

JAS. 1:19 – 2:26

By Ashby L. Camp

Copyright © 2006 (revised in 2017) by Ashby L. Camp. All rights reserved.

C. Call to be doers of the word during trials (1:19 – 2:13)

1. With regard to hostility toward oppressors (1:19-27)

a. anger toward oppressors (1:19-25) – ¹⁹**You know this, my beloved brothers, but let every man be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger; ²⁰for a man's anger does not produce the righteousness of God. ²¹Therefore, having put away all moral filth and abundance of evil, accept with humility the implanted word that is able to save your souls. ²²And be doers of the word, not hearers only, deceiving yourselves. ²³Because if anyone is a hearer of the word and not a doer, he is like a man who looks at his face in a mirror; ²⁴for he noticed himself and went away and immediately forgot what he was like. ²⁵But the man who looked into the perfect law, the law of freedom, and remained, not being a forgetful hearer but a doer of the work, this one will be blessed in his doing.**

(1) James's readers knew they were to be Christ-like in their handling of conflicts. They knew the proverbial statement (v. 19) that was intended to keep one's emotions in check, to keep one from crossing over into sinful anger, but they needed to be called back to it because some were failing in that regard by becoming sinfully angry in their conflict with the rich oppressors.

(2) James commands them to live up to what they know, to avoid sinful anger, because sinful anger does not produce, is not conducive to, the righteousness of God. In other words, it is a sinful state of spirit, a sinful disposition or attitude, that does not produce behavior that is pleasing to God. Rather, as Jesus explained in Mat. 5:22, anger is murderous in principle; it is a sense of hostility that finds its ultimate expression in murder. Moo comments (p. 84), "Presumably, [James] is thinking especially of different sinful acts, such as violence, murder (see Matt. 5:21-26 and Jas. 4:2-3), and especially in this context, unwise speech, that stem from anger." In Gal. 5:20, Paul lists anger among the works of the flesh, and in Col. 3:8 he lists it among the things that have no place in the Christian's life.

(3) There is, of course, a form of anger that is not sinful, but James is not focused on that. We know some anger is not sinful because Jesus never sinned (Jn. 8:46; 2 Cor. 5:21; Heb. 4:15, 7:26; 1 Pet. 2:22; 1 Jn. 3:5), and yet Jesus was angry (Mk. 3:5). The difference is that Jesus' outrage was toward sin (injustice, unbelief, misrepresentation of God, exploitation of others) rather than personal offense; it was what we often call "righteous indignation." Holiness cannot be indifferent toward *sin*. As Robertson McQuilken and Paul Copan state in *An Introduction to Biblical Ethics*, 3rd ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press,

2014), 354, "Indeed, *never* getting angry would be a sign of *apathy*; not getting angry at injustice and cruelty is a vice, not a virtue."

(4) The explanation in 1:20 (note "for") of the proverbial saying in 1:19b ("let every man be quick to listen, slow to speak, and slow to anger") makes clear that anger is the focus of James's concern. He does not spell out that the anger in vv. 19-25, the hostile speech in vv. 26-27, and the preference toward the rich in 2:1-13 are oppression related, but that is a reasonable conclusion. As Peter Davids remarks, "On the one hand, the church naturally felt resentment against the rich. . . . On the other hand, if a wealthy person entered the church or was a member, there would be every reason to court him." One would not expect James to refer to his readers' oppression in this context because it does not diminish their personal responsibility for sin (1:14-15) and is therefore irrelevant to his call to repent.

(5) Having repented of all evil when they initially received the gospel, the soul-saving word (taking the aorist participle *apothémēnoi* as circumstantial rather than imperatival), they must continue on that path with regard to their anger. They must humbly submit to the ethical demands of that implanted word, submit to the law of freedom that calls them to overcome evil with good (Rom. 12:21; 1 Cor. 4:12-13) and to love their neighbor as themselves.

(a) As Peter Davids observes:

The call to receive the word of the gospel which they have already implanted in them sounds contradictory. But the stock characteristic of the language of receiving the word (meaning accepting and acting on it, as in the examples above) and the fact the gospel consists of both a word about Jesus and ethical content (which is James's main concern: cf. Mussner, 102) point to the sense of "act upon the word you accepted at conversion" (or baptism, if one accepts Mussner's baptismal context).

