

--  
6191U

## GOSNELL'S SPECIAL EFFORT - 1996

### JAMES THE JUST

Speaker: Bro. Roger Lewis

Study3: Pillar of Truth

Reading: Galatians 2: 1-10

Brother chairman, my dear brethren and sisters in the Lord Jesus Christ.

We do bring with us the love and the fraternal greetings of the brethren and sisters of the Christchurch Suburban ecclesia in New Zealand, and we joy to be with you this day, as we assemble around the emblems of our Lord and of His sacrifice, that we might remember Him in the way appointed.

I have asked for permission this morning, to use certain overheads in the course of our exhortation, because the exhortation as our chairing brother has said, is at once and the same time also, a study as part of the effort on the life of James the Just. These overheads will be helpful to our better understanding of the material this morning, but we do not believe that in any way it will impair the dignity of our memorial remembrance.

Now, you'll recall that what we've been doing in the course of these studies, is to take together approximately 6 years of the history of the Jerusalem ecclesia, and to move with that ecclesia and with James, through time that we might see the development of that ecclesia and the development of James in that regard. So, this morning we're going to do just that, we're going to move a little bit further ahead in time, and we're going to commence, in fact, our story this day with Acts 12, because Acts 12 takes us to the beginning of the next 6 years of the history of the ecclesia. We're going to be examining the years AD.42 to AD.47, and we're going to come more specifically at the beginning, therefore, of this exhortation, to the circumstances whereby James now finally does become the leader of the Jerusalem ecclesia; a circumstance that we believe occurred in AD.44. Then we're going to see how it was, that shortly after that, that Paul made yet a further visit to Jerusalem, and whilst there had a private meeting with James, on which the basis of the inclusion of the Gentiles was finally discussed, and finally agreed on by a number of brethren, but the two most important brethren that were to agree on this matter, were James and Paul. It was vital that those two brethren in particular, reach

agreement. Then we're going to find that whilst they were there in Jerusalem, James and Paul conferring privately, at that very time, that further controversy was seen from the circumcision party within the ecclesia; we're going to see how that, as it were, at the same time as certain brethren were warmly agreeing on the work of the truth together, that others were agitating in the ecclesia, and causing yet further controversy. Then we're going to find that, we believe, it was shortly after that, that James wrote his first epistle, his only epistle, an epistle to Jewish brethren and to Jewish believers.

Well then, Acts 12, and the circumstances of James now coming to final leadership of the ecclesia at this particular time. Now do you see what Acts 12 verse 1 says, it says, 'Now about that time Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the ecclesia. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword. And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also. (Then were the days of unleavened bread)'. He killed James the brother of John with the sword, says the record, and you know, in this episode there was fulfilled the very words of the Lord which the Lord had spoken to James on an earlier occasion. If you come to Mark 10, we read you see, that the Lord had warned James (this is not James the Just but James the son of Zebedee) that this would indeed occur. In Mark 10 you'll remember these words where James and John in verse 35, came to the Master asking certain things of Him. He said unto them, verse 36, 'What would ye that I should do for you? They said unto Him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand and the other on thy left hand, in thy glory. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask: can ye drink of the cup that I drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto Him, We can! and Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized'. James ben-Zebedee was the first of all the apostles who was to drink the cup of death and to die on behalf of the truth, as a martyr for the faith, and the Lord's words came true, you see, in Acts 12, when Herod in vexing certain of the ecclesia, killed James the brother of John and he did indeed, drink of the Lord's cup. The first of all the 12 to do so, his life lost in the cause of the truth.

Verse 4 says, 'When he had apprehended Peter, he put him in prison, and delivered him to four quaternions of soldiers to keep him; intending after Easter (which of course is the Passover) to bring him forth to the people. Peter therefore was kept in prison: but prayer was made without ceasing of the ecclesia unto God for him.' Actually, notice the margin for Acts 12 verse 5, it says, prayer or instant and earnest prayer was made without ceasing of the ecclesia; so what we have here, is an apostolic basis for the offering of special prayers for those in danger or those in need. This was an apostolic custom to offer special prayers, and whenever we do that, b&s, in the circumstances of ecclesial life, we are following a principle that was first founded in apostolic times. We know, of course, that those prayers were heard, because you'll all know this story the wonderful story of Rhoda coming to the door, and she hears the knocking and she

