

Title: "The Litmus Test in Jerusalem" (Part 1)

Passage: Galatians 2:1-2

Theme: Part three of Paul's defense of his thesis (vv. 11-12)

Number: 1014Ga2.1-2(11)

Date: October 12, 2014

---

{{Read Passage}}

[i] Look closely at the first word of verse 1 ("then")

1 word in English – corresp. to 1 word in t/orig. Gk. text (keeping notes = Ἐπειτα).

I have been accused of many things, some of them false.

1 thing true: preaching an entire sermon from (what?) a single verse – no, I've done that dozens of times. How about a single word?

Not often – but true.

You may be thinking that I've done that by way of detailed word studies. Answer – 'no' – I don't generally do detailed word studies. In fact, I think word studies can be downright dangerous.

If you don't know what "doing a word study" means {define}

Why is that dangerous? The meaning of words changes w/context and form. BTIM – 'context' (where does t/word fit in a sent., for examp.) 'form' (words have different meanings depending on their grammar – exp. true w/NT words).

If this is a subject of interest to you, I'd suggest a book (not an easy read, but a good one): *Biblical Words and Their Meanings* by Dr. Moises Silva.

Silva = former professor of NT at WTS & GCTS (now retired).  
Silva was a translator for both t/NASB & ESV....

In his book, Silva sums up 1 of t/key dangers of raw word study:  
“[O]ne may import into a particular passage a meaning discovered elsewhere without noticing that the word in the latter passage is modified by a particular phrase or by some syntactical feature (proposition, article, inflection).” [page 26]

IOW – you might falsely assume that a word means something in 1 passage that t/author never intended it to mean based on how it's used someplace else.

Danger that teachers and preachers succumb to all t/time.

*“I did my word studies and I disc. that t/word “power” (δυναμις) can have this meaning and that will really preach well if I put that meaning into the passage I'm teaching.”*

Dunamis is a good example of another type of word-study fallacy: word-association fallacy. Cf. 1 Timothy 1:7 (“dynamite” - anachronism – invented in late 19<sup>th</sup> c. by Alfred Nobel).

**[ii] Why do I tell you all of this? (2 reasons):**

- 1) It's good for you to know. We're a CH that takes t/study of God's Word ser. & we want to “accurately handle it”.
- 2) For t/sake of introduction it brings me back to to t/first word of v. 1 Ἐπειτα (then) – a word that is important because of t/context.  
(add: Have no inten. of preaching an entire message on this 1 word).

*“Context my dear Watson”*

Context as it rel. to this 1<sup>st</sup> word of 2:1 goes all t/way back to 1:11-12.

**[iii] Verses 11-12 – Paul's Thesis**

By “thesis” = his central proposition / his main point out of which he builds his entire argument in t/verses that follow.

**For I would have you to know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man.**

**For I neither received it [the gospel] from man, nor was I taught it, but [I received it] through a revelation of Jesus Christ.**

Sum both of these verses up w/the statement:

**Paul's gospel came directly from Christ who is the Gospel!**

**[iv] Why is that important?**

Because behind all of this stands a group of 1<sup>st</sup> c. false teachers who were enemies of t/Gospel // of Paul // God – Judaizers.

They showed up shortly after Paul & Barnabas left south Galatia after having est. CH's t/o t/region.

Cf. 1:6-9.

They claimed that Paul had changed. That he may have once preached a pure gospel as they defined it – salvation by law and grace – but he had changed as he began to minister to Gentiles and was preaching a lawless gospel of salvation by faith alone. In that regard – they claimed that Paul was not really a “Jerusalem Apostle” but was inferior to men like Peter, James, and John.

John Stott gives what may have been another of their arguments:

“One of the ways in which some false teachers of Paul's day tried to undermine his authority was to hint that his gospel was different from Peter's, and indeed from the views of all the other apostles in Jerusalem. 'as a result,' they said, 'the church is being saddled with two gospels, Paul's and Peter's . . . Which are we going to accept?' 'Surely,' they went on, 'we cannot follow Paul if he is in a minority of one, and if Peter and the rest of the apostles disagree with him?' This was evidently one of the specious arguments of the Judaizers. They were trying to disrupt the unity of the apostolic circle.” [Stott, 40]

Rather than rob Peter to pay Paul – exalting Peter to demean Paul.

