

# Galations #9

*Disclaimer: this is an automatically generated machine transcription - there may be small errors or mistranscriptions. Please refer to the original audio if you are in any doubt.*

Date: 19 December 2014

Preacher: Marvin Wiseman

[ 0 : 0 0 ] If you will take your scripture sheet that is indicated as 2B, we'll just do a little bit of initial reading here, and I'll try to reserve comment for when we get to the new material.

But I want to point out how utterly important this is, that when the Apostle Paul goes to Jerusalem and has the opportunity to communicate to the shakers and movers there what he has been preaching among the Gentiles, they are going to put their imprimatur on it and give him their approval, which is very, very important.

Now, it's important to note also that Paul was not seeking their approval. He was not asking them if it was okay as to what he was preaching. Because he had already been commissioned by the risen Christ to preach what he was preaching.

But he wanted to make sure that they would not be speaking against his message and thus attempt to neutralize it. Because there is nothing in Paul's message that he is going to communicate to the Gentiles that the Jews would be likely to accept.

Again, this points out this tremendous distinction throughout Scripture that must be maintained between Jew and Gentile.

[ 1 : 2 4 ] And I don't know of any place where it is more critical that we understand that than in the Acts of the Apostles and here in Galatians. Because there are two different schools of thought.

One is Jewish, one is Gentile. They are both focusing upon the person of Jesus Christ. But the Gentile is doing that without any consideration of the law of Moses.

For the Jew, he would not consider that. The idea of not adhering to the law of Moses was just unthinkable to the Jew.

But it wasn't to the Gentile. And Paul didn't include various things in the Gentile message when he preached the gospel. So, long story short, for people who say there is only one gospel, that is not true.

There is only one gospel that we are to be proclaiming today. That is the gospel of the grace of God. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.

[ 2 : 3 1 ] So, it is true to say there is only one gospel for our day. But to say there is only one gospel in the Bible is really a huge misunderstanding.

Because in this text it will become quite clear that there is the gospel or the good news that was proclaimed to the circumcision, to the Jew. And there is another message that is proclaimed to the Gentile.

Now, suffice it to say, the message that was preached to the Gentile is still the message that is in vogue today. So, the message to the Jew, which included the aspects of the law of Moses, plus the finished work of Christ, that gospel is faded out.

So that we are no longer, in fact as Gentiles, we never have been under the directives of the Mosaic law. And truth be told, fellas, here is something that is not hardly at all appreciated today by Jewish people.

Even the Jew today is not under the law of Moses. The Jew today is not under the law of Moses.

[ 3 : 44 ] But he doesn't know that. So, you have Jews who are orthodox and keep kosher kitchens and they make sure their children are circumcised. And they observe the Sabbath and all the rest of it.

Because they don't know the law of Moses has been abrogated in the finished work of Christ. So, they still go through the motions of law keeping. So, here in Galatians chapter 2, I'm just going to begin reading and I'll just read with the dark King James part.

Fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem. Note where he's going. Jerusalem. Headquarters of Judaism. And I took Titus with me also.

And I went up by revelation. That is, he was told to go up by the risen Christ. And I communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles.

That ought to tell us right there. That is something different. Because there's no point in his going to Jerusalem and tell them the gospel that he's preaching to the Gentiles if he's preaching the very same thing they were preaching.

[ 4 : 55 ] But he wasn't. That's the whole point. And he says, I communicated unto them that gospel or that good news which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately took them aside to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run or had run in vain.

That is, he didn't want the shakers and movers who were the Jews there at Jerusalem bad-mouthing him for the gospel he was preaching to the Gentiles because it didn't include those Jewish things.

So we've got a real situation here. It is a potential real problem. So he's going up to clear with them what he is preaching to the non-Jewish audiences because after all he is raised up to be the apostle to the Gentiles.

And he is saying, I want you guys to know what I have been telling the Gentiles. I also want you to know what I haven't been telling them. I haven't been trying to make Jews out of them.

It's really important that they understand that. And then he adds this. But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised. Well, that ought to tell us right there that the gospel he's preaching to the Gentiles does not include circumcision.

[ 6 : 20 ] And that's the whole nub of Acts chapter 15 and the council of Jerusalem that we've considered sometime in the past. So Titus was not a Jew and they were not trying to make him a Jew or demand that he be a Jew because he was a Greek.