hears Peter's voice, and she's so excited that she goes back in to tell them it's Peter. Of course, they say 'she's mad' but she says 'no, it's definitely Peter. They say, 'how do you know?' she said, 'he was knocking at the door, and I heard his voice', and they said, 'where is he?' and she says, 'oh, he's at the door' and rushes back because she's completely forgotten in her excitement, of course, to open the door, and goes back and opens the door, and there's Peter, exactly as she had said. Verse 16 says, 'But Peter continued knocking and when they had opened the door, and saw him, they were astonished. But he, beckoning unto them with the hand to hold their peace, declared unto them how the Lord had brought him out of the prison. And he said, Go, show these things unto James, and to the brethren'.

Now, who's the James of Acts 12 verse 17? Well, of course, it can't be James ben-Zebedee, because he's been killed in verse 2; it can only be James the Lord's brother, the James who already has become an apostle in Galatians 1, one who has been sent to the Hebrew believers, and this is the James of whom Peter now says, '**Go show these things to James**'. Now why did Peter tell them to do so? why did Peter tell the brethren to go and tell these things to James? Well, obviously because James was now the leader of the ecclesia. You know, there's an old Jewish tradition that says, (well not a Jewish tradition actually, an old tradition) 'the apostles stayed in Jerusalem for about 12 years, before they left to continue their work in other areas', and that of course, would take us to AD.42, the ecclesia was founded in AD.30. Well, we know they were there for longer than that because there were apostles there at the time of the Jerusalem conference which we will look at, God willing, this evening, and that was about AD.49 or 50, so they were there for longer, but the point of the story is this, that there was a reason why another leader was needed in the Jerusalem ecclesia. Acts 1 tells us, well what does Acts 1 say? Acts 1 says verse 8, 'Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be witnesses unto Me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth'. Here was the Lord's commission to the 12 apostles! so you see that one by one every one of the 12 would leave the Jerusalem ecclesia; and one by one they would go to other parts of the earth, other parts of the world, other parts of the Roman empire, to be the witnesses of the Lord. When they were all gone, there would be somebody needed to take the place of the 12 in the Jerusalem ecclesia. Someone needed to guide the ecclesia once the 12 had gone, and during these years, we believe that another man had risen to prominence in the ecclesia, one who was universally respected and one who had been marked out by the Lord Himself to assume that position, James the Lord's brother. So Peter says, 'Go, show these things unto James'.

Now we know that all this took place in AD.44 because at the end of Acts 12 we have the death of Herod. We know that the death of Herod historically can be matched to the year AD.44. Now you see, just shortly after that, we believe that the apostle Paul made a further visit to the Jerusalem ecclesia. Now the story of that visit begins in Acts 11 but

it ends in Acts 12. If you come back to Acts 11 for a moment, we read the story then, of Paul's next visit to the ecclesia, and by the time he comes, James you see, is already the leader of the ecclesia. Acts 11 verse 27 says, 'In these days came prophets from Jerusalem unto Antioch. And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Caesar. Then the disciples every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea: Which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul'. So Saul, or Paul, you see, was one of the delegates chosen to convey this relief from the Antioch ecclesia to the Jerusalem ecclesia, and by the way, it wouldn't have been money. It would have been food and supplies. There was no point sending money to Jerusalem because there was a **famine** in Judea; you could have all the money in the world but it wouldn't buy any food, because there was no food. This was a delegation from the Antioch ecclesia which brought the actual goods needed, and as such it would take some time for their distribution. I believe, that when the apostle Paul and Barnabas on this occasion came down to Jerusalem to distribute this beneficence, this generosity from the Antioch ecclesia, that they probably spent a number of months in Jerusalem attending to that matter.

Acts 12 tells us in the very last verse, 'And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John'. Now, do you see the word 'ministry' in verse 25, it's the word 'diakonia' (1248) and it's the same word translated 'relief' in Acts 11 verse 29; and it's the same word because it's the same thing that they're involved in, it's the same visit, it's the same story; so Acts 11 verse 29 says, 'the Antioch ecclesia determined to send some 'diakonia' to the Jerusalem ecclesia, and they sent it by Barnabas and Paul, and Acts 12 verse 25 says, 'When Barnabas and Paul had finished fulfilling their 'diakonia', they returned to Antioch'. So there's a visit here of the apostle Paul in the middle of all this, probably for a number of months, and we believe that while he was there, he took opportunity to have a private meeting with James on great issues of the truth, and that meeting is Galatians 2, which we had read in our hearing today.