[v] Judaizers falsely claimed to represent t/Jerusalem CH over against what Paul taught

None of it was true. For one, Paul's gospel wasn't lawless in t/sense of antinomianism. What was true, however, was that t/gospel of salvation in X is apart from human merit. A gospel based on law/works/merit is anything but good news. It's bad news // horrible news – it can't save. If it can't save then there's no hope; only the fearsome expectation of God's wrath and eternal hell.

[vi] There's only 1 gospel (cf. 1:6b-7a)

Any deviation from that singular truth results in anathema to t/message & all who embrace it (1:8).

In saying ==>

**. . . I would have you to know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man.**

Paul ironically states what was true of t/false teachers. They were preaching a damning, false G. which was “accord. to man” not God.

And, as we'll see later, Paul wasn't at odds w/the leaders of t/Jer. CH – they were in complete agreement that salv. was by grace alone thru faith alone in X alone.

[vii] Verse 12 of chapter one (the second half of Paul's thesis) - two negative statements and a positive one

First neg. statement:

**For I neither received it from man,**

Second neg. statement:

**nor was I taught it,**

He's saying: “I didn't receive t/Gospel through t/Jerusalem Apostles. They weren't respons. for my conversion & I wasn't instructed in t/faith by them.”

*“How did you receive it, Paul?”*

The Positive Assertion:

**but [I received it] through a revelation of Jesus Christ.**

When Paul says

**but [I received it] through a revelation of Jesus Christ.**

He's not talking as much about t/message as he is the Person.

[viii] Paul's gospel came directly from Christ who is the Gospel!

It's a ==>

**a revelation of Jesus Christ.**

Understand “of Jesus Christ” as an objective genitive.

It wasn't that JC revealed to me a truth;

JC was revealed to me as t/truth!

Christ IS the Gospel!

*“I received the Gospel when JC was revealed to me in all his Glory.”*

IOW – X is the object, the substance.

God the Father was t/One who revealed t/truth to Paul & it was JC who was revealed. He's t/object, t/substance of t/revelation.

To know X is to know t/Person of t/Gospel.

Can't be limited to a set of facts or a singular prayer.

As essential as facts are – facts alone will save no one apart from t/object/person behind t/words (X).

John 17:3 *“And this is eternal life, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.”*

Philippians 3:10 *that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being conformed to His death;*

It's about knowing X! There 1000s of people who claim to know facts. They can tell you what t/gospel is. They can tell you that they prayed a prayer or walked an aisle. But they have no love for X because they don't know Him. He's been reduced to a decision or words on a tracts.

If you don't know JC you don't know t/Gospel. Conversely, if you know t/Gospel you know JC.

That's t/new birth: Born in t/family of God.

That's adoption: adopted as children of God who know Him.

In knowing JC Paul knew t/Gospel & was wondrously saved.

You {^} . . . Not natural; it's supernatural.

[ix] Paul's opponents claimed he was a second rate Apostle who didn't speak for God

Paul counters that he was a true Apostle (v. 1) who was sovereignly saved & entrusted w/a message that's as immutable as God Himself because it was God Himself who authored it.

From a human perspective, there was a lot at stake here.

Galatian Xns were perilously close to apostasy. False teachers were attempting to lead them straight to hell. Truth of t/Gospel was at stake. Reputation of God was at stake.

[x] Paul assumes the role of a defense attorney

Out of 1:11-12 flow a courtroom drama where Paul takes his stand in front of t/tribunal & systematically unfolds a 4-part defense.

[xi] 1:13-17 ==>

I. Paul's First Defense: Jesus Not Jerusalem (vv. 13-17)

- A. "Who I Was" (Paul's Pre-Conversion Life as a Jew) – vv. 13-14
- B. "What I Am" (Paul's Conversion to Christ) – vv. 15-16a
- C. "Where I Went" (his Post-Conversion Trip to Arabia) – vv. 16b-17

Verse 13 – Paul's life as an unregenerate Jew

Verse 14 – His accomp. as a Pharisee

Verses 15-16 – His dramatic conversion to X and his calling to preach t/Gospel to the Gentiles

All of that by direct revelation from JC (starting w/Damascus Rd.).