He didn't have to be circumcised. Now, let me ask you this. Could he have been circumcised if he wanted to be? Yeah. Yeah. But it wasn't required because he was not under that law of Moses.

Now, later on, later on, and we saw this in the book of Acts, where Timothy was accompanying Paul. And Paul had Timothy circumcised.

Wait a minute. What's going on there? Well, Timothy had a parent. I don't remember whether it was a father or mother at the point.

But he had a father or mother who was a Jew. And Paul was going into the Jewish synagogue, as he did whenever he went to a new city, to minister to the Jews in the synagogue.

[ 7 : 36 ] And he knew, he knew that if Timothy was not circumcised, having a Jewish parent, he'd have no credibility.

Timothy would have no credibility with a Jewish audience. That's why he was circumcised. This is not a double standard thing at all. Titus was a full-fledged Gentile.

No demand at all for circumcision. But Timothy, that's another issue. Because when you're going to the Jew, and if you are not circumcised, you expect to say something to the Jew theologically, and you want him to listen, and you're not even circumcised, forget it.

It wouldn't give you the time of day. You would have nothing to say to them. Joe? We're told in many other places, too, to go along with what people are doing, even as long as it's not against the faith.

Go along with it. It will help the people. If it brings them along, go along with it. That's the point that he was making when he said, listen, to the Jew, I became as a Jew, that I might win the Jew.

[ 8 : 38 ] Paul wasn't going into the synagogue and saying, listen, all of you fellow Jews, forget the Sabbath. Forget circumcision. Forget the kosher food. None of that stuff matters.

He's not going to do that. Good grief. He would create a firestorm. And yet, that's what some understand and think that Paul was having a double standard because he had Timothy circumcised, but he didn't have Titus circumcised.

There's a very logical reason for both of these. He was not compelled to be circumcised. Dana? So, he was not, Timothy was not circumcised as an infant. No, obviously not.

Obviously not. We don't know why. We don't know why he wasn't, but he wasn't. And yet, he had a Jewish parent. And like I said, it escapes me now. I can't remember whether his mother was a Jew or his father was a Jew.

His mother. His mother. Okay. Dan? Mark, the statement that you made about the Jew today is not under the law of Moses. If the Jews today, they accept Jesus Christ as a prophet, not as the one sent from God.

[ 9 : 50 ] Mm-hmm. Okay? So, they don't believe in the law? Are they because of that? I was under the understanding they do believe in the law because they do not accept who Jesus Christ was.

Yeah. Well, the Jew today is a real mixed bag. There are what are referred to as Orthodox Jews. Right. They are strict.

They refer to themselves as observant Jews. They observe Judaism. They do keep the Sabbath. They do keep kosher diet. They do have their children circumcised.

And yet, there is a much larger contingency of Judaism, much larger than the Orthodox, and it's called the Reform. And the synagogue that we have here in Springfield is a Reform synagogue.

And they observe the Sabbath, and they meet in the synagogue, and they have a number of traditional ritualistic Jewish things. But they are not nearly as strict in their observance as are the Orthodox.

[ 10 : 56 ] So, there are different shades of compliance to the law of Moses in Judaism. But what our Jewish friends today do not understand and would not agree with is that they are no longer under the law of Moses at all.

Because the law of Moses was abrogated with the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. That put the law into the past. And this is what the burden of the letter to the Hebrews is.

It is addressed to the Jews to explain to them that Jesus Christ is a better sacrifice. He is a better mediator.

He is superior in every way, shape, and form to the law of Moses. And you need to come up and embrace this new thing that God has provided through the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ.

And that's what, of course, they didn't buy then. And Jews today don't buy as well. This is my new covenant. Yeah. That's the new covenant that Christ established the night that he was betrayed.

[ 12 : 05 ] When he said, this cup is the new covenant in my blood. So, that, of course, our Jewish friends do not accept as valid. So, neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.

And that, because of false brethren unawares brought in, and obviously they would have tried to impose this on them, who came in privately to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage.

To whom we gave place. We did not yield to these people, not for an hour. That the truth of the gospel might continue with you. If Paul had yielded here, and said, okay, okay, we'll circumcise Titus.

And caved in, he would have compromised himself in a way that would have been, I think, irretrievable. And he did not do that.

And then he says, but of these who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, shakers and movers, people in positions of authority, makes no matter to me, God accepts no man's person.

