πολὺν φέρει).' Fruitlessness leads to removal (15:6). This is the Johannine version of James 2's dead faith.
- John 14:15 — 'If you love me, you will keep my commandments (τὰς ἐντολάς μου τηρήσετε).' Love for Christ — itself the evidence of genuine pisteuō eis — expresses itself in obedience. Not to earn salvation, but as its natural outflow.
- 1 John 2:320134 — The one who says he knows God yet does not keep his commandments is self-deceived. The verb legō (to say/claim) echoes James 2:14 (legē tis — someone claims). John and James are combating identical antinomian hypocrisy.
- 1 John 3:17 — 'But if anyone has the world's goods and sees his brother in need, yet closes his heart against him, how does God's love abide in him?' This is nearly a paraphrase of James 2:15–16.

The Johannine literature thus completely harmonizes with both Paul and James: saving faith (pisteuō eis) is genuine, personal, and productive; claimed faith without fruit is self-deception (1 John 1:8; 2:4). John adds a pneumatological dimension: the Holy Spirit is the internal agent who produces the fruit (John 15:26, 16:13; 1 John 3:24), which corresponds to Paul's 'fruit of the Spirit' (Gal 5:22).

PART VI: HOW THE PRE-NICENE FATHERS READ THE JAMES-PAUL TENSION

The pre-Nicene fathers (c. 90–325 CE) did not, in general, experience James 2 as a theological crisis. This is itself significant. The 'problem' of James became acute primarily in the context of the Reformation debate, where Sola Fide was being sharply articulated as a polemical counter to accumulated Catholic merit theology. The fathers, operating before this controversy crystallized, tended to read James and Paul as complementary without extensive harmonization effort.

6.1 Origen of Alexandria (c. 230–254 CE)

Origen is the most important pre-Nicene exegete of Paul. In his Commentary on Romans, commenting on Romans 3:28 ('justified by faith apart from works of law'), he wrote:

> **Origen,** *Commentary on Romans 3.9: "Paul says that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law. Faith itself, then, is something great and much to be admired, which by itself can justify those who have faith, even without the works of the law."*

Yet the same Origen, in his Homilies on Genesis (Homily 8, on Abraham's offering of Isaac), reads Genesis 22 exactly as James does — as the demonstration and completion of Genesis 15:6's faith-righteousness:

> **Origen,** *Homilies on Genesis, Homily 8.3: "Then therefore faith is perfected by works, when, what we believe in word we confirm with deeds. This therefore is what is written, 'Faith worked together with his works, and by works faith was perfected.'"*

Origen harmonizes Paul and James without tension: faith alone is the basis of justification (as Paul says); that same faith is perfected/demonstrated by works (as James says). He does not treat them as competing claims but as descriptions of different aspects of the same organic reality.

6.2 Clement of Rome (c. 90–96 CE)

Writing to the Corinthians, Clement achieves perhaps the earliest and most elegant harmony of faith and works in the post-apostolic literature. In 1 Clement 32:3–33:1:

> **Clement of Rome,** *1 Clement 32:3–33:1: "We ourselves, therefore, who through His will have been called in Christ Jesus, are not made righteous through ourselves, or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety, or through the works we have done in holiness of heart — but through faith... What then shall we do, brothers? Shall we be idle and cease from doing good? By no means! But let us hasten with all eagerness and readiness to perform every good work."*

Clement's sequence is exactly Ephesians 2:8–10: justification is through faith, not through works — immediately followed by an imperious call to good works. The works are the response to grace, not its cause. The question 'shall we be idle?' anticipates the antinomian error James combats, and Clement's answer — 'By no means!' (μὴ γένοιτο, the same Pauline formula) — is identical to Paul's in Romans 6:1–2 and consistent with James's entire argument.

6.3 Irenaeus of Lyon (c. 180 CE)

Irenaeus addresses the Paul-James dynamic in the context of his anti-Gnostic polemic. Against the Gnostic antinomians who used Paul's grace-language to license moral indifference, Irenaeus insists that genuine faith in Christ produces ethical fruit:

> **Irenaeus,** *Against Heresies 4.26.1: "For it behooves us to flee far away from the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Scribes... and not to seek to appear righteous, but to be [righteous], as also our Lord said: 'Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven.' For what was their unrighteousness? It was that while they appeared righteous outwardly, they were full of injustice inwardly."*

> **Irenaeus,** *Against Heresies 4.13.1: "Abraham himself, without circumcision and without observance of the Sabbath, 'believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness.' He first listened to the voice of God by faith, and then subjected himself to circumcision and other ordinances as a confirmation of his faith — not as justification."*

The phrase 'not as justification' (non ad iustificationem) is Irenaeus's explicit statement that Abraham's subsequent acts were confirmatory of already-established faith-righteousness — not the source of it. This is James's argument in reverse: the confirmatory works came after the faith-justification, demonstrating it.