[xii] 1:18-24 ==>

I. Paul's Second Defense: Only A Fortnight In Jerusalem (vv. 18-24)

**Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to become acquainted with Cephas and I remained with him fifteen days.**

A. Purpose: “To Know Peter Not the Gospel” (18-19)

Point: “I did go to Jerusalem 3 years later, but it was only to become acquaint. w/Peter, not to get instruction from him or any of t/other As.”

B. Promise: “The Truth, t/Whole Truth, & Nothing But t/Truth” (20)  
Paul seals his words w/an oath ==>

**(Now, I testify, before God, that I am not lying in what I write to you!)**

For a Jew – you didn't tread upon t/divine name in your lie. Invitation for God to pour out His wrath upon you!

C. Polemic: “Getting out of Dodge” (21) . . . Jerusalem  
By “polemic” I mean “defense” / “alibi”

**Then** Ἐπειτα = another time marker (as in v. 18).

Paul spent 15 days in Jerusalem and then went  
**. . . into the regions of Syria and Cilicia.**

According to BOA, Paul's first Jerusalem visit ended when his attempts to evangelize t/Jews stirred up persecution against him. To save his life, the Jerusalem believers "took him down to Caesarea and sent him off to Tarsus" (Acts 9:30).

H. Power: “From Persecutor to Preacher” (23)

**But they were only hearing that, “he who once persecuted us is now preaching the faith he once tried to destroy.”**

I. Praise: “Soli Deo Gloria!” (24)

**And they were glorifying God in me.**

Those words close chapter 1

[xiii] As far as chapter 2 is concerned we've only covered one word

ἔπειτα (“then”) - marks Paul's 3d defense.

*We have time – I'm not even halfway done yet!*

"The Litmus Test in Jerusalem"

According to one dictionary I consulted [The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition copyright ©2000 by Houghton Mifflin Company. Updated in 2009. Published by Houghton Mifflin Company. All rights reserved]

litmus test

1. A test for chemical acidity or basicity using litmus paper.
2. A test that uses a single indicator to prompt a decision:
  - 2a. a critical indication of future success or failure <== fits!

What is ==> "The Litmus Test in Jerusalem"?

Involves TAP's "14 years later" trip there.

1 of t/disciplines I have when it comes to preparing an exeget. sermon is to sum up whatever passage I'm preaching in a single sentence.

Paul's second trip to Jerusalem proves that there's harmony between Jerusalem and Antioch.

What do I mean by "harmony between J & A"?

Sometimes cities stand representative of a philosophy or worldview.

World politics: Washington vs. Moscow

Theology: Geneva vs. Rome (reformation orthodoxy vs. Roman catholicity)

Here: Antioch in Syria represents Paul and Barnabas. Why?

Acts 13 - it was t/CH in Antioch that sent them out on t/1st missionary journey – a missions trip that we believe birthed t/Galatian CH's. Acts 13:2 – HS said, “set apart for Me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them.” So, they laid their hands on them and sent them off.

Antioch = Paul, along with Barnabas and Titus

Jerusalem = Peter, along with James and John (Pillars, cf. v. 9).

Paul's second trip to Jerusalem proves that there's harmony between Jerusalem and Antioch.

Little more memorable =>

The Pillars and Paul sing in unison.

## I. Paul's Third Defense: A Litmus Test in Jerusalem (2:1-10)

### A. The Consequent Journey to Jerusalem: Paul's Second Trip (vv. 1-2)

#### 1. Company of Five Faithful Friends

Adapted in part from a poem by Rudyard Kipling

“I Keep Six Honest Serving Men”

I keep six honest serving-men

(They taught me all I knew);

Their names are What and Why and When

And How and Where and Who.

I send them over land and sea,

I send them east and west;

But after they have worked for me,

I give them all a rest. . . .

a. When was the trip? (v. 1a)

**Then, fourteen years later, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus along also.**

(1) As it relates to the text

... **fourteen years later** ... (“after 14 years”)

(a) After what?

To be consistent w/the chronology here and in t/BOA – same event as in 1:18 “three years later” – i.e. 3 years after his conversion in Damascus.

Here ==>

... **fourteen years later** ...

14 years after his conversion.

(b) Keep in mind that in Paul's day years weren't counted with the same exactness as we do today

Could move to Samaria in late 67 AD & leave in early 69 AD & say you were 3 yrs in Samaria. Figure late 67 to early 69 is more like a year an a half. But in antiquity each year was counted. 67-68-69.