(b) The "law of freedom" in 1:25 and 2:12 is called the "royal law" in 2:8 and is there identified with "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." This is the command Christ singled out in Mat. 22:34-40 as a summary of interpersonal ethical obligations (see Rom. 13:9-10 and Gal. 5:14).

(6) As kingdom participants, they must be doers of kingdom righteousness, not merely hearers (see, Mat. 7:21; Lk. 6:46-49; Mat. 7:24-27). Those who ignore the ethical demands of the gospel, who hear the word but do not obey it, are deceiving themselves about their relationship with God (1 Jn. 1:3-4). (Here is the first indication of the distortion of Paul's teaching.) It is of no value to become aware of what you need to do if you promptly forget it (i.e., do not act on it).

(7) God's blessing is on the one who obeys the ethical demands of the gospel, who obeys what Paul in Gal. 6:2 calls the "law of Christ," not because obeying merits

God's blessing but because the faith on which God bestows his grace includes a commitment to obey, a surrender to the truth of who God is and what he's done in Christ, and that commitment necessarily finds expression in one's life as empowered by the Holy Spirit.

b. evil speech toward oppressors (1:26-27) – ²⁶**If anyone considers himself to be religious, while not bridling his own tongue but deceiving his own heart, this one's religion is worthless.** ²⁷**Religion that is pure and undefiled before God, the Father, is this: to look after orphans and widows in their distress and to keep himself unspotted from the world.**

(1) Their anger against the oppressors was, as often is the case, accompanied by hostile speech. And rather than being convicted of their sin in that regard, they deceived themselves into thinking they were pious despite their sinful speech. They justified their sin in their hearts. James flatly states that this type of religion, one that disassociates faith from life, is worthless.

(2) The addressees apparently magnified the sin of their oppressors, the failure to care for the poor and powerless (epitomized by widows and orphans), while minimizing or ignoring their own contamination by the world in the form of anger and evil speech. This explains James's emphasis on their being doers of the word rather than hearers only (1:22-24) and the references to their self-deception (1:22, 1:26).

(a) Davids states (p. 103), "It is also clear that [orphans and widows] were typical examples . . . for all who suffer distress and oppression." Kurt Richardson states (p. 101), "Orphans and widows are the objects of repeated appeals for righteous action to minister to the needy and helpless. These exemplify the poor to whom God shows special favor (cf. 2:1-7) against the natural human preference for the wealthy."

(b) James bursts their delusion of piety by reminding them that pure and undefiled religion involves not only caring for the poor but *also* keeping oneself unspotted by the world. They needed to confront their own sin rather than hide it in the shadow of the oppressors' sins.

2. with regard to preference toward rich (2:1-13)

a. problem identified (2:1-4) – **My brothers, keep the faith of our glorious Lord Jesus Christ without partiality.** ²**For if a man wearing gold rings and fine clothes comes into your meeting, and a poor man in shabby clothes also comes in,** ³**and you look at the one wearing the fine clothes and say, "You sit here in style," and to the poor man you say, "Stand there or sit under my footstool,"** ⁴**have you not discriminated among yourselves and become judges with evil thoughts?**

(1) Some in James's audience, fearing the power of the wealthy, carried their favor even to the point of showing them preference when they appeared at meetings

of the church (as visitors or, perhaps more likely, as new converts). They sought to ingratiate themselves to the wealthy at the expense of the poor. Moo remarks in *The Letter of James*, TNTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 87, "Apparently the oppression they were experiencing at the hands of the rich (cf. vss. 6-7) had led . . . to an excessive deference towards the rich and powerful that resulted in a slighting and demeaning of poorer people."

(2) The word translated "partiality" or "favoritism" (*prosōpolēmpsía*) is literally, "receiving the face," which means to make judgments about people based on external appearances. James applies this principle to differences in dress that reflect contrasting social/economic situations.

(3) James commands them to practice their faith without such partiality. To discriminate on the basis of wealth is to judge by an unspiritual criterion, by the evil standards of the world.