[ 13 : 18 ] For they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me. That simply means those 12 apostles, if that's who they were, and I'm sure it included some of them, and others who were well respected in the community of Israel at the time, who were believers in Christ.

Paul is saying, they couldn't tell me anything I didn't already know. They could not give me any kind of update at all. But however, Paul really had some updates to give them.

Namely, what Christ had revealed to them after his ascension, that the 12 never received while Christ was here on earth.

So Paul has a tremendous amount of information to share with them, and he is going to do so. And he says, but contrarywise, but on the other hand, verse 7, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision, and when you see that word, just replace it with the word Gentile, talking about the Gentile, the uncircumcision was committed unto me as the apostle to the Gentiles, as the gospel of the circumcision, which is simply another way of saying the gospel to the Jew, was unto Peter, for he that wrought effectually in Peter, and who was that that wrought effectually in Peter?

It was Jesus Christ, through the Holy Spirit. He is the one who delegated Peter's gospel, and Peter's ministry, and Peter's marching orders.

[ 15 : 03 ] And what Paul is saying is, I want you to know, I received my authority and my marching orders from the same one that gave Peter his. Namely, the person of Christ.

He was mighty in me toward the Gentiles. Now, if you'll take your new sheet and look at item 3A, at the top of the page there, he says, and when James, and when James, Cephas, we know Cephas is simply another name for Peter, when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, well, weren't these guys pillars during the Lord's earthly ministry?

Absolutely. Same three. Who were the big three? Peter, James, and John. And of the three, Peter was the chief spokesperson. When James, Peter, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived, understood, appreciated the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me, and Barnabas, the right hands of fellowship, that we, Paul and Barnabas, should go unto the heathen, which is a synonym for Gentile, which is a synonym for uncircumcised, and they unto the circumcision.

You see what this is saying? Paul is saying that the big three, those who seemed to be pillars, Peter, James, and John, they understood that the commission that was given to me was different from the commission that was given to them.

They appreciated that. They approved it. They okayed it. They put their blessing on it. They are not going to fight Paul on this. They are not going to say, Paul, you can't preach that.

[ 17 : 08 ] You've got to preach the law. No, no, no. They are recognizing the legitimacy of this. And, fellas, I cannot tell you how important it is to understand this.

There is a serious line of demarcation here that is being made. And what is happening is the Jewish gospel, the gospel of the circumcision, is being preached daily by Peter and James and John.

And they are preaching to their own constituency, the Jewish people. And what are they telling them? They are telling them the same thing Peter told them on the day of Pentecost. Jesus was the Messiah.

You crucified him. God raised him from the dead. But if you, Jews, will now embrace Jesus as your Messiah, you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit, and you will become accepted with God.

Save yourselves from this untoward generation. That's the message there. That's what Peter preached in Acts 2, in the day of Pentecost. That's what he preached in Acts 3. That's what he continued preaching to the Jew in 4 and 5 and 6.

[ 18 : 25 ] That's what Stephen was preaching. Same thing to the Jew. And that led to Stephen's martyrdom. Because his life was taken from him by stoning by his Jewish countrymen.

They put him to death. So we've got this tremendous transition taking place here. And by the way, who is the focal point of both Gospels?

Jesus Christ. That hasn't changed at all. But the big change is in their obligation to the law, which really no longer exists, because Christ is the fulfillment of the law to everyone who believes.

So this is very, very critical stuff. Very critical. They gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship.

That cannot be construed as anything other than agreement and approval and understanding and appreciation.

[ 19 : 25 ] They are shaking hands with Paul and Barnabas and saying, what you are preaching to the Gentiles is right on. Go get them, boys. That's your message.

We understand that. And there was no variation at all. No distinction made here. Joe, do you have a comment? I'm just going to say the reason mainly they were in agreement with Paul and supported him was because of Peter's experience with Caiaphas or what's he named?

Ananias. Ananias. Ananias. Yeah. It's mainly because of that experience that they were supporting him. Right. Right. Absolutely. And they did have one thing to add.

They didn't find any fault at all with what Paul was preaching, but they're going to say, we agree with what you're preaching. That's right. That's what God has called you to do.

That's the message that you should have. Oh, by the way, there is one thing that we would like you to keep into consideration, and that is in verse 10, only they would or they ask that we should remember the poor, the same which I was also forward to do.

[ 20 : 38 ] Now, all that is saying is, of course, they're not adding that to the gospel because the gospel is clearly surrounding the person and work of Jesus Christ, and it doesn't have anything to do with the poor or the rich.