6.4 Clement of Alexandria (c. 195–215 CE)

Clement of Alexandria, in Stromata (Miscellanies) Book 6, chapter 18, addresses the relationship of faith and works directly:

> **Clement of Alexandria,** *Stromata 6.18.164: "For we are not saved by works alone, but also by faith — the grace of God operating along with both. But works without faith are not productive of salvation... And so faith is the foundation on which works are built."*

Clement's metaphor — faith as the foundation on which works are built — is architecturally precise. No building stands without a foundation, but a foundation alone is not a building. Faith is the necessary and sufficient ground of salvation; works are the necessary and visible superstructure that demonstrates the foundation is real. This is the James-Paul synthesis in architectural form.

6.5 Tertullian of Carthage (c. 200–220 CE)

Tertullian, commenting on Galatians in Against Marcion (5.3), follows Paul's argument that justification is by faith apart from law-works:

> **Tertullian,** *Against Marcion 5.3: "In order that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith, that Abraham was approved on account of faith, not of works... For faith is the substance of all of these things; and without faith it is impossible to please God."*

In the same period, Tertullian's De Paenitentia (On Repentance) vigorously insists that repentance and transformation must follow conversion — not as the basis of salvation but as its necessary evidence. Like all the pre-Nicene fathers, Tertullian sees no contradiction between these requirements.

6.6 The Patristic Consensus

The pre-Nicene fathers consistently:

- Ground justification/salvation in divine grace and faith, not meritorious works (following Paul)
- Insist that genuine faith produces visible transformation, acts of mercy, and obedience (following James)

- Read the Abraham narrative as having both a faith-moment (Genesis 15) and a works-confirmation moment (Genesis 22) that demonstrate, not create, his righteousness
- Combat antinomianism (the error James addresses) with equal vigor to the legalism Paul addresses
- Do not experience James 2 as a theological problem requiring resolution — they read it as the necessary complement to Paul's forensic doctrine

The crisis of James 2 is largely a post-Reformation problem, arising when Sola Fide was defined so narrowly that works became theologically suspect even as evidence of salvation.

PART VII: THE EXEGETICAL PROBLEMS — WHERE INTERPRETATION GOES WRONG

The apparent contradiction between James 2 and Paul is not a textual contradiction but a product of identifiable exegetical errors. These errors can be precisely catalogued:

7.1 Error #1: Reading the Same Greek Vocabulary as Having Identical Referents

The most fundamental mistake is treating δικαιόω, πίστις, and ἔργα as univocal (having only one meaning) across both authors. As demonstrated in Part III, δικαιόω carries both a forensic use (Paul: declare righteous before God) and a demonstrative use (James: vindicate, prove righteous before observers). Πίστις in James 2:19 is explicitly defined as demonic intellectual assent — a different referent than Pauline pistis as fiducia (personal trust and reliance). ἔργα νόμου (works of Mosaic law, Paul) ≠ ἔργα (works of mercy and obedience, James 2:15–16).

Good lexicography requires sensitivity to semantic range and context. The failure to apply this basic principle generates the appearance of a contradiction that the Greek text does not contain.

7.2 Error #2: Ignoring the Different Polemical Targets

Paul writes against Judaizers who demanded Torah observance as a supplement to faith for justification — a kind of excessive, law-based addition to the gospel. James writes against antinomians who professed verbal faith while living in moral indifference to their neighbors' suffering (James 2:15–16 — the cold, hungry brother receiving only words). These are opposite errors. Applying Paul's polemic against legalism to James's polemic against antinomianism — or vice versa — generates confusion. The doctors are treating different diseases, not contradicting each other about the same disease.