(4) We must guard against favoring those who have status in the world's eyes. We must not be more solicitous of the doctor, the business tycoon, the pro athlete, or the celebrity than we are of the common laborer.

b. foolishness of favoring the rich (2:5-7) – **⁵Listen, my beloved brothers: did not God choose the poor in the world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to those who love him? ⁶But you dishonored the poor man. Do not the rich exploit you? And do they not drag you into courts? ⁷Do they not blaspheme the excellent name that was invoked over you?**

(1) In discriminating against the poor, they were acting contrary to God. He did not discriminate against the poor but chose them to be rich in faith and to be heirs of the kingdom, as evidenced by the number of poor believers in their congregation. You see this same concept in 1 Corinthians.

(a) In 1 Cor. 1:26-31, Paul, to further his argument that the gospel he preached stands in direct contradiction to human expectations about God, turns to the existence of the Corinthians themselves as believers. The very fact God's church is made up mostly of "nobodies," people from the lower classes, shows the foolishness of God that confounds the wise.

(b) Celsus, a Roman opponent of Christianity in the late 2d century, ridiculed Christianity in these words:

Their injunctions are like this. "Let no one educated, no one wise, no one sensible draw near. For these abilities are thought by us to be evils. But as for anyone ignorant, anyone stupid, anyone uneducated, anyone who is a child, let him come boldly." By the fact that they themselves admit that these people are

worthy of their God, they show that they want and are able to convince only the foolish, dishonorable and stupid, and only slaves, women, and little children.

(c) When God called out a people to be his, he called them without regard for their social status, without regard for their standing in the eyes of the world. And many who had status were offended that it was ignored. As David Garland comments on the Corinthian text (p. 74), "When Paul proclaimed the word of the cross, it did not attract the wise and powerful. They are not excluded but tend to exclude themselves by rejecting the wisdom of the cross, which does not honor their achievements but pours contempt on their pride."

(d) The church was filled with "riff-raff" in the world's eyes to make clear that salvation has nothing to do with human status or standing. It is not an entitlement of the privileged or a matter of human accomplishment but a completely undeserved gift. So no person may boast that he stands clean before God because of his intellect, education, or pedigree.

(2) In favoring the rich, they were honoring those who, for the most part, were unbelievers and were engaged in exploiting them, dragging them into court, and slandering the name of their Lord.

(a) Most of James's readers probably were poor agricultural laborers who were being bled dry by unscrupulous rich landowners and merchants. As part of that process, these rich oppressors undoubtedly were using their wealth and influence with the courts to secure favorable verdicts against the poor. Moo writes (PNTC, 109): "Practices familiar in every age, such as forcing people to forfeit their land for late payments of mortgages, insisting on ruinous interest rates for any monetary help, and the like, are probably in view."

(b) The fact the rich are slandering the name of Christ suggests that their oppression of poor Christians was at least in part motivated by religious discrimination.

c. seriousness of the sin (2:8-13) – **⁸If you truly fulfill the royal law according to the scripture, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself," you do well; ⁹but if you show partiality, you commit sin, being convicted by the law as transgressors. ¹⁰For whoever keeps all the law but stumbles in one part has become guilty with regard to all parts. ¹¹For the one who said, "Do not commit adultery," also said, "Do not murder." Now if you do not commit adultery but do murder, you have become a transgressor of the law. ¹²Speak and act in this manner, as those about to be judged by the law of freedom. ¹³For judgment will be merciless to the one who did not show mercy; mercy triumphs over judgment.**

(1) Showing partiality, dishonoring the poor, is a transgression of the "royal law," a transgression of the requirement in Scripture (Lev. 19:18) to "love your neighbor as yourself."

(a) This is called the "royal law" because it was singled out by Christ, the fulfiller and authoritative interpreter of the law, as the essence of the interpersonal aspects of the Mosaic law (Mat. 22:34-40). It thus was taught by Christ as an expression of God's will *for Christians*. James is not binding the Mosaic law on Christians.

(b) This is confirmed by the fact this "royal law" is described in 2:12 as the "law of freedom." In 1:25 the phrase "law of freedom" clearly has reference to the gospel, "the implanted word that is able to save your souls" (1:21).

(2) Even if they kept the royal law on every other occasion, that would not lessen their guilt in violating it with regard to partiality. The royal law, like the Mosaic law, is kept or broken as a unit. In other words, no violation of it is petty; no violation can be trivialized or offset by counterbalancing acts of obedience.

