

## Rethinking Discrimination in Christian Fellowship: Theological Implications of James 2:1–13 for Gen Z

**Claudia Angelina<sup>1</sup>, Joko Priyono<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Soteria Purwokerto, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Teologi Injili Indonesia Samarinda, Indonesia

✉Correspondence: [claudiaangelina@sttsoteria.ac.id](mailto:claudiaangelina@sttsoteria.ac.id)

### Abstract

This article examines the theological implications of discrimination in Christian fellowship through an exegetical reading of James 2:1–13 in relation to the Gen Z community. Using a qualitative approach grounded in historical-critical exegesis and theological literature analysis, this study argues that James's prohibition of partiality is not merely a moral warning against social inequality, but a theological critique of communal practices that contradict faith in Jesus Christ, the royal law of love, and the community's accountability before divine judgment. The analysis shows that the rich-poor contrast in James 2:1–13 functions as a concrete case through which the text exposes a broader ecclesial disorder, namely the tendency to assign differential worth according to outward status and visibility. In dialogue with practical-theological studies on Gen Z, the article further argues that the passage remains highly relevant in a context where younger generations evaluate Christian communities through justice, authenticity, participation, and belonging. This study contributes an integrative theological framework that connects biblical exegesis, discrimination in Christian fellowship, and the practical-theological horizon of Gen Z, while proposing James 2:1–13 as a normative resource for evaluating ecclesial belonging in contemporary church life.

**Keywords:** Christian fellowship; discrimination; ecclesial belonging; gen z; James 2:1-13

### Abstrak

*Artikel ini mengkaji implikasi teologis diskriminasi dalam persekutuan Kristen melalui pembacaan eksegetis Yakobus 2:1–13 dalam kaitannya dengan komunitas Generasi Z. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif yang berlandaskan eksegesis historis-kritis dan analisis literatur teologis, kajian ini berargumen bahwa larangan Yakobus terhadap keberpihakan bukan sekadar peringatan moral terhadap ketimpangan sosial, melainkan kritik teologis terhadap praktik komunal yang bertentangan dengan iman kepada Yesus Kristus, hukum kerajaan tentang kasih, dan pertanggungjawaban komunitas di hadapan penghakiman ilahi. Analisis ini menunjukkan bahwa kontras kaya-miskin dalam Yakobus 2:1–13 berfungsi sebagai kasus konkret yang melaluinya teks tersebut menyingkapkan kekacauan eklesial yang lebih luas, yakni kecenderungan untuk menetapkan nilai yang berbeda berdasarkan status dan penampilan lahiriah. Dalam dialog dengan kajian teologi praktis tentang Generasi Z, artikel ini selanjutnya berargumen bahwa perikop tersebut tetap sangat relevan dalam konteks ketika generasi muda menilai komunitas Kristen melalui keadilan, autentisitas, partisipasi, dan rasa keberterimaan. Kajian ini menyumbangkan kerangka teologis integratif yang menghubungkan eksegesis biblika, diskriminasi dalam persekutuan Kristen, dan horizon teologis-praktis Generasi Z, sekaligus mengusulkan Yakobus 2:1–13 sebagai sumber normatif untuk mengevaluasi keberterimaan eklesial dalam kehidupan gereja masa kini.*

**Kata kunci:** persekutuan Kristen; diskriminasi; keberterimaan eklesial; generasi z; Yakobus 2:1-13

### INTRODUCTION

Discrimination within religious communities is a persistent issue in global theological and sociological studies, reflecting the tension between universal moral principles and exclusive practices within religious institutions. Despite the message of love and inclusivity

being central to Christianity, studies show that the modern church still suffers from discrimination based on race, social status, orientation, and personal identity.<sup>1</sup> This phenomenon occurs in various parts of the world, including Christian-majority countries, where exclusionary practices are legitimized by the internal doctrines of the church community itself.<sup>2</sup>

This issue of discrimination has become especially urgent in light of the serious tension between the church's affirmation of divine love and its concrete communal practices. In many Christian settings, the language of equality, mercy, and mutual acceptance continues to be affirmed normatively, yet forms of exclusion based on social location, symbolic status, and communal visibility remain deeply embedded in the life of faith communities.<sup>3</sup> This tension becomes particularly significant when read through James 2:1–13, a passage that explicitly condemns partiality and places discrimination in direct contradiction to faith in Jesus Christ and obedience to the royal law of love.<sup>4</sup> For that reason, James 2:1–13 should not be treated merely as a moral appeal against social impropriety in the early church, but as a theological text that exposes the incompatibility between Christian faith and discriminatory patterns of fellowship.

The significance of this issue becomes sharper when Christian fellowship is viewed in relation to Generation Z. For the purposes of this study, Generation Z refers to the cohort of individuals born between approximately 1997 and 2012, who grew up in a fully digitalized, globally networked, and socially pluralistic environment.<sup>5</sup> This generational framing is significant because it situates the discussion within a demographic context that is now actively shaping contemporary church life. As Landová notes, Gen Z exhibits distinct patterns of religiosity and spirituality shaped by digital culture, shifting social values, and heightened sensitivity to institutional credibility, though these characteristics vary considerably across cultural and national settings.<sup>6</sup> Contemporary research in practical theology and youth studies indicates that many members of Generation Z do not evaluate religious communities solely on the basis of doctrinal coherence, but also through their ability to embody justice, authenticity, participation, and a sense of belonging in tangible and relational ways. In the Indonesian context specifically, the issue of discrimination within church communities carries its own complexities, intersecting social stratification, ethnic diversity, cultural hierarchy, and theological tradition simultaneously. Indonesian churches serve a theologically plural and ethnically diverse population, and communities within this context face particular challenges in embodying the anti-partiality vision of James 2:1–13 across lines of social class, cultural

---

<sup>1</sup> Jonathan Fox and Ariel Zellman, "The Utility of Discrimination: Religious Discrimination and Governmental Legitimacy in Christian-Majority Countries," *European Political Science Review* 17, no. 3 (August 22, 2025): 496–513.