7.3 Error #3: Lifting James 2:24 from Its Literary Context

James 2:24 — 'a person is justified from works and not from faith alone' — is routinely cited in isolation from the surrounding diatribe. When read in context, the 'faith' James denies is the faith he has defined: the demonic intellectual assent of verse 19, the claimed faith without fruit of verse 14. The person in verse 14 'claims to have faith' (λέγῃ τις ἔχειν) — does not genuinely have the faith of John 3:16. James is not saying that genuine Pauline faith is insufficient; he is saying that what this hypothetical person has is not genuine faith at all.

7.4 Error #4: Ignoring Chronological Sequence in the Abraham Argument

Both Paul and James cite Abraham. Both cite Genesis 15:6 (explicitly). But Paul's works-exclusion argument is grounded in the chronological priority of Genesis 15 (faith-justification) over Genesis 17 (circumcision) and Sinai (law) — establishing that justification by faith precedes and does not require works. James's works-inclusion argument cites Genesis 22 (the offering of Isaac) — an event approximately 25 years after Genesis 15. James is not describing the initial event of Abraham's justification; he is describing the mature demonstration of a faith already declared righteous a generation earlier. The two authors are citing different moments in Abraham's narrative for different purposes. Reading them as if they cite the same event produces a false contradiction.

7.5 Error #5: Confusing Organic Relationship with Sequential Priority

A profound insight from Reformed exegesis — shared by scholars from John Calvin to Thomas Schreiner to John Murray — is that the distinction between faith and its fruit is logical and analytical, not temporal or mechanical. In the justified person, faith and works are not two separate items that arrive sequentially; they are organically united aspects of one transformed life. The Westminster Confession captures this: 'Faith thus receiving and resting on Christ and His righteousness, is the alone instrument of justification: yet is it not alone in the person justified, but is ever accompanied with all other saving graces' (WCF 11.2). James is not adding works to faith as a second condition; he is insisting that what appears as 'faith' without accompanying transformation is, by definition, not the faith that saves.

PART VIII: MAJOR SCHOLARLY APPROACHES TO THE JAMES-PAUL QUESTION

8.1 The Complementarity View (Dominant Scholarly Consensus)

The overwhelming majority of NT scholars across confessional traditions (Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox) hold that James and Paul are complementary, not contradictory, when their different

audiences, purposes, vocabulary uses, and rhetorical targets are properly considered. Key representatives:

- Douglas Moo (The Letter of James, Pillar NT Commentary, 2000): Paul and James use the words faith and works and justify in different ways. Paul argues against those who think that Jewish works of law contribute to justification; James argues against those who think that a bare mental acceptance of Christian doctrine is sufficient for salvation. Moo concludes they are in full agreement.
- Peter Davids (The Epistle of James, NIGTC, 1982): 'James and Paul use the same terms with different meanings in different situations. There is no real contradiction between them.'
- Luke Timothy Johnson (The Letter of James, Anchor Bible, 1995): Argues that James is addressing a different community situation and a different theological error. The verbal overlap does not constitute doctrinal contradiction.
- Thomas Schreiner & Ardel Caneday (The Race Set Before Us, 2001): Demonstrate that Paul himself requires the fruit of obedience as the necessary evidence of genuine faith, entirely consistent with James.
- Scot McKnight (The Letter of James, NICNT, 2011): Identifies James's target as 'socioeconomic favoritism' and 'verbal faith without social transformation' — a pastoral problem, not a theological contradiction of Paul.

8.2 The 'New Perspective on Paul' Contribution

The 'New Perspective on Paul' (NPP), associated with E. P. Sanders (Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 1977), James D. G. Dunn (The Epistle to the Galatians, 1993), and N. T. Wright (Justification, 2009), offers a somewhat different framing: Paul's ἔργα νόμου (works of law) refers primarily to Jewish ethnic boundary markers (circumcision, food laws, Sabbath) that separated Jew from Gentile in the covenant community, rather than to moral meritorious achievement broadly. Under this reading, Paul's polemic is less about earning righteousness through morality and more about the exclusion of Gentiles from covenant blessing.

Whether the NPP is fully correct or not (and the debate continues vigorously), its contribution to the James-Paul question is significant: if Paul's target is ethnic boundary markers and James's target is antinomian moral failure, the two authors are addressing completely different problems and there is no overlap at all, let alone contradiction. The NPP reading, if correct, would make the James-Paul tension even easier to resolve.