(a) The royal law is viewed as a body of particulars, a set of commands that are encompassed by the summary command "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." That is why James can refer to "all the law," "one part," and "all parts." So it is like the Mosaic law in that both have a plurality of moral requirements, many of which overlap.

(b) As I have said many times, Christians in the N.T. were not required to obey (other than as an accommodation) commandments of the Mosaic law relating to circumcision, sacrifices, the priesthood, feasts, holy days, ritual purity laws, and food laws (see, e.g., Mat. 15:16-20; Mk. 7:18-19, indicating that the rules of ritual contamination are removed). These commandments point to deeper realities that have found their fulfillment in Christ. His one sacrifice has made those in him perpetually holy and clean; we are the true temple.

(c) The fundamental ethical requirement for the Christian is love (Mat. 7:12, 22:37-40; Rom. 13:8-10; Gal. 5:14), but some specific conduct is loving and other conduct is not. Love is the center, but there are definite requirements on how it expresses itself. As Paul indicates in Rom. 13:9, the command to love your neighbor as yourself encompasses the commands of the law not to commit adultery, not to murder, not to steal, and not to covet (and other commands he does not specify).

(d) Thus, the Christian, though not being under the Mosaic law, the set of commands that are part of Mosaic covenant, upholds the royal law, which encompasses the transcendent moral requirements that are included in the Mosaic law (e.g., Rom. 13:8-10; 1 Cor. 10:14; Eph. 6:2). It is this ongoing or re-expressed moral law, centered in love, that is the "law of Christ" (1 Cor. 9:21; Gal. 6:2 [with 5:14]). That's why Paul can say in 1 Cor. 7:19, "Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God [is everything]."

(3) James tells them that they must speak and act as those who are going to be judged by this law of freedom (2:12), by the ethical requirements of the gospel (note

"law of freedom" in 1:25), because those who reject the ethics of faith, such as by not showing mercy to the poor, reject faith itself and the mercy that faith receives. This is the same idea behind the verses that speak of one's works as a basis for judgment (e.g., Mat. 25:31-46; Jn. 5:29; Rev. 20:12).

(a) As Moo states, "'Showing mercy' is, in fact, just what the love command requires (vs. 8) and what James' readers are failing to do when they 'dishonour the poor man.' This relationship between mercy and concern for the poor is explicit in Zechariah 7:9-10."

(b) This is an echo of Jesus' parable of the unmerciful servant in Mat. 18:23-35. And as Moo notes:

James also, in effect, transforms Jesus' beatitude – "Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy" (Matt. 5:7) – into its opposite: "Cursed are those who are not merciful, for they will not be shown mercy." Being "merciful," as these texts suggest, is not merely a feeling of concern, but involves actively reaching out to show love to others. The discrimination that James's readers are practicing is the opposite of such mercy; and if they continue on this path, they will find at the end of their lives a judgment "without mercy."

(c) This is what James means in saying "mercy triumphs over judgment." *Faithful* living (not sinlessness or perfect living) – which includes loving the poor, being merciful to them – will triumph over judgment in that the person who has a genuine faith, a faith that manifests in faithful living, will not be subject to judgment.

III. Defense of call to works in light of error (2:14-26)

A. Error of "faith only" shown from everyday example (2:14-17) – **¹⁴What good is it, my brothers, if someone claims to have faith but does not have works? Can that faith save him? ¹⁵If a brother or sister is naked and lacking daily food, ¹⁶and one of you says to them, "Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill," but you do not give to them what is necessary for the body, what good is it? ¹⁷In the same way, faith by itself, if it does not have works, is dead.**

1. Having called his readers to good works, with regard to their hostility toward their oppressors and their preference toward the rich, James defends that call against a circulating false doctrine that works are irrelevant or insignificant for those in Christ.

a. This false doctrine probably originated in a misunderstanding of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith (e.g., Gal. 2:15-16, 21; Rom. 3:28, 4:1-8; Eph. 2:8). There are clear hints of this tendency to misunderstand in Rom. 6:1 and Gal. 5:13.

b. Paul began preaching in Syrian Antioch (Acts 11:25-26) in the mid-40s A.D. Jewish Christians "scattered" by the persecution following Stephen's death had traveled to Antioch and other places around Palestine (Acts 11:19). Some of those Christians had apparently misinterpreted Paul's doctrine as an excuse for moral laxity, reducing "faith" to mean simply intellectual assent. News of this misunderstanding reached the church in Jerusalem.