Years ago I was at a bank in AZ on Good Fri. 1 of the tellers remarked, “*Jesus was supp. to be in t/grave 3 days. But if he was crucified on Fri. & resurrected on Sun. that's only like 2 days.*” Parts of Days are counted as whole days – Fri (1); Sat. (2); Sun. (3).

Same here. 14 years later could be 14 complete years after Paul's conversion, or it could be 12. Or likely somewhere in between.

**(c) Point is that Paul's ministry was independent of the Apostles in Jerusalem**

Emphasized in Paul's first defense in 1:13-17 ("Jesus Not Jerusalem"). {summarize vv. 13-18} ==> out of a period of 14 years Paul spent a whopping "fortnight in Jerus." (or 14 days + 1). 15 days out of 14 yrs pretty much establishes that Paul was not a product of t/Jer. apostles or under their authority.

As it relates to our first main point ==>

**A. The Consequent Journey to Jerusalem: Paul's Second Trip (vv. 1-2)**

Bigger ? is where does chapter 2 fit into t/BOA.

**(2) As it relates to the Book of Acts**

Was this [^] same time that t/Jerusalem Council was held in Acts 15?

Was this visit at t/same time?

Many scholars who think that Gal. 2:1-10 corresponds to Acts 15.

**(a) There are similarities between the two**

Same people: Paul & Barnabas; Peter & James. Judaizers; issue of circumcision and the law as it relates to Gentile believers. Decision of t/Jerusalem Council was that Gentiles are saved by faith apart from the law just as t/Jews.

**(b) But there are striking differences that I just can't ignore**

In Acts 15 Paul & Barnabas are sent from t/CH at Antioch as an official delegation to address t/issue.

Here in chapter 2 we see that it was a divine revelation that moved Paul to go to Jerusalem (look at later).

Council of Acts 15 was public. This meeting in Gal. was private (v. 2).

Chronology of t/South Galatian theory lends itself to an earlier visit than the one in Acts 15.

Biggest consid. is that nowhere in Gal. does Paul refer to t/outcome of the Jer. Cncil & t/written apostolic decree that he & Barnabas later distributed among t/CH's in Syria, Cilicia, & Galatia (Acts 16:4).

F.F. Bruce writes: “After the publication of the apostolic decree of Acts 15:20–29, it would have been difficult for Judaizing preachers invoking the authority of the leaders of the Jerusalem church to impose circumcision on Gentile Christians.” [cited in George, 137]

John Calvin, writing in the 16<sup>th</sup> c., seems to agree==>

While [Paul's] opponents [i.e. Judaizers] were falsely pleading the name of the [Jerusalem] apostles, and earnestly striving to ruin the reputation of Paul, what carelessness would it have [been for] him to pass by the decree [of Acts 15] universally circulated among them, which struck at those very persons! Undoubtedly, this one word would have shut their mouth: *“You bring against me the authority of the apostles, but who does not know their decision? and therefore I hold you convicted of unblushing falsehood. In their name, you oblige the Gentiles to keep the law, but I appeal to their own writing, which sets the consciences of men at liberty.”*

Why doesn't Paul mention that universal decree of all t/Apostles & Elders that obedience to t/Law isn't requisite for salvation? Why don't t/Galatian CH's know about that decree? Only answer is that it hadn't happened yet.

**a. When was the trip? (v. 1a)**

If Paul was converted in A.D. 32 or 33 (likely). We add t/14 years later of 2:1 w/the understanding that 14 yrs by ancient reckoning could be less than that, we can date Paul's 2d visit to Jer. around A.D. 44–46

This would mean that the events of Gal 2:1–10 parallel the “famine visit” Paul and Barnabas made to Jerusalem as recorded in Acts 11:25–30.

That also fits t/? we're going to ask in a moment “Why did they go to Jerusalem?”

Before we do that, let's look at t/”who” (2d question) ==>

**b. Who went? (v. 1b)**

**. . . I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus along also.**

3 men: Paul; Barn.; Titus. We know about Paul. What about t/other 2?

**(a) Barnabas**

We first read of Barnabas in Acts 4 ==>

36 And Joseph, a Levite of Cyprian birth, who was also called Barnabas by the apostles (which translated means, Son of Encouragement), 37 and who owned a tract of land, sold it and brought the money and laid it at the apostles' feet.