<sup>2</sup> David Kline, *Racism and the Weakness of Christian Identity* (Routledge, 2020), <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780429591570>.

<sup>3</sup> Savannah Senger and Veola E. Vazquez, "Religious Experiences, Expectations of Discrimination, and Distress Among Biracial Christians," *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 52, no. 4 (December 14, 2024): 386–391, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00916471241231914>.

<sup>4</sup> Philip Suciadi Chia, "The 'Faith' Problem in James 2," *Theological Journal Kerugma* 7, no. 1 (April 25, 2024): 37–42, <https://jurnal.sttii-surabaya.ac.id/index.php/kerugma/article/view/373>; Jeannine K. Brown, "James 2:1–13," *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 62, no. 2 (April 1, 2008): 174–175, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/002096430806200208>.

<sup>5</sup> Pew Research Center, "Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins," *Pew Research Center*, January 2019, <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>, Accessed June 4, 2026.

<sup>6</sup> Tabita Landová, "What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection," *Journal of Youth and Theology* 22, no. 2 (September 5, 2022): 226–250, [https://brill.com/view/journals/jyjt/22/2/article-p226\\_005.xml](https://brill.com/view/journals/jyjt/22/2/article-p226_005.xml).

background, and generational difference. These contextual pressures make the theological contribution of the present study especially relevant for the Indonesian ecclesial setting, where Generation Z's heightened sensitivity to justice and equality increasingly challenges inherited patterns of communal life. Consequently, patterns of exclusivity within the church are no longer viewed as trivial interpersonal failures; they are interpreted by younger believers as indicators of whether the Christian faith is genuinely lived out or merely proclaimed. In this regard, discrimination within the Christian community is not merely a pastoral issue of interpersonal sensitivity, but a theological issue that directly affects the church's witness before a generation that is especially attentive to inconsistency, inequality, and symbolic exclusion.

Previous studies have developed along three major lines. First, the study by Halawa and Zega highlight the importance of non-discriminatory love as an embodiment of the church's social theology, but has yet to extend this reflection to the framework of the younger generation community.<sup>7</sup> Exegetical research on James 2:1–13 has largely concentrated on the condemnation of favoritism, especially in relation to the rich and the poor, and has clarified the passage's rhetorical, ethical, and theological structure.<sup>8</sup> These studies are important because they establish that *prosōpolēmpsia* in James is not a trivial social fault but a violation of the very logic of faith and of the command to love one's neighbor. Second, research in practical theology and youth ministry has increasingly focused on inclusivity, participation, and the problem of ecclesial attrition among young people, showing that youth disengagement is closely tied to church cultures that are programmatic, hierarchical, and insufficiently relational.<sup>9</sup> Third, empirical studies on discrimination within Christian communities have demonstrated that exclusion has measurable psychosocial and spiritual consequences, especially among individuals who experience themselves as vulnerable, marginal, or structurally unseen within church life.<sup>10</sup> Together, these strands of scholarship confirm that discrimination is not a secondary issue in ecclesial studies, but one that touches biblical interpretation, community formation, and the credibility of Christian witness.

At the same time, the existing literature still leaves important questions unresolved. Exegetical studies on James 2:1–13 have successfully clarified the text's condemnation of favoritism and its ethical coherence, yet they have generally remained concentrated on the socio-economic contrast between rich and poor in the ancient setting and have not sufficiently developed a constructive theological account of how this text addresses discrimination in contemporary Christian fellowship.<sup>11</sup> Conversely, studies on Gen Z, inclusivity, and youth ministry have highlighted the importance of justice, authenticity, and belonging, but these discussions often remain at the level of pastoral strategy or ecclesial adaptation and are rarely grounded in sustained exegetical engagement with a biblical text that can function normatively

---

<sup>7</sup> Jonius Halawa and Abad Jaya Zega, "Yakobus 2: 1-13: Meninjau Pentingnya Kasih Tanpa Memandang Muka," *Jurnal Teologi Injili dan Pendidikan Agama* 2, no. 1 (2024): 43–50.

<sup>8</sup> Brown, "James 2:1–13," 174–176; Chia, "The 'Faith' Problem in James 2," 34–49.

<sup>9</sup> Michael W. Droege and Malan Nel, "Inclusivity in Youth Ministry Praxis and the Challenge of Mainline Church Attrition," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 45, no. 1 (June 4, 2024): 2–7, <https://verbumeteclesia.org.za/index.php/ve/article/view/3016>.

<sup>10</sup> Senger and Vazquez, "Religious Experiences, Expectations of Discrimination, and Distress Among Biracial Christians," 386–391; Desi Sianipar et al., "Teaching Anti-Discrimination Attitudes through Christian Religious Education in School," *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies* 3, no. 4 (August 30, 2021): 276–278, <https://ojs.unimal.ac.id/ijevs/article/view/4101>.

<sup>11</sup> Brown, "James 2:1–13," 175–176; Chia, "The 'Faith' Problem in James 2," 40–46.

for theological critique of church life.<sup>12</sup> As a result, the relationship between James 2:1–13, the theological meaning of discrimination in Christian fellowship, and the lived expectations of the Gen Z community remains conceptually underdeveloped. This unresolved tension constitutes the central problem addressed by the present article: the absence of an integrative theological framework that explains how the anti-partiality teaching of James 2:1–13 can be brought into direct dialogue with contemporary forms of exclusion within Christian communities and with the ecclesial expectations of a generation especially sensitive to justice, relational credibility, and communal belonging.<sup>13</sup>

A further difficulty in the literature lies in several assumptions that are often accepted without sufficient scrutiny. One common assumption is that the significance of James 2:1–13 is adequately captured when the passage is confined to the rich-poor binary. Although that social contrast is undeniably central to the text, such an interpretation may become reductive when applied too quickly to contemporary contexts. Partiality in James is not only about economic preference; it concerns the theological act of assigning differential worth within the body of believers, thereby violating the law of love and undermining the communal logic of faith itself.<sup>14</sup> Another assumption in practical theology is that ecclesial inclusivity can be secured primarily through better programming, improved youth engagement, or more contextually sensitive ministry methods. Yet such an approach may fail to address the deeper issue, namely that exclusion in Christian fellowship often arises not merely from methodological weakness but from theological incoherence within the church's own relational structures.<sup>15</sup> These assumptions become particularly inadequate when transferred across contexts, because Gen Z cannot be treated as a monolithic category and contemporary experiences of exclusion cannot be explained fully by inherited pastoral models alone. What is needed, therefore, is a more integrated reading in which James 2:1–13 is approached not as a narrowly historical text or a general ethical slogan, but as a living theological critique of communal practice in the present church.