2. James first shows the error of that doctrine from an everyday example. Just as lip service to the poor is of no value, something they probably knew quite well, so faith without works is dead.

B. Error of "faith only" shown from fate of demons (2:18-19) – **¹⁸But someone will say you have faith and I have works. Show me your faith without works, and I will show you my faith by works. ¹⁹You believe that God is one; you do well. The demons also believe - and shudder!**

1. Because biblical faith involves a surrender of will, not simply an acceptance by the mind, works are an inevitable companion of faith. They are faith's "vital signs." James imagines a hypothetical third party taking issue with that perspective by saying "you" [the person in James's audience who claims works are not an essential concomitant of faith] have faith whereas "I" [James] have works, implying that either way is acceptable.¹ James, of course, denies that.

2. As proof that belief disconnected from life is inadequate, he cites the case of demons. They believe there is only one Almighty God but, because they are unwilling to act on that belief, it is inadequate to save them. Instead, they are left to shudder in fear (as their fate is the eternal fire – Mat. 25:41).

C. Error of "faith only" shown from Scripture (2:20-26) – **²⁰But are you willing to understand, O foolish man, that faith without works is useless? ²¹Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he offered his son Isaac on the altar? ²²You see that his faith worked with his good works, and that faith was made complete by the works, ²³and the scripture was fulfilled that says, "And Abraham believed God, and it was credited to him as righteousness," and he was called God's friend. ²⁴You see that a man is justified by works and not by faith alone. ²⁵Likewise, was not Rahab the prostitute also justified by works when she welcomed the messengers and sent them out by a different way? ²⁶For as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead.**

¹ A number of English versions put the key phrase in quotes – "you have faith and I have works" – thus treating it as a case of direct rather than indirect discourse. This is based largely on the fact the phrase is not preceded by "that," what is considered the common marker of indirect discourse. But Blomberg and Kamell (p. 134) state that "in Koine Greek, the sharp, classical boundaries between direct and indirect discourse were often blurred, and writers might shift suddenly from one to the other without any contextual indicators." So they translate the phrase without quotes.

1. Faith that saves is a living faith, a faith that finds expression in obedience. A dead faith is one that says "Lord, Lord" but refuses to act as though that confession is true (see, Lk. 6:46). To speak of a faith that has no works is like speaking of a human life that has no pulse, respiration, or brain waves.

2. Given that obedience inevitably accompanies saving faith, one cannot remain justified before God without obedience. The refusal to obey is conclusive proof there is no saving faith; there is only lip service. James stresses the obedience side of this equation because he was addressing those who had divorced faith from life and were hearing that one can be saved through a nonworking faith, through mere intellectual assent.

3. These Jewish believers accepted that Abraham's obedience in offering Isaac was indispensable to his continuing justification before God. If he had refused to obey, if his faith had ceased to be a matter of both mind and will, he would no longer have been right with God.

4. James says a man is "justified by works not by faith alone" and cites Abraham (Gen. 22) as an example. Paul says (Rom. 3:28, 4:1-8) a man is justified by faith apart from works of the law and cites Abraham (Gen. 15) as an example. How are these positions to be understood?

a. Works are not the basis on which God's grace is bestowed; rather, they are the byproduct of the faith on which grace is bestowed. Since biblical faith, true saving faith, what Matthew Bates calls "allegiance," necessarily works, the absence of works indicates the absence of saving faith. So works are relevant to judgment (one is "justified" by them) only in a secondary or derivative sense. This is how I understand the verses that speak of one's works as a basis for judgment (e.g., Mat. 25:31-46; Jn. 5:29; Rev. 20:12).

b. The faith of which Paul spoke was not a dead faith, a sterile, inactive faith. For example, he said in Gal. 5:6: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision means anything; rather, [what matters is] faith *working* through love." He said in 1 Cor. 7:19: "Circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God [is everything]."

c. The issue Paul faced was whether Gentiles were obligated to obey the set of commands that comprised the Mosaic law, that set or package of commands that included such distinctive elements as circumcision, sacrifices, the priesthood, feasts, holy days, ritual purity laws, and food laws.