So let's go and have a look at Galatians 2 and see what the circumstances of this meeting were; it was a very important meeting you see, important for a whole lot of reasons. Now one thing that we don't have time to do this morning because it's not profitable to spend time on this during the word of exhortation, but many of you will know, those of you who have looked at the subject of the epistle to the Galatians, and in particular the visit of Galatians 2, that there has been some debate on both the writing of the epistle and the particular visit of this chapter. There are some who believe that the visit of Galatians 2 is Acts 11, which is what I'm saying this morning, and there are some who believe that the visit of Galatians 2 is Acts 15, which we'll look at, God willing, tonight. Now we haven't got time to go into detail on this this morning, suffice to say that

in the overheads, God willing, (which will be run off in the course of this week, and will be available with the tapes at the end of the effort), in the overheads I have half a dozen substantive reasons, why I believe that the visit of Galatians 2 corresponds to Acts 11. So, I'm going to ask you to at least bear with me at this stage in accepting that, but you'll be able to assess the evidence for yourself in that regard later on.

Galatians 2 verse 1 says, 'Fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach'; of course, the 'revelation' of verse 2 really answers to the prophecy of Agabus in Acts 11, because a man came and gave a revelation, that there was a famine in the land, and on the basis of that revelation, this particular visit was organized and Paul came on that basis. By the way, when he comes later on in Acts 15, he doesn't come by revelation at all! Acts 15 says, he came at the express request of the Antioch ecclesia, so it's a different circumstance, but here we believe, the circumstance answers to Acts 11. He comes with Barnabas because, remember, these were the two brethren who were asked to go up with the relief, to minister to the Jerusalem ecclesia. When it says he took Titus with him, verse 1, I think Titus was one of a number of brethren that would have gone with them on this occasion, to assist in the distribution of the relief to the brethren.

Now says Galatians 2, while he was there he took opportunity to have a meeting, verse 2 says, 'I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them that were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain'. You see, sometimes private meetings are useful, and on this particular occasion, the apostle Paul felt that such were the importance of the issues to be discussed, that it was best if, in the first instance, a private discussion was held with certain brethren, and we're told who the certain brethren are in verse 9, these were the brethren of the Jerusalem ecclesia that he and Barnabas met together with. Verse 9 says, 'And when James, and Cephas and John who seemed to be pillars **perceived the grace** that was given unto me', now notice that James is mentioned first ahead even of Peter, ahead even of John; that James was indeed now, the leader of the Jerusalem ecclesia. So to James Paul comes in order to have this private discussion on the matter; and the private discussion was, verse 2, 'about that gospel that Paul was to preach among the Gentiles'. Of course, Paul had already been involved in preaching to the Gentiles, but his first official ministry had not begun, in fact, it was only after this visit to the Jerusalem ecclesia, and only after this discussion with James, that Paul's first preaching journey then commenced the following year. Do you know where he went the following year? why, to the Galatians, to the very Galatians that he's writing to now, he went just after this discussion with James.

Now, what was the gospel that he preached to the Galatians? Well, Acts 13 tells us! because if you come back to Acts 13, we have that gospel that Paul preached to the

Gentiles, in fact, that gospel that Paul preached **immediately after** his visit to Jerusalem on this occasion. Here was the gospel that he preached to the Gentiles: verse 38, 'Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by Him **all that believe** are justified from **all things**, from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses'. Now you'll know that the word 'believe' in verse 39 is the same word as we translate as 'faith' (4100) but you can't 'faith' something in verb form, can you? so we use the verb 'believe' instead, but in the Greek it's the same; so, really, what he says is, 'by him all that believe are justified, or they are justified by faith', and they're justified says the apostle, 'from those things from which you could not be justified by Law'. So Paul's gospel to the Gentiles in essence was **justification by faith and not by Law**, and do you notice what he says in verse 39 reading carefully (you see it's how we place the emphasis, isn't it?) 'by Him, he says, **all that believe**', now you see what he's saying there, he's saying that the basis of acceptance before God on the basis of justification by faith applies not just to the Gentile, but ultimately to the Jew also; **all that believe!** This wasn't just going to be Paul's gospel to the Gentiles, this was of such far reaching importance that it would ultimately be, the very basis of acceptance for the Jew as well, and **not justification by Law**, says the apostle.