This article argues that James 2:1–13 provides a crucial theological basis for rethinking discrimination in Christian fellowship in relation to the Gen Z community. By bringing exegetical theology into direct conversation with practical theology and with the social-religious horizon of younger believers, this study seeks to show that the prohibition of partiality in James is not exhausted by its ancient socio-economic setting, but speaks normatively to the church's present struggle to become a community marked by justice, mercy, and genuine belonging. In this way, the text functions not merely as a source of ethical exhortation, but as a theological lens through which the church can evaluate whether its patterns of fellowship remain faithful to the gospel it proclaims.

Therefore, this article offers a distinctive contribution by integrating the exegesis of James 2:1–13 with the theological analysis of discrimination in Christian fellowship and the practical-theological horizon of Gen Z in order to construct a normative framework for evaluating ecclesial belonging in contemporary church life. More specifically, it aims to

---

<sup>12</sup> Droege and Nel, "Inclusivity in Youth Ministry Praxis and the Challenge of Mainline Church Attrition," 238–246; Tanita Tualla Maddox, "Chrysostom and Generation Z: Resilience, Identity, and Social Justice," *Journal of Youth and Theology* 23, no. 2 (May 26, 2023): 220–226, [https://brill.com/view/journals/jyt/23/2/article-p209\\_005.xml](https://brill.com/view/journals/jyt/23/2/article-p209_005.xml).

<sup>13</sup> Droege and Nel, "Inclusivity in Youth Ministry Praxis and the Challenge of Mainline Church Attrition," 6–8; Senger and Vazquez, "Religious Experiences, Expectations of Discrimination, and Distress Among Biracial Christians," 388–391.

<sup>14</sup> Brown, "James 2:1–13," 174–176; Chia, "The 'Faith' Problem in James 2," 37–46.

<sup>15</sup> Droege and Nel, "Inclusivity in Youth Ministry Praxis and the Challenge of Mainline Church Attrition," 6–8; Landová, "What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection," 238–246.

formulate the theological implications of James 2:1–13 for understanding and responding to discrimination in Christian fellowship within the lived context of the Gen Z community. In doing so, the article advances a biblically grounded and contextually focused theological account of Christian fellowship that moves beyond general appeals to inclusivity by showing how the royal law of love must shape ecclesial relationships, communal structures, and the church’s credibility before younger generations.

## METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research design grounded in biblical exegesis and theological literature analysis. Its primary method is historical-critical exegesis, used to interpret James 2:1–13 as the principal text for examining the theological meaning of discrimination in Christian fellowship. In this framework, exegesis is not limited to reconstructing the original sense of the passage, but is directed toward clarifying the normative theological claims embedded in the text and their relevance for contemporary ecclesial life. Such an approach is appropriate because the central problem of this article is not empirical measurement of attitudes among Generation Z, but the formulation of a theological account of Christian fellowship derived from James 2:1–13 and brought into dialogue with present concerns regarding justice, belonging, and exclusion within the church.<sup>16</sup>

The primary source of this study is the Greek text of James 2:1–13 in the *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th edition, which remains one of the most widely recognized critical editions for New Testament scholarship.<sup>17</sup> The exegetical analysis focuses on the rhetorical movement of the passage, its socio-historical setting, and key theological terms that structure its argument, especially *prosōpolēmpsia* and *nomos basilikos*. Particular attention is given to how the prohibition of partiality functions within the internal logic of the passage and how the royal law of love serves as the normative center of James’s ethical vision.<sup>18</sup> In this respect, the analysis proceeds through close reading of the text, examination of lexical and syntactical features, and engagement with relevant scholarly interpretations in order to identify the theological weight of James’s critique of favoritism.

To support this exegetical work, the study also employs a theological-literature review of selected scholarship in three interconnected areas: studies on James 2:1–13 and its theology of faith, judgment, and partiality; studies on discrimination and exclusion within Christian communities; and studies in practical theology concerning Generation Z, especially those related to justice, authenticity, participation, and belonging. These secondary sources are not used as empirical data in the strict sociological sense, but as interpretive conversation partners that help situate the theological implications of James 2:1–13 within contemporary ecclesial discourse.<sup>19</sup> This step is necessary because the article seeks to build an integrative theological argument rather than merely repeat the historical meaning of the text or describe youth ministry trends in isolation.

Methodologically, the study proceeds in three stages. First, it conducts an exegetical reading of James 2:1–13 by attending to the structure of the passage, its key vocabulary, and its

<sup>16</sup> Chia, “The ‘Faith’ Problem in James 2,” 37–49.

<sup>17</sup> Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Revised Ed. (Stuttgart Alle Rechte vorbehalten: Institute for New Testament Textual Research, 2012), 66.

<sup>18</sup> Brown, “James 2:1–13,” 174–175; Chia, “The ‘Faith’ Problem in James 2,” 40–46.

<sup>19</sup> Droege and Nel, “Inclusivity in Youth Ministry Praxis and the Challenge of Mainline Church Attrition,” 2–7; Landová, “What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection,” 232–239; Maddox, “Chrysostom and Generation Z: Resilience, Identity, and Social Justice,” 214–222.

theological argument against favoritism. Second, it synthesizes the exegetical findings with contemporary theological and practical literature on discrimination in Christian fellowship and the lived concerns of Gen Z. Third, it formulates the theological implications of the passage for Christian fellowship today, with particular attention to how the church's communal life may be evaluated in light of the royal law of love and the problem of ecclesial belonging. In this way, the method remains consistent with the aim of the study, namely, to construct a biblically grounded and contextually focused theological framework for understanding and responding to discrimination in Christian fellowship within the horizon of the Gen Z community.