But what they are saying is, in your ministry, when you go out and proclaim this gospel, don't forget, we have an obligation to the poor and underprivileged, and Paul says, well, I've been doing that anyway.

That wasn't something new to be added. That was something that was already on their agenda. And then, notice what we've got here in verse 11.

But when Peter, who is the same as the Cephas of verse 9, when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.

Now, do you realize what we've got here is an apostolic theological shootout at Antioch? These guys are crossing horns.

[ 21 : 48 ] Now, some would, I suspect, consider that unthinkable, because, how can two godly people possibly be at odds with each other?

The answer is very obvious. I don't care how godly you are, you still have a volition. You still have an old flesh nature to deal with.

And, Paul did, and Peter did. And they both demonstrate that they are able to square off one to another. We've got a face-to-face confrontation between two men, both of whom love the Lord, both of whom want to serve the Lord, both of whom have signed on and have made themselves available, if necessary, even for martyrdom.

But they are in disagreement. Now, there is nothing wrong with good, honest, intelligent people disagreeing. Disagreeing, one with another.

That simply means they see the same issue in a different way. And sometimes, it doesn't mean somebody has to be wrong and somebody has to be right.

[ 22 : 59 ] Sometimes, it means that they're just different. That's all. They have a different perspective. But sometimes, there is a moral issue, and it isn't a matter of gray or some shade of gray.

It's black and white. And herein is where some difficulty arises. Because issues of doctrine and principle are black and white.

Issues of methodology and of preference and of style can be gray. They can fluctuate.

But this is a black and white issue, and here we have an apostle calling out another apostle. And all this does, fellas, is it demonstrates their humanity.

They were men just like we are. They were flawed, fallen human beings just like we are. They put on their pants one leg at a time. They are not different in that respect.

[ 24 : 10 ] They are both subject to the same foibles and failures that we all are. Because we're all cut from the same bulb of cloth called the human race. And the only one in the human race that was not fallen was the one who was the God-man.

And we have only one of those, and that, of course, is our Lord Jesus. Peter, when he came to Antioch, I stood up to him because he was to be blamed.

That simply means 20th century New Testament says for he stood self-condemned. What had he done? How was it that he was to be blamed?

How was it that he was to be faulted by Paul? And by the way, what gave Paul the right to call down Peter? I'll tell you what gave him the right.

He was a fellow believer in Jesus Christ. That's it. What gives you the right to call down a fellow believer whom you know is behaving in a way that is disgraceful or contrary to the God whom he says he loves?

[ 25 : 19 ] What gives you the right to call him down? You not only have a right, you have a responsibility. We are supposed to hold each other accountable. And when you see a brother in Christ engaging in something that you know to be dishonoring to the Lord, and you dummy up and go silent because you're saying, well, none of us is perfect.

you have done a disservice to your brother. We are to be accountable one to another.

That is something that is really lost sight of today because nobody wants to call down anybody on anything and we use this as an excuse.

Well, you know, I'm not perfect either. No, you're not. And maybe when you screw up, the brother whom you correct three weeks later may have need to correct you.

And that's what accountability is all about. But we've pretty much lost sight of that. And we go individualistic and we say, well, you know, to each his own. It's none of my business. Yes, it is your business.

[ 26 : 32 ] If they are a believer in Jesus Christ and they are conducting themselves in a way that is dishonoring to the Lord, you owe it to them. You owe it to the Lord to take that person aside and say, brother, I need to talk to you about something.

This is really disturbing. Do you care enough to confront somebody like that?

No. That's not putting yourself up on a pedestal that makes you a righteous judge and able to sit in judgment on everybody else. That's not what we're talking about.

When Paul wrote to the Romans chapter 14, he said, I am confident that you are able also to admonish one another.

And when we see a brother or sister really stray from the truth and bring discredit to the cause of Christ, we have a moral obligation to them to say, I need to talk to you about this.

[ 27 : 42 ] This is really disturbing. You're not doing it in a judgmental or a condemning way, but in a way of concern and care. And I'll tell you what, I would hope that you would love me enough to do that to me.

It's an act of love. It isn't an act of judgmentalism or holier than thou. And that's exactly why Paul is not going to let Peter get away with this.

And I'll tell you something, I am convinced, can't prove it, but I am convinced that Peter is not going to resent this. He's not going to hold a grudge against Paul.