Now, come back to Galatians 2, and see how consistent that is with the apostle's teaching in this very chapter. In verse 16, the apostle says, 'Knowing that a man is **not justified** by the works of the Law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the **faith** of Christ, and not by the works of the Law: for by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified'. This is the same teaching as Acts 13, isn't it? that the basis for acceptance before God is justification by faith and not justification by Law nor by the works of Law. Now the question is, did James agree with that? The answer is, yes, he did! because as we come through this story in Galatians 2, we find, remember, that the very objective of Paul raising these matters, as that second point there tells us, was in order that he might find acceptance with those brethren in the Jerusalem ecclesia on this particular matter; that the hope of the Gentiles being included, would centre on their acceptance **by faith in Christ and not by observance of the Law**. You see, it was so vital to ensure the unity of mind that they ought to have on this issue, and of all those three men, the pillars of the Jerusalem ecclesia, of all the men in Galatians 2, that it was vital that Paul secure acceptance from, it was James, because James was **the leader** of the Jerusalem ecclesia. He was in a sense, **the** apostle to the Hebrews and Paul was **the** apostle to the Gentiles, and it was vital that these two men be in accord, if the work of the truth was to be advanced.

You'll notice that the third paragraph says there, what was the result? and the answer was, an endorsement of his work, an endorsement of his doctrine, there was an obviously warm and friendly bond that existed between Paul and James, it's evident in

the very reading of the passage, there's a spirit of harmony between the two. There's no envy, no jealousy, there's no rivalry, there's a united loyalty to the purpose of God, that permeates this meeting between James and Paul. The friendly spirit of interchange was sealed by a formal division of labour, Paul and Barnabas to the uncircumcision, James, Peter and John to the circumcision. In fact, do you notice those words in verse 9 at the end of verse 9, 'that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision'. They unto the circumcision; so, James was a man sent to the circumcision, he was an apostle to the Hebrews. Galatians 2 says that there was absolute agreement between these two brethren at this meeting.

That was vital! Do you know why it was vital? b&s, because you see, many people still saw the Jerusalem ecclesia as the mother ecclesia; and they saw James as the leader of that ecclesia as being authorative, and if James had come down with a decision that said, 'I do not agree with Paul', then the work of the truth would have been hindered everywhere. If these two men could not agree on that issue, then there were problems indeed, in the brotherhood. But when Paul writes this story and recounts this episode, do you know what he remembers? He remembers the warm, friendly spirit of that meeting, and the accord that he and James had. Ah, yes, they were united alright! I'm sure that these two brethren worked hand in hand, and you know, b&s, even as Paul remembers with gladness of heart the joy of that meeting, and the pleasantness of being able to discuss things in a spirit of brotherly kindness, he remembers also the bitterness also of that same visit to Jerusalem. Because at the very same time, as it were, he was behind closed doors with these brethren, there are others secretly agitating in the Jerusalem ecclesia, at the very same time, the circumcision party are at their work again, and verses 3 to 5 tell us that this was occurring at the same time.

Now do you see what these verses say? It says, 'Neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us unto bondage: To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you', says the apostle'. You know, if you look at the Greek of these verses, you can just feel the agitation of the apostle. He's deeply upset as he recounts the story of this episode, one of the other aspects of his visit to the Jerusalem ecclesia on this occasion. Now let's just take some thoughts through from those verses.

CONTROVERSY! further controversy now with the circumcision party yet again. So, what we're being told, therefore, in these verses, is that the presence of Titus the Greek, who was there amongst Paul's company, as Galatians 2 verse 1 tells us, attracted the attention of the circumcision party. The record implies that they employed devious and hypocritical methods to ascertain his position, Galatians 2 verse 4, and then they began to agitate about his uncircumcised state, Galatians 2 verse 3. Oh, this was a **classic**