This research does not claim to offer direct empirical findings about the experiences of Gen Z in specific congregations, since it does not employ interviews, surveys, or ethnographic observation. Rather, its contribution lies in theological construction: it re-reads James 2:1–13 as a normative text for evaluating contemporary Christian fellowship and then places that reading in critical conversation with current scholarship on younger generations and ecclesial inclusion.<sup>20</sup> Accordingly, the validity of the study depends on exegetical rigor, conceptual coherence, and the careful integration of biblical theology and practical-theological reflection.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Rhetorical and Theological Analysis of James 2:1-13

James 2:1–13 forms a coherent rhetorical unit whose central concern is the incompatibility between faith in Jesus Christ and acts of partiality within the believing community. Rather than presenting a loose moral admonition, the passage unfolds as a carefully ordered argument: verse 1 states the thesis, verses 2–4 illustrate the problem through a concrete congregational scenario, verses 5–7 supply theological and social reasons for the rebuke, and verses 8–13 bring the argument to its climax by grounding the entire discussion in the royal law and in the certainty of divine judgment. This arrangement is important because it shows that James is not merely condemning bad manners toward the poor; he is exposing a theological contradiction within the life of the assembly itself. Faith in “our glorious Lord Jesus Christ” cannot coexist with a mode of fellowship that assigns honor according to visible social advantage.<sup>21</sup> The analysis therefore concludes that James 2:1–13 must be read not simply as a social critique, but as a theological indictment of discriminatory fellowship.

### *Hypothetical Case and Rhetorical Questions as Exordium and Narratio (vv. 1-4)*

Verses 1–4 function rhetorically as *exordium* and *narratio*, that is, as the opening of the argument and the presentation of the case that frames the issue under dispute. James begins with an imperative prohibition in verse 1: believers are not to hold the faith of “our glorious Lord Jesus Christ” with partiality. This opening already establishes the central theological tension of the passage, because it places side by side two realities that cannot coexist: faith in Christ and discriminatory judgment within the assembly. As Jeannine K. Brown observes, the force of the verse lies in the incompatibility between allegiance to the exalted Christ and social valuation based on external status; James therefore introduces the issue not merely as improper conduct, but as a contradiction of faith itself.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Landová, “What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection,” 220–226.

<sup>21</sup> Brown, “James 2:1–13,” 174–175; Wesley Hiram Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 59–113.

<sup>22</sup> Brown, “James 2:1–13,” 174–175.

The movement into *narratio* occurs in verses 2–3, where James constructs a vivid hypothetical case involving two visitors entering the assembly, one richly dressed and the other poor. The rhetorical strength of the illustration lies not simply in the contrast between rich and poor, but in the congregation’s evaluative response. Honor is extended to the wealthy man, while the poor man is humiliated and relegated to a lower place. Duane F. Watson argues that James 2 is rhetorically arranged according to a recognizable argumentative pattern, and this illustrative case functions to draw the audience into the logic of the argument rather than merely provide an example of social inequality.<sup>23</sup> The scene therefore serves as more than social description; it reveals the criteria by which the community distributes dignity.

Verse 4 then brings this opening movement to its climax through rhetorical interrogation: “Have you not made distinctions among yourselves, and become judges with evil thoughts?” These questions are not requests for information, but instruments of exposure. James compels the hearers to recognize that their treatment of persons is theologically charged. Wesley Hiram Wachob notes that the rhetoric of James 2:1–13 is deliberative in force, aiming to persuade the audience that partiality is incompatible with the faith they profess.<sup>24</sup> Thus, verses 1–4 function effectively as *exordium* and *narratio* by introducing the problem, embodying it in a concrete congregational case, and leading the audience toward self-judgment. The rich-poor example remains the immediate case in view, but the theological principle extends beyond that example: whenever the church assigns worth selectively on the basis of outward markers, it betrays the character of faith itself.

#### *Theological Argumentation as Confirmatio (vv. 5-7)*

Verses 5–7 function as *confirmatio*, the stage in which James provides the grounds for his rebuke and demonstrates why partiality is indefensible. Here the argument moves from narrated case to theological reasoning. James reminds the assembly that God has chosen the poor in the world to be rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom promised to those who love Him. The point is not that poverty is romanticized or treated as inherently virtuous, but that the congregation’s evaluative order stands in direct contradiction to God’s own action. Brown rightly notes that James reverses ordinary social assumptions by locating honor where the community had withheld it.<sup>25</sup> In this way, the church’s discriminatory conduct is exposed as a failure to see persons according to the logic of God’s kingdom.

James then strengthens the *confirmatio* by appealing to lived social reality. The rich, whom the congregation has preferred to honor, are frequently the very ones who oppress them, drag them into court, and dishonor the noble name by which they are called. Peter H. Davids points out that James’s argument here is both theological and practical: the community’s favoritism is irrational because it grants privilege to those aligned with structures of domination while dishonoring those whom God has dignified.<sup>26</sup> The rhetorical effect is sharp. Partiality appears not merely as social unfairness, but as an ecclesial failure that mirrors worldly hierarchies rather than the kingdom logic the church confesses.

Accordingly, verses 5–7 serve as *confirmatio* by showing that favoritism cannot be defended either in light of God’s action or in light of communal reality. The church’s pattern of

---

<sup>23</sup> Duane F. Watson, “James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation,” *New Testament Studies* 39, no. 1 (1993): 94–100.

<sup>24</sup> Wesley Hiram Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, 59–75, 98–100.

<sup>25</sup> Brown, “James 2:1–13,” 175–176.

<sup>26</sup> Peter Davids, *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text (New International Greek Testament Commentary)*, *New International Greek Testament Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 107–110.

recognition is exposed as fundamentally disordered because it contradicts divine election, misunderstands the nature of faith, and reproduces the honor codes of the surrounding world.