8.3 The Lutheran Canonical Skepticism (Minority View)

Luther's position — that James is a secondary epistle of straw — has been largely abandoned even within Lutheran scholarship. The Lutheran confessional tradition formally includes James in its canon and does not treat it as sub-canonical. Karl Barth (Church Dogmatics, IV/1) argued that James and Paul are approaching different aspects of the one Christ-reality and must be read together. Rudolf Bultmann acknowledged the tension but did not regard it as irresolvable within canonical hermeneutics. The position that James is in genuine unresolvable contradiction with Paul

is today a minority scholarly view confined largely to hypercritical and deconstructive NT scholarship rather than mainstream exegesis.

8.4 The Roman Catholic and Orthodox Reading

Roman Catholic scholarship traditionally reads James 2 as supporting the role of meritorious works in the process of justification, consistent with Trent's definition of justification as inner renewal accompanied by cooperation with grace. However, even Catholic scholars of note (Joseph Fitzmyer, Brevard Childs, Raymond Brown) acknowledge that James's concern is pastoral (proving genuine faith, combating antinomian claim) rather than a systematic counter to forensic justification. The James-Paul question thus remains internal to Protestant exegesis; Catholic and Orthodox traditions do not experience it as a crisis because they do not hold Sola Fide as a confessional commitment.

PART IX: SYNTHESIS — JAMES AND PAUL AS CANONICAL UNITY

9.1 The Complete Picture in Canonical Scope

When the full canonical witness is assembled — Paul, James, John, and the pre-Nicene fathers — a single coherent picture emerges that can be mapped as an organic sequence:

#	Stage	Greek NT Teaching	Source
1	Human condition: spiritual death	νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν — dead in trespasses (Eph 2:1). No capacity to earn or deserve grace.	Paul (Ephesians 2)
2	Divine grace: God's sovereign initiative	τῇ χάριτί ἐστε σεσῳσμένοι — by grace you have been saved (Eph 2:8). Salvation originates in God, not human will.	Paul (Ephesians, Romans, Galatians)
3	Faith: the receiving instrument	διὰ πίστεως — through faith. Faith is the means of receiving grace, not the merit that earns it. Πιστεύω εἰς (entrusting oneself to Christ, not mere cognitive assent).	Paul (Eph 2:8); John (3:16, 5:24, 6:47)
4	Justification: the forensic verdict	δικαιωθέντες ἐκ πίστεως — having been justified by faith (Rom 5:1). God's legal declaration of righteousness. Instantaneous.	Paul (Rom 3–5, Gal 2–3, Phil 3)

		Completed.	
5	Regeneration: new creation	κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ — created in Christ Jesus (Eph 2:10). New nature. Spirit given (Gal 3:14, Eph 1:13).	Paul; John (3:3–8, 15:5)
6	Fruit: good works as evidence	ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς — for good works (Eph 2:10); πίστις δι᾽ ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη — faith working through love (Gal 5:6). Fruit of Spirit (Gal 5:22).	Paul (Eph 2:10, Gal 5–6, Tit 2:14); John (15:5, 14:15); 1 John
7	Demonstration: works proving faith genuine	ἐκ τῶν ἔργων μου τὴν πίστιν (Jas 2:18); ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἐτελειώθη ἡ πίστις (Jas 2:22). Works vindicate and complete faith before human observers.	James 2 (complementing step 6)
8	Diagnostic: absent works = absent faith	ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστιν (Jas 2:26). A 'faith' that produces nothing is not saving faith — it is demonic intellectual assent. Identical to 1 John 2:4; 3:17.	James 2; 1 John 2–3; John 15:6

9.2 Is James a Contradiction? The Verdict

The answer that emerges from the Greek critical text, the pre-Nicene patristic witnesses, and the full canonical survey is unequivocal: James 2 is not a contradiction of Sola Fide as exegetically derived from Paul and the Johannine literature. It is, rather, its necessary complement and diagnostic safeguard.

The apparent contradiction arises entirely from four identifiable exegetical errors:

18. Reading δικαιόω as univocal when it has both forensic (Paul) and demonstrative (James) uses
19. Ignoring the different rhetorical targets: Judaizing legalism (Paul) vs. antinomian nominal faith (James)
20. Lifting James 2:24 from the diatribe context that defines 'faith' as demonic intellectual assent
21. Missing the Abraham chronology: Genesis 15 (faith-justification) precedes Genesis 22 (works-demonstration) by ~25 years

When these errors are corrected through rigorous Greek exegesis, James and Paul teach a single, coherent doctrine articulable as follows:

> Salvation is by grace alone, through faith alone, because of Christ alone — with that faith being not bare intellectual assent but personal trust (pisteuō eis) that, being genuinely alive (empowered by the Spirit), necessarily produces the visible fruit of obedience, love, and mercy. Where genuine fruit is absent, 'faith' is either immature and growing or dead — a claim without substance. Paul establishes the ground and instrument of justification; James establishes the diagnostic test of its genuineness; John establishes the pneumatological engine that makes both possible.