--

issue for them, why, this was their very flag, **circumcision!** and they found someone in the meeting who wasn't! **Excellent!** but you see, it was all done in a underhand manner. There was a secret agitation, there was no coming forth to Titus or Paul, to ask openly about the matter, for a friendly discussion in a brotherly spirit, so that the truth might be served; it was done in a devious way! 'Do you know that that brother is not circumcised? pass it on!' It's so easy to spread rumours in ecclesiastis, isn't it, b&s, hurtful, hateful, spiteful rumours! You know there's a proverb that says, 'that the words of a talebearer are wounds, they go down into the deepest part of the belly', but the word 'wounds' doesn't mean 'wounds' in the proverb, it means 'choice morsels' (3859) Proverbs 18 verse 8; the real meaning of the proverb is that the words of a talebearer are like choice morsels, they go down into the deepest parts of the belly. You know, we all love gossip, don't we? b&s, 'you know, I shouldn't be telling you this, but do you know brother so-in-so...., really? but don't say anything about it! that's shocking! We love gossip and especially about other brethren and sisters, because somehow we feel just that much better if we're able to pull others down. That was the work and the spirit of the circumcision party, **they agitated from within**, they didn't bring it out into the open and call, at least, for an open discussion on the matter, they did it behind the scenes. Never to the face, of course, never to the person, only behind!

Do you see the second paragraph there, the strong language that's used to describe the circumcision party and their actions, indicate how distressed Paul was, at their disruptive influence within the Jerusalem ecclesia. Do you see these terms from verse 4, he describes them as, **false brethren** - pseudadelphos (5569), unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out', and they all suggest that these pseudo brethren were, in fact, to secretly infiltrate into the ecclesia, as spies to prepare for war against the truth. Do you see the word 'spy' (2685) in verse 4, it's the same word translated 'spies' in Numbers 13, when the spies were sent to spy out the land; now what do you send spies into a land for to spy out the land, what do you send spies for? Well you see, they are the **advance guard before the army**, their job is to 'reconnoitre', their job is to **assess the strength of the enemy**, their job is to see how the battle might be run, their job is to prepare for the all out war that's going to follow, that's what this party is all about. They're there to do battle in the ecclesia. That's their spirit you see!

The third paragraph says that the disjointed language and the broken grammar in the text itself, reveals Paul's agitated state of mind, as he recollects the bitter and argumentative nature of this episode. The words 'compelled' (315) verse 3, and 'subjection' (5292) verse 5, are words which both indicate, the aggressive approach used by the circumcision party, as they brought intense pressure to bear on the apostle, that he **yield** to their point of view. You see, what they wanted to do was to compel Paul and subject Titus to circumcision. The very language that's used describes the approach of this party, doesn't it? There's nothing gentle, there's nothing brotherly, there's nothing kindly about this group, just an aggressive determination to win their own

--  
cause and to promote their own view, whatever the cost and whatever the price to ecclesial harmony.

You see, as Paul recounts in Galatians 2 the story of his visit to the Jerusalem ecclesia on this occasion, he remembers two things side by side; oh, this episode was bitter-sweet to the apostle. He remembers the friendly spirit of a private meeting with James and the dreadful antagonism of the circumcision party. All in the same visit to the same ecclesia! and he says in verse 5, 'We gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that **the truth of the gospel might continue with you**', and Paul saw that the very issue at stake here was such a vital principle that would forever effect the basis on which a man was justified before his God; and he knew that if the circumcision won this particular battle, that justification before God from this time forth would be on the basis of Law and works of Law, and he says, I cannot agree with that! I cannot accept that! and he would not accept that, and he that we wouldn't so the truth of the gospel might continue **with you**, and he's talking, of course, to the Galatians but doesn't the word 'you' come down echoing throughout the centuries, that to this very day, we have cause to be thankful that 5 men stood firm! and as a result of that, **we** this day, the Gentiles of a far off time, come before our God to be justified on the basis of faith and not Law, because Law keeping cannot save, b&s. It is a dead letter!

Now, I want you to see what brother Carter says on this matter of circumcision that this party was so anxious to promote. Brother Carter says in his own book on Galatians, he says, 'Observance of days and months and years, wrong as Paul has shown, was yet of minor significance compared with acceptance of circumcision. The rite is antithetic to the way of salvation in Christ. It is fleshly, it implies a trust in the flesh, and it represents a trust in ritual and works that excludes faith. But faith is God's way, the only possible way, and faith is as exclusive as circumcision. There's no midway', and so the lesson that brother Carter points out as he says is, 'If they were then to turn to circumcision, Christ and His work could not profit; by their own acts, they had excluded Christ from their lives. The observance of the rite was a confession that for them, faith was insufficient, and since faith has for its object Christ and His work, it also practically, denied that Christ's way is adequate. Nothing remained but a full acceptance of the old legal observance, futile and enslaving'. This really was a crucial time, you see, for this ecclesia!