### ***Normative Principle and Conclusion as Peroratio (vv. 8-13)***

Verses 8–13 form the *peroratio*, the climactic conclusion in which James gathers the argument into its normative and eschatological force. The decisive turn occurs in verse 8, where he invokes the *nomos basilikos*, the royal law: “You shall love your neighbor as yourself.” With this appeal, James shifts from the narrated instance of discrimination to the governing principle by which the community must be judged. Luke Timothy Johnson argues that the quotation of Leviticus 19:18 functions here as the normative center of the passage, establishing love of neighbor as the measure of authentic communal life.<sup>27</sup> James’s point is therefore not simply that favoritism is unpleasant or harmful, but that it violates the central command by which the people of God are to live.

Verses 9–11 intensify this claim by insisting that partiality convicts the community as transgressors and by appealing to the unity of the law. The law cannot be obeyed selectively, because it expresses the coherent will of God rather than a list of detachable commands. Douglas J. Moo emphasizes that James does not minimize other sins here; rather, he underscores that disobedience at this point reveals a fundamental breach in covenantal fidelity.<sup>28</sup> This means that favoritism is not a minor inconsistency that can be hidden beneath orthodox confession, but a concrete violation of the divine will.

The section reaches its full *peroratio* force in verses 12–13, where the community is exhorted to speak and act as those who will be judged by the law of liberty. The final statement, “mercy triumphs over judgment,” does not soften the rebuke but completes it. Mercy becomes the decisive mark of life under God’s reign, while the absence of mercy exposes the assembly to judgment without mercy. Johnson observes that James here binds ethics and eschatology together: communal conduct is measured in view of divine judgment, and mercy becomes the criterion by which the integrity of faith is disclosed.<sup>29</sup> Thus, verses 8–13 conclude the argument by showing that discrimination within Christian fellowship is theologically intolerable because it violates the royal law, contradicts the freedom of the gospel, and places the church under eschatological scrutiny.

### **Linguistic and Ethical Analysis of James 2:1-13**

The linguistic texture of the passage confirms this theological reading. The term *προσωποληψία* (*prosōpolēpsia*) in verse 1 refers to partiality or favoritism based on external consideration, especially social standing or visible status. In the context of James 2:1–13, the term does not denote mere preference in an ordinary sense, but discriminatory valuation that disrupts the moral order of the believing community. Its force becomes clear when read together with verse 4, where discriminatory treatment is identified as making distinctions and becoming judges with evil thoughts. The lexical field, therefore, links partiality to corrupted judgment. James is not only criticizing behavior; he is exposing a distorted mode of perception

---

<sup>27</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson, *No Title, The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, The Anchor Yale Bible* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001), 237–239.

<sup>28</sup> Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000), 109–113.

<sup>29</sup> Johnson, *No Title, The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, The Anchor Yale Bible*, 240–244.

in which external signs of prestige govern communal discernment.<sup>30</sup> The analysis of the term thus strengthens the conclusion that discrimination in fellowship begins not merely in action, but in a theological failure of vision.

The phrase νόμος βασιλικός (*nomos basilikos*) in verse 8 functions as the positive counterpart to that distorted vision. The *nomos basilikos* is not merely an ethical norm but carries an eschatological and communitarian dimension that provides the theological basis for egalitarian social ordering within the Christian community.<sup>31</sup> This law affirms that love is not an optional extra, but a divine mandate that becomes the benchmark of piety. By calling love of neighbor the royal law, James frames the life of the community under a norm that is both ethical and theological. The law is “royal” because it expresses the order of God’s reign and directs communal life according to divine rather than social hierarchies. In this light, love is not an optional virtue added to church life after doctrine has been established; it is the norm by which the authenticity of the community’s faith is tested. The result of the linguistic analysis, therefore, is that the movement from *prosōpolēmψia* to *nomos basilikos* marks the movement from corrupted communal judgment to rightly ordered ecclesial life. James’s argument is not satisfied with the rejection of one discriminatory act; it calls for the reconstitution of communal relationships under the rule of mercy and love.<sup>32</sup>

### Preliminary Theological Result

Taken together, the rhetorical, lexical, and theological features of James 2:1–13 yield one primary result: discrimination in Christian fellowship is incompatible with the identity of the church because it contradicts faith in Christ, dishonors God’s valuation of persons, violates the royal law of love, and exposes the community to judgment without mercy. This means that the passage should not be treated merely as an ancient rebuke against economic favoritism, but as a normative theological text for evaluating the credibility of ecclesial belonging in every context where visible status, symbolic capital, or social advantage becomes the basis for communal recognition. That conclusion becomes especially important for the next stage of discussion, where the implications of this text must be brought into dialogue with contemporary forms of exclusion and with the expectations of Gen Z regarding justice, authenticity, and belonging in church life.<sup>33</sup>

### The Theological Meaning of Discrimination in Christian Fellowship

The results of the exegetical analysis show that James 2:1–13 does not treat discrimination as a marginal ethical weakness, but as a theological contradiction within the community of faith. The prohibition of partiality in verse 1, the exposure of corrupt judgment in verse 4, and the appeal to the royal law in verses 8–13 together indicate that favoritism is not

---

<sup>30</sup> Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*, 2nd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 744, sec. 88.228; Chia, “The ‘Faith’ Problem in James 2,” 40–42.

<sup>31</sup> Hendra Winarjo, “Jesus Christ as The Embodiment of the Wisdom of God: A Theological Commentary on James 3:13-18,” *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi dan Pelayanan* 22, no. 2 (December 2, 2023): 303–319, <https://ojs.seabs.ac.id/index.php/Veritas/article/view/539>.

<sup>32</sup> Serge Ruzer, “James on Faith and Righteousness in the Context of a Broader Jewish Exegetical Discourse,” in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity* (BRILL, 2013), 79–104, [https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004245006/B9789004245006\\_006.xml](https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004245006/B9789004245006_006.xml); Brown, “James 2:1–13,” 175.