This synthesis was understood, implicitly or explicitly, by Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen in the pre-Nicene period. It was articulated formally by Calvin (Institutes 3.11.1: 'We are justified by faith alone, but not by faith that is alone'), by the Westminster Confession (WCF 11.2), and by modern commentators across confessional traditions. The James-Paul problem is a solved exegetical problem, not an ongoing contradiction.

9.3 The Enduring Pastoral Relevance

James's contribution to the canonical discussion of Sola Fide is not merely academic. It performs three vital pastoral functions:

22. Anti-antinomian safeguard: James prevents the forensic doctrine of justification from being distorted into a license for moral indifference. If 'faith alone saves,' and one can be saved while living exactly as an unsaved person, James counters: examine your faith — if nothing has changed, the faith may not be real.
23. Canonical balance: A NT canon without James would produce a truncated Sola Fide that could easily be weaponized for antinomianism, as Paul himself feared (Romans 6:1). James ensures that the full orb of canonical teaching includes both the forensic and the ethical dimensions.
24. Pastoral diagnosis: James provides the church with a practical tool for self-examination (cf. 2 Corinthians 13:5: 'Examine yourselves, whether you are in the faith'). The presence or absence of fruit is diagnostic — not of the basis of salvation, but of whether salvation has genuinely occurred. This is consistent with the Reformed doctrine of the perseverance of the saints and the Wesleyan doctrine of the witness of the Spirit.

Luther, whose instincts about the Gospel were sound even when his canonical judgment about James was not, himself acknowledged this balance in his later writings: 'It is impossible to separate faith and works... just as it is impossible to separate heat and light from fire.' His Preface to the New Testament 1546 edition significantly softened the 'epistle of straw' language. Had Luther attended more carefully to James's Greek diatribe structure and the Abraham chronology, he might have avoided the overreach entirely.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources — Greek Text

- Nestle, E., Aland, K., et al. Novum Testamentum Graece. 28th ed. (NA28). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- Rahlfs, A. & Hanhart, R. Septuaginta. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006. [LXX for Genesis 15:6 and Habakkuk 2:4]
- Bauer, W., Danker, F. W., Arndt, W. F., & Gingrich, F. W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament (BDAG). 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

James Studies

- Davids, Peter H. The Epistle of James. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. The Letter of James. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- McKnight, Scot. The Letter of James. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.
- Moo, Douglas J. The Letter of James. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Martin, Ralph P. James. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco: Word Books, 1988.

Paul and Justification

- Dunn, James D. G. The Epistle to the Galatians. BNTC. London: A&C Black, 1993.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. The Law and Its Fulfillment: A Pauline Theology of Law. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. Faith Alone: The Doctrine of Justification. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2015.
- Seifrid, Mark A. 'Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism.' In Justification and Variegated Nomism, ed. D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001.
- Wright, N. T. Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2009.

Pre-Nicene Patristic Sources

- Roberts, A. & Donaldson, J. (eds.). Ante-Nicene Fathers. 10 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Origen. Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. Trans. Thomas P. Scheck. 2 vols. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2001–2002.
- Origen. Homilies on Genesis and Exodus. Trans. Ronald E. Heine. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1982.
- McGrath, Alister E. Iustitia Dei: A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Calvin, Luther, and Confessional Standards

- Calvin, John. Institutes of the Christian Religion. Ed. J. T. McNeill. Trans. F. L. Battles. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960. [Esp. 3.11–3.16]
- Luther, Martin. Preface to the New Testament (1522, 1546). In Luther's Works, vol. 35. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1960.
- Westminster Confession of Faith (1646). Chapter 11 (Of Justification) and Chapter 16 (Of Good Works). In The Book of Confessions. Louisville: Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), 2016.

All Greek citations are from the NA28. English renderings are the author's own unless otherwise noted. Where patristic quotations are given in English, they are drawn from the Ante-Nicene Fathers series (Roberts & Donaldson) with cross-reference to critical editions where possible.