(1) Though the Mosaic covenant was an interim, subsidiary covenant which was given until God's earlier promise to Abraham began to be fulfilled in Christ, some Jews gave it priority over the Abrahamic covenant and exalted it to the point that the works of the law, the commands that were part of the Mosaic covenant, became the basis of one's relationship with God and thus the basis of one's inheritance (Lk. 18:9-14; Rom. 3:27 - 4:8, 9:30

- 10:8; Gal. 2:16, 3:2, 5, 10; Phil. 3:2-11). In other words, some turned the Mosaic law into a legalistic path of salvation. Making salvation something gained by works impermissibly changed the prior and ongoing Abrahamic covenant by canceling out its promissory character (Rom. 4:13-17; Gal. 3:15-18).

(2) Part of Paul's explanation why the Gentiles were not obligated to obey the Mosaic law, contrary to the Judaizers' insistence (see, e.g., Acts 15:1, 5), was that one's standing before God is not based on one's works; it is a gift bestowed by God on the basis of faith (Rom. 3:28, 4:1-8). So to the extent Jews sought to bind the Mosaic law out of a belief that obedience to it achieved or was the basis of one's salvation, they were wrong. (Indeed, the fact Abraham's justification preceded his works shows that works are not the basis of his right standing in the eyes of God.)

(3) Another part of Paul's explanation why the Gentiles were not obligated to obey the Mosaic law was that the Christ event had rendered the old *covenant* obsolete and thus had rendered the *body of laws* that were part of that covenant obsolete (2 Cor. 3:4-18; Gal. 3:15 – 4:7). Indeed, the fact some Jews clung to the Mosaic law, insisted on applying it beyond the time of its divinely designed obsolescence, was evidence they had distorted it into the basis of their salvation.

(4) The fact Christians are not under the Mosaic law does not mean that no commands in the Mosaic law have an ongoing or renewed applicability. Some moral requirements of God that were included in the Mosaic *set* of commands continue to be applicable and indeed find their full expression in the new covenant. The law of Christ, which is based on love, includes some of those same commands (but not by virtue of their being in the Mosaic law), but it does not include things like circumcision and the myriad food laws, Sabbath and festival observances, and sacrificial rites. So if any Jews argued that those kind of "amoral" civil and ceremonial aspects that separated Jews and Gentiles were necessary manifestations of saving faith, as James argues about the ethical implications of the gospel, they were wrong.

d. The issue James faced was whether mere mental assent to the truths of Christ was sufficient for salvation. (The fact Abraham's justification would not have continued without works shows that saving faith is more than mental assent.) He declared it was not, and Paul would have agreed with him. As Daniel B. Wallace says (*Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 219): "Both James and Paul would agree, I believe, with the statement: 'Faith alone saves, but the faith that saves is not alone.'" Moo writes (PNTC, 43):

Christians need to continue to pay attention to the warning of James that true faith is to be tested by its works and that only a faith that issues in works is genuinely saving faith. James recognizes that Christians continue to sin (3:2), so he clearly does not expect 100 percent conformity to the will of God. But how high must the percentage be? How many works are necessary to validate true, saving faith? James, of course, gives no answer. But what we can say with confidence on the

basis of James's teaching is that the claim of anyone who is totally unconcerned to lead a life of obedience to God to have saving faith must be questioned.

e. Dietrich Bonhoeffer was a brilliant young German (Lutheran) pastor and seminary teacher who opposed Adolph Hitler's policies and was executed by the Nazis just days before the Allies swept in to liberate Germany. He wrote in *The Cost of Discipleship*:

Cheap grace is the grace we bestow on ourselves. Cheap grace is the preaching of forgiveness without requiring repentance, baptism without church discipline, communion without confession. Cheap grace is grace without discipleship, grace without the cross, grace without Jesus Christ, living and incarnate. Costly grace . . . is the kingly rule of Christ, for whose sake a man will pluck out the eye which causes him to stumble, it is the call of Jesus Christ at which the disciple leaves his nets and follows him" (from *The Cost of Discipleship*, quoted in *Christianity Today* 2/7/94 p. 39).

5. Rahab's faith was expressed in her welcoming and protecting Israel's spies. She did not say, "I believe in God" and then refuse to honor the agents of God. Her walk matched her talk.