<sup>33</sup> Droege and Nel, “Inclusivity in Youth Ministry Praxis and the Challenge of Mainline Church Attrition,” 2–8; Landová, “What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection,” 232–246.

simply a matter of social impropriety, but a denial of the identity of the church as a community gathered under the lordship of Christ. In this respect, discrimination in Christian fellowship is theological before it is sociological. It is theological because it distorts the community's perception of persons, replacing God's evaluative order with human criteria of honor, status, and visibility.<sup>34</sup> James therefore does not merely ask believers to behave more kindly; he calls the assembly to recognize that discriminatory fellowship is incompatible with faith in the glorious Lord and with the law of love that governs life under God's reign.

This point is important because much of the discussion on James 2 has been confined to the socio-economic contrast between rich and poor. That dimension is certainly central to the text, but the theological force of the passage is broader than that single contrast. The rich-poor scenario functions as the concrete case through which James exposes a deeper ecclesial pathology, namely the tendency of the believing community to assign differential worth according to outward markers. The problem, then, is not wealth as such, but the formation of a community whose patterns of recognition are shaped by social prestige rather than divine mercy.<sup>35</sup> In this light, James 2:1–13 offers more than a social critique of the ancient assembly; it articulates a theological anthropology and an ecclesiology in which the value of persons is not determined by public status but by their equal standing before God.

The reference to the *nomos basilikos* in verse 8 is decisive for this theological reading. By grounding communal life in the command to love one's neighbor as oneself, James frames discrimination as a failure to live according to the central norm of covenantal existence.<sup>36</sup> Love here is not reducible to sentiment or moral idealism. It is the authoritative principle by which Christian fellowship is ordered, tested, and judged. That is why James can move from the condemnation of favoritism to the warning of judgment without mercy. The church is not free to treat mercy as an optional supplement to orthodoxy, because mercy belongs to the very substance of faithful communal life. When the assembly honors some and humiliates others, it does not merely fail socially; it fails theologically by contradicting the law it claims to uphold.<sup>37</sup> In this sense, James 2:1–13 presents discrimination as a spiritual and ecclesial disorder that threatens the integrity of Christian witness.

### ***James 2:1-13 and the Horizon of the Gen Z Community***

When these theological findings are placed in conversation with the horizon of Generation Z, the relevance of the passage becomes especially clear. Contemporary studies suggest that many Gen Z individuals demonstrate heightened sensitivity to questions of justice, participation, authenticity, and belonging, and that this cohort frequently evaluates institutions, including religious ones, according to whether these values are embodied in practice rather than merely affirmed in language.<sup>38</sup> It must be acknowledged, however, that these tendencies are not uniform across all Gen Z individuals or cultural settings. In the Indonesian context, for instance, young Christians navigate complex intersections of family loyalty, ecclesial tradition, cultural hierarchy, and emerging personal values, and their responses to discrimination within church life reflect this layered reality rather than a single

---

<sup>34</sup> Brown, "James 2:1–13," 174–175; Chia, "The 'Faith' Problem in James 2," 37–42.

<sup>35</sup> Wesley Hiram Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*, 98–108; Watson, "James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation," 111–117.

<sup>36</sup> Brown, "James 2:1–13," 175–176.

<sup>37</sup> Ruzer, "James on Faith and Righteousness in the Context of a Broader Jewish Exegetical Discourse," 92–98.

<sup>38</sup> Maddox, "Chrysostom and Generation Z: Resilience, Identity, and Social Justice," 209–230; Landová, "What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection," 226–250.

generational profile. The point, therefore, is not that Gen Z should be idealized as morally superior to previous generations or treated as a monolithic category with fixed characteristics. Rather, it means that the church, including churches in Indonesia, now encounters a generation whose awareness of exclusion makes discriminatory patterns within Christian fellowship increasingly visible and theologically untenable. For many younger believers, the issue is not only whether the church teaches love, but whether that love becomes recognizable in its patterns of welcome, recognition, and genuine participation.

At this point, James 2:1–13 speaks with striking contemporary force. The text reveals that the contradiction between confession and communal practice is not a modern problem imposed on Scripture from outside, but one already confronted within the New Testament itself. James shows that a community can profess faith in Christ while simultaneously reproducing relational hierarchies that deny the implications of that faith. This insight is crucial for interpreting the ecclesial disillusionment that research increasingly documents among younger generations. When younger Christians perceive favoritism, symbolic exclusion, or unequal participation within church life, their concern is not merely a generational preference; it often reflects a legitimate theological perception that communal practice has failed to correspond to the gospel the church proclaims. In the Indonesian ecclesiastical landscape, where social hierarchy, economic stratification, and ethnic identification can inform patterns of recognition and belonging within congregations, this dynamic carries particular weight. Indonesian Gen Z believers who encounter such inconsistencies are not simply responding to abstract ideals; they are evaluating whether the church embodies the kind of community that James describes as governed by the royal law. In that sense, the concern for justice and belonging that researchers associate with many younger generations can be read not as an external pressure placed upon the church, but as a context in which the church is called to confront, with renewed seriousness, the continuing force of James's warning against partiality.

This perspective also helps resist an overly reductive reading of Gen Z. The literature often emphasizes that this generation values openness, participation, and authenticity, yet such descriptions require careful qualification to avoid becoming sweeping generalizations that obscure the diversity of lived experience within the generation.<sup>39</sup> Scholars have cautioned that portraying Gen Z as a uniform cohort defined by particular values risks both idealizing and essentializing a generation whose members navigate varying cultural, economic, religious, and national contexts.<sup>40</sup> The analytical contribution of James 2:1–13 in this regard is not to confirm a cultural profile but to provide a theological grammar for understanding why discrimination in Christian fellowship carries such significant consequences regardless of generational context. When exclusion is embedded in Christian fellowship, the church becomes difficult to inhabit as a believable site of grace, and this difficulty is not confined to any single generation. For those who are younger and still forming their relationship to institutional Christianity, however, the costs may be especially formative. Belonging is not merely a psychological need or a ministry strategy; it is a communal expression of the law of love. A church that cannot sustain just and merciful relationships risks not only losing younger members, but also obscuring the theological intelligibility of its own confession.