He's going to be grateful. You see, Peter had the kind of a personality. He could be a vacillating individual. Peter could be all over the map. Peter was the kind of guy that, as I've often said, he suffered from hoof and mouth disease.

He always put his foot in his mouth. He always said something stupid, did something stupid, but the guy was so lovable and so caring and so considerate of others, he was a sanguine kind of individual and he was always getting into something that was difficult for him to get himself out of and yet, he was the kind of guy you couldn't help but love him.

[ 29 : 17 ] He was just a lovable character and yet, lovable characters can do wrong things and Paul says he was to be blamed. Why was he to be blamed?

Joe, what? He was being hypocritical here. He was trying to please both sides at the same time. Yeah. Working both sides of the street. I'll tell you what, listen, Peter would have made a great politician.

Paul would not. Can you see the Apostle Paul as a social worker? No. Peter would have made a great politician. Peter knows how to work both sides of the street.

He knows how to glad hand and back slap and keep everybody happy. But Paul's not into that. Now, this doesn't mean that one's right and one's wrong. It just means these guys have different personalities like we do.

And this is the way Peter was. And he gives an example. And it is hypocrisy. It is just plain hypocrisy. For before that certain came from James.

[ 30 : 20 ] Now, where was James and who was James and what was this all about? James, this is the James, this is not the James of verse 9.

The James of verse 9 is the brother of John, sons of Zebedee. But the James in verse 12, you see, we've got more than one James in the Bible, we've got more than one John in the Bible, we've got multiple names just like we do here.

this James is the half-brother of our Lord, and he is the James who presided over the council at Jerusalem in Acts chapter 15.

And the council at Jerusalem was, of course, at Jerusalem. And that's where James was. He was headquartered there. And before that certain came from James.

Who are these certain from James? They are Jews. they are fellow Jews. And they came from Jerusalem, where of course the Jewish headquarters was.

[ 31 : 24 ] And when certain came from James, he, that is Peter, did eat with the Gentiles. That is, before they came from James, Peter ate with the Gentiles.

That means Peter socialized with the Gentiles. This means a non-Jewish person would tell Peter, hey, Peter, we are going to have a big barbecue Saturday night.

Will you come? Peter says, sure, I will come. I will be there. Can I bring something? And Peter goes to this barbecue and he sits down and has this meal with these Gentiles.

And he does not think a thing about it. Because after all, Peter still has in mind the lesson that he learned back in Acts chapter 10. Remember Cornelius? The sheet let down from heaven? All of that.

So, Peter would eat with the Gentiles. But, but, when they were come, that is, these certain Jews from James, when they were come, Peter withdrew and separated himself.

[ 32 : 33 ] It simply means Peter wouldn't have anything to do with the Gentiles. Who are these people? I've never met them before in my life. I don't know who they are. I don't know anything about them. They're Gentiles.

Now, Peter, come on. Come on. Look at what he's doing. When they were come, he withdrew and separated himself.

Why did he do that? Peer pressure. Peer pressure. He didn't want to look bad with his fellow Jews, fearing them, which were of the circumcision.

What was he fearing about? What did he think they were going to do? Execute him? Put him in jail? No, of course not. But he knew that he ran the risk of their shaming him, looking down his nose, calling him into question, Peter, what are you doing?

Why are you doing this? You're hobnobbing with Gentiles? I can't believe you do this. That's the same kind of routine that he got when he went to Cornelius and was called on the carpet by the Jewish brethren.

[ 33 : 45 ] And you know something? He really hasn't learned his lesson. This is why, listen, this will get you into big, big trouble. Peter, Peter was a people pleaser.

He wanted to be in good with everybody. The apostle Paul really didn't put that much stock in pleasing people because on more than one occasion he said, if I wanted to please people, I wouldn't be preaching what I'm preaching.

If I wanted to please people, I would preach a gospel that would be a whole lot more palatable to them. But I'm not concerned about being a man pleaser.

I just want to please God. That was Paul's directive. So, we'll continue this in our next session. Any question or comment before we close it?

If you want to please people, you're going to say you're a sinner. That's right. If you want to please people, you say, hey, I'm sure God is really glad that you're on his side.

[ 34 : 52 ] And you're just such a wonderful person and blah, blah, blah. And this is the strokes that folks like. Don't forget your handouts, guys, when you come out. We'll make them available here.



Three different ones.