But James and Paul had fortunately met together and were at one! Now that's interesting that that's the case because there are those who do believe that James and Paul, in fact, had a different view. You'll be aware that some, in fact, who regard the epistle of James as spurious because it's different or appears to be different to the teaching of the apostle Paul. But whereas the apostle Paul said, a man is justified by faith and not by works, that James says in his epistle, a man is justified by works and not by faith, says James. So therefore, there are those that believe sincerely that the

whole epistle of James is questionable, as being absolutely antithetic to the teaching of the apostle Paul. NO, IT'S NOT, B&S, it's not at all, in fact, it's important that we understand that, I think the reason James and Paul sound different is because their words convey different meanings, they carry different weights. We need to understand that these two men, in fact, really were at one.

Now, I'm just going to show that to you by way of illustration: perhaps if you turn to James 2, in the first instance, and let's just see what James says. Now James says in James 2 verse 20, 'But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead? Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness', and you see, Paul quotes that same passage from Genesis 15, and says, 'no, we're justified by faith and not by works' and James quotes the same passage from Genesis and says 'a man is justified, verse 24, by works, and not by faith only'. But we just have to understand the respective meanings of each apostle, to whom they wrote, and the weight attached to their words.

Now, here it is, b&s, you see, James was writing to **Jews** and Paul was writing to **Gentiles**, and the problem that the Jews had was not the same as the Gentiles. Therefore, the words that James uses are not the same as Paul: now when James talks about faith to the Jews, he means those that say, 'I have faith, I believe in the truth, I believe in God, **but there was no transformation in their life**'. Their faith was merely intellectual and theoretical. James says, 'you have to have more than just theory, you've got to have a life that's changed, you've got to have works. But when James says **works** he means **works of real genuine godliness**'. You've got to have those, says James, as an indication that your faith is alive. Now what motivates those works? says James, well he says, 'it's the Law, but when James says it's the Law that motivates us, he means the liberty of a moral renewal by the inspiration of bible principle that was to be discovered in the true spirit of the Law of Moses. Therefore, James says that forgiveness for a saint comes by works of personal faith. Not that you can ever earn the kingdom, but that God expects to see that our belief has been translated into **a way of life**.

But when Paul writes, he writes to Gentiles. When Paul says you've got to have faith, what Paul means by faith is a practical life transforming power, that is, itself already seen in behavioural characteristics and in a conduct that has brought forth fruits meet for repentance. That, says Paul, in contrast to the works of Law, those works of legal and ceremonial righteousness which cannot save; it's no good to have those works, says the apostle, we need the works that spring from the transforming power of faith. **Do not go back to the Law** he says, but by the Law the apostle Paul means, the bondage of ritual observance by compulsion rather than as James understands, a moral

renewal by inspiration. When Paul says therefore, that justification comes by faith, he means that for the sinner of the Gentile, who first comes to God, there's no work that he can offer, no work that he can give to God, apart from a humble faith, the divine grace to save!

There's no difference between these two men at all, b&s, **just different words to different people for different reasons to solve different problems.** But their understanding is the same really, isn't it? the one says, 'no good having theory, our life must be transformed by the power of the Word, and it must be seen in the works of a living faith'. The other man says, 'no good having works of mere ritual, we must have our life transformed by faith in the scriptures, to live as new men and women'. It's the same thing really, just expressed in different ways.

Oh yes, they were in agreement, b&s, these two, and we should thank God that they were, because out of that, the truth of the gospel has come to us this day, and this day, b&s, with thankful hearts we bow before God and we confess on the one hand, that no works that we can do can ever save us; that only the grace of God will be sufficient for our weakness and that we rest upon the divine mercy and have faith in the blood of Christ. But that on the other hand we also know, that if Christ is our light and life, our Mentor and our Guide, then our Father also expects us to follow after Him, and to show forth works of true belief, morally transformed by the power of the Word, that we might be seen, to be, 'doers of the Word, and not hearers only'.