---

<sup>39</sup> Landová, "What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection," 226–250.

<sup>40</sup> Maddox, "Chrysostom and Generation Z: Resilience, Identity, and Social Justice," 209–230.

### ***From Anti-Partiality to Ecclesial Belonging***

The exegetical results and the Gen Z horizon together suggest that the central issue in this study is not inclusion in the abstract, but the theological quality of ecclesial belonging. James 2:1–13 does not simply call for more courteous treatment of marginalized persons; it reorders the church's logic of recognition. Belonging, in this framework, cannot mean passive admission into a community whose structures of honor remain unchanged. It must refer to a form of fellowship in which persons are received without discriminatory valuation and where communal life is shaped by mercy rather than prestige. This is why the anti-partiality command in James should be interpreted not only negatively as the rejection of favoritism, but positively as the construction of a fellowship governed by the royal law.

Such a move is important because much contemporary church language speaks of inclusivity without adequately examining the structures through which exclusion is maintained. A congregation may use the language of welcome while still organizing its life around prestige, patronage, generational distance, or unequal access to voice and visibility. James 2:1–13 challenges precisely that inconsistency. The text pushes the discussion beyond formal acceptance toward the deeper question of whether the church's relational order actually reflects God's valuation of persons.<sup>41</sup> In this sense, the theological contribution of James is not exhausted by condemning a discrete act of favoritism; it lies in revealing that Christian fellowship must be assessed by the way it distributes dignity, participation, and mercy within the body.

For the Gen Z community, this point is especially significant, though it must be understood in relation to the particular contexts in which younger Christians live and worship. In the Indonesian setting, for example, younger Christians often seek communities in which they are not merely included as passive recipients of programming, but are genuinely recognized as participants in a shared life, one shaped by mutual regard, theological seriousness, and equitable access to voice and belonging. Therefore, the category of ecclesial belonging helps clarify what is theologically at stake in the application of James 2:1–13 today. The opposite of discrimination is not merely neutrality or formal acceptance, but a community in which one's presence is not diminished by status markers, inherited hierarchy, or symbolic exclusion. Such belonging is theological because it arises from the church's obedience to the law of love; it is ecclesial because it concerns the actual ordering of fellowship; and it is practical because it becomes visible in the habits, decisions, and communal ethos of the congregation. On this reading, James 2:1–13 does not simply prohibit a wrong action; it calls the church to become a recognizably different kind of community.

### ***Ecclesial and Practical Implications***

The theological implications of this discussion are direct. If discrimination in Christian fellowship contradicts faith in Christ, then the church must examine not only explicit acts of exclusion, but also the relational and symbolic structures through which partiality is normalized. This includes the ways honor is distributed, whose voices are heard, whose presence is centered, and how communities implicitly define worth and credibility. The challenge posed by James is therefore not satisfied by occasional ethical exhortation. It requires a critical re-evaluation of ecclesial culture itself. Churches that wish to remain credible before

---

<sup>41</sup> Jonathan S. Barnes, "A Word about . . . Belonging and the Continuing Struggle for Justice," *Review & Expositor* 119, no. 3–4 (November 26, 2022): 197–201, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00346373231161597>.

younger generations must do more than proclaim inclusion; they must cultivate communal practices in which mercy, justice, and equal regard are structurally visible.<sup>42</sup>

This does not require the church to surrender theological conviction in order to accommodate contemporary sensibilities. On the contrary, James 2:1–13 suggests that the rejection of partiality belongs to the heart of Christian theological conviction. The issue is not whether the church should become socially fashionable, but whether it will embody the communal implications of the faith it professes. In that respect, Gen Z does not stand outside the theological argument of the text; rather, the concerns frequently associated with Gen Z bring into sharper focus the continuing force of James's critique. The church's task, then, is not merely to become more attractive to younger people, but to become more faithful to the royal law by which Christian fellowship is measured.

For this reason, the present study argues that the contemporary significance of James 2:1–13 lies in its capacity to provide a normative theological framework for evaluating ecclesial belonging. The passage shows that discrimination is not a secondary problem to be addressed only at the level of pastoral response, but a matter that touches the church's identity, witness, and fidelity to God's law of love. In the context of the Gen Z community, this framework becomes especially valuable because it allows the church to interpret younger generations' concern for justice and authenticity not as a threat to tradition, but as an occasion for theological self-examination. Thus, the enduring contribution of James 2:1–13 is that it compels the church to ask whether its fellowship truly reflects the mercy it proclaims and whether its communal life can be inhabited as a credible sign of the gospel in the present age.

## CONCLUSION

James 2:1-13 has been shown in this study to provide a substantial theological basis for understanding discrimination in Christian fellowship as a contradiction of faith rather than merely a social or pastoral deficiency. Through a qualitative approach grounded in historical-critical exegesis and theological literature analysis, this article has argued that the prohibition of partiality is inseparable from faith in Jesus Christ, the royal law of love, and the community's accountability before divine judgment. The rhetorical and lexical analysis of the passage demonstrated that *prosōpolēmpsia* represents not a minor social failing, but a distortion of the believing community's mode of perception, a corruption of its evaluative order in which divine mercy is displaced by human criteria of honor, status, and visibility. The exegetical analysis further showed that the passage's movement from the condemnation of favoritism (vv. 1-7) to the normative appeal of the royal law (vv. 8–13) constitutes a positive theological vision of ecclesial life shaped by justice and mercy rather than prestige. This theological vision was then placed in dialogue with the practical-theological horizon of Generation Z, with particular attention to the Indonesian ecclesial context, where patterns of social stratification, ethnic diversity, and cultural hierarchy intersect with the concerns of younger believers for authenticity, justice, participation, and genuine belonging. The study demonstrated that the concerns associated with many Gen Z individuals, while varied and not reducible to a single cultural profile, nevertheless resonate with the kind of communal critique that James articulates: a community's credibility depends on whether its practice corresponds to its profession.

Accordingly, the central contribution of this study lies in its integration of three dimensions: the exegesis of James 2:1-13, the theological analysis of discrimination in Christian

---

<sup>42</sup> Sianipar et al., "Teaching Anti-Discrimination Attitudes through Christian Religious Education in School," 276–278.

fellowship, and the practical-theological horizon of Generation Z, with a particular focus on the Indonesian context. This integrated framework moves beyond general appeals to inclusivity by showing that the credibility of Christian fellowship is theologically measured by the royal law of love, and that this law has direct implications for how the church orders its relational life, distributes dignity, and constitutes itself as a community of genuine belonging. By bringing together biblical exegesis and contemporary practical theology, the study provides a normative resource for evaluating ecclesial belonging that is both scripturally grounded and contextually engaged. Several directions for future research emerge from this study. First, empirical investigations are needed to examine how discrimination is specifically experienced by Gen Z members in Indonesian congregations, including how factors such as socioeconomic status, ethnicity, gender, and regional church culture shape these experiences. Second, comparative studies across different Indonesian denominational traditions would enrich the understanding of how varying ecclesial polities and theological emphases shape the practice of belonging for younger believers. Third, practical-theological research could examine how specific congregational practices, including liturgical formation, leadership structures, small group life, and digital community, either reinforce or subvert patterns of partiality. Fourth, further exegetical and theological work on the *nomos basilikos* in relation to contemporary ecclesiology would help develop a more comprehensive normative account of communal life for diverse Christian contexts. Ultimately, James 2:1-13 confronts the church with an enduring and pressing theological question: whether its communal life truly corresponds to the faith it confesses and to the law of love by which it will be judged.

## REFERENCES

- Barnes, Jonathan S. "A Word about . . . Belonging and the Continuing Struggle for Justice." *Review & Expositor* 119, no. 3–4 (November 26, 2022): 197–204. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00346373231161597>.
- Brown, Jeannine K. "James 2:1–13." *Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 62, no. 2 (April 1, 2008): 174–176. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/002096430806200208>.
- Chia, Philip Suciadi. "The 'Faith' Problem in James 2." *Theological Journal Kerugma* 7, no. 1 (April 25, 2024): 34–49. <https://jurnal.stti-surabaya.ac.id/index.php/kerugma/article/view/373>.
- Davids, Peter. *The Epistle of James: A Commentary on the Greek Text (New International Greek Testament Commentary)*. *New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Droege, Michael W., and Malan Nel. "Inclusivity in Youth Ministry Praxis and the Challenge of Mainline Church Attrition." *Verbum et Ecclesia* 45, no. 1 (June 4, 2024): 1–9. <https://verbumeteclesia.org.za/index.php/ve/article/view/3016>.
- Fox, Jonathan, and Ariel Zellman. "The Utility of Discrimination: Religious Discrimination and Governmental Legitimacy in Christian-Majority Countries." *European Political Science Review* 17, no. 3 (August 22, 2025): 496–513.
- Halawa, Jonius, and Abad Jaya Zega. "Yakobus 2: 1-13: Meninjau Pentingnya Kasih Tanpa Memandang Muka." *Jurnal Teologi Injili dan Pendidikan Agama* 2, no. 1 (2024): 43–50.
- Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Letter of James: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, The Anchor Yale Bible*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Kline, David. *Racism and the Weakness of Christian Identity*. Routledge, 2020. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780429591570>.

- Landová, Tabita. "What Does Generation Z Believe? The Religiosity and Spirituality of Contemporary Czech Youth in Practical-Theological Reflection." *Journal of Youth and Theology* 22, no. 2 (September 5, 2022): 226–250. [https://brill.com/view/journals/jyt/22/2/article-p226\\_005.xml](https://brill.com/view/journals/jyt/22/2/article-p226_005.xml).
- Maddox, Tanita Tualla. "Chrysostom and Generation Z: Resilience, Identity, and Social Justice." *Journal of Youth and Theology* 23, no. 2 (May 26, 2023): 209–230. [https://brill.com/view/journals/jyt/23/2/article-p209\\_005.xml](https://brill.com/view/journals/jyt/23/2/article-p209_005.xml).
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Letter of James*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Nestle-Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Edited by Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger. Revised Ed. Stuttgart Alle Rechte vorbehalten: Institute for New Testament Textual Research, 2012.
- Pew Research Center. "Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins." *Pew Research Center*, January 2019. <https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/01/17/where-millennials-end-and-generation-z-begins/>.
- Ruzer, Serge. "James on Faith and Righteousness in the Context of a Broader Jewish Exegetical Discourse." In *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*, 79–104. BRILL, 2013. [https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004245006/B9789004245006\\_006.xml](https://brill.com/view/book/edcoll/9789004245006/B9789004245006_006.xml).
- Senger, Savannah, and Veola E. Vazquez. "Religious Experiences, Expectations of Discrimination, and Distress Among Biracial Christians." *Journal of Psychology and Theology* 52, no. 4 (December 14, 2024): 379–394. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00916471241231914>.
- Sianipar, Desi, Wellem Sairwona, Johanes Waldes Hasugian, Nova Ritonga, and Yunardi Kristian Zega. "Teaching Anti-Discrimination Attitudes through Christian Religious Education in School." *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies* 3, no. 4 (August 30, 2021): 275–279. <https://ojs.unimal.ac.id/ijevs/article/view/4101>.
- Watson, Duane F. "James 2 in Light of Greco-Roman Schemes of Argumentation." *New Testament Studies* 39, no. 1 (1993): 94–121.
- Wesley Hiram Wachob. *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Winarjo, Hendra. "Jesus Christ as The Embodiment of the Wisdom of God: A Theological Commentary on James 3:13-18." *Veritas: Jurnal Teologi dan Pelayanan* 22, no. 2 (December 2, 2023): 303–319. <https://ojs.seabs.ac.id/index.php/Veritas/article/view/539>.