His name was “Joseph” but his nickname was “Barnabas” which no doubt reflected on his character. Was an encourager (thank G. 4 them).

He was a great encouragement to Paul.

It was Barnabas who convinced t/apostles that Paul was truly a Xn and no longer a threat (Acts 9:27) // later recruited Paul for the work in Syrian Antioch (11:25–26).

B. was P's traveling companion on t/1st great miss. journey recorded in Acts 13–14. B. joined Paul in defending t/Gospel during t/Jer. C of Acts 15. It was B. (we're told in 2:13) was caught up in Peter's hypoc.

Even t/best of men and t/best of friends can have their troubles. Hence P & B's famous disagreement about whether they should take John Mark on t/2d missionary trip. That dispute led to a parting of t/ways.

God in His grace brought restoration. I believe that Paul & Barnabas were restored, as were Paul & Mark. Lesson there for all of us . . . .

### (b) Titus

Titus played a major role in t/city of Corinth. His name appears all over 2 Cor. Paul later wrote a letter to Titus bearing his name. It's there that Paul calls him his “true child in a common faith” (Titus 1:4).

Most significantly, Titus was an an uncircumcised Gentile & a product of the very ministry the Judaizers were attacking.

### *A. The Consequent Journey to Jerusalem: Paul's Second Trip (vv. 1-2)*

“when” - “who” - THIRD ==>

### c. Why did they go? (v. 2a)

This point relates to t/first ? of “when.” We said that t/events of Gal 2:1–10 parallel t/“famine visit” P. & B. made to Jer. in Acts 11:25–30.

### *c. Why did they go? (v. 2a)*

**But it was because of a revelation that I went up. . . .**

Paul didn't go to Jer. because he was called on t/carpet under t/auth. of t/apostles there (what t/Judaizers would have said).

God sent him there [^]

(1) What “revelation”? – Turn to Acts chapter 11 (11:19-30)

19 So then those who were scattered because of the persecution that arose in connection with Stephen made their way to Phoenicia and Cyprus and Antioch, speaking the word to no one except to Jews alone. 20 But there were some of them, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who came to Antioch and began speaking to the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus. 21 And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a large number who believed turned to the Lord. 22 And the news about them reached the ears of the church at Jerusalem, and they sent Barnabas off to Antioch. 23 Then when he had come and witnessed the grace of God, he rejoiced and began to encourage them all with resolute heart to remain true to the Lord; 24 for he was a good man, and full of the Holy Spirit and of faith. And considerable numbers were brought to the Lord.

And he [Barnabas] left for Tarsus to look for Saul; 26 and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. And it came about that for an entire year they met with the church, and taught considerable numbers; and the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch.

27 Now at this time some prophets came down from Jerusalem to Antioch. 28 And one of them named Agabus stood up and began to indicate by the Spirit that there would certainly be a great famine all over the world. And this took place in the reign of Claudius. 29 And in the proportion that any of the disciples had means, each of them determined to send a contribution for the relief of the brethren living in Judea. 30 And this they did, sending it in charge of Barnabas and Saul to the elders.

Tacitus, Suetonius and Josephus – all near contemp. historians, record t/fact in their writings that there were food shortages at this time.

Collection is taken for t/brethren in Judea which P. & B. deliver to Jer.

That's t/connection to t/time of Paul's visit & t/events recorded here in Galatians 2:1-10.

#### d. What happened? (v. 2b)

**. . . And I declared to them the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles . . .**

#### (1) “Declared” = ἀνατιθημι = to lay before, communicate

It's to present, lay before, communicate something to someone.

Here, it's Paul presenting t/gospel he preaches (present tense – what he's been preaching for 14 years).

#### (2) To whom does he present it? “Them”?

Later in v. 2 we're told that they were those of “reputation” (repeats that in v. 6). According to v. 9 this at least included Peter, James, John (could have been more, but it may have only been those 3).

**. . . And I declared to them the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles . . .**

#### (3) That's the whole issue as it relates to the book of Galatians

Does Paul preach an accurate Gospel? Does he preach to t/Gentiles t/same message that Peter preaches to t/Jews? Judaizers were claiming that it was a different message / Gospel. Here's a test case: t/Jewish preacher to t/Gentiles goes to Jer. to confer w/the preacher to t/Jews.

(4) Even though Barnabas & Titus are with him - Paul uses the 1st person singular

... the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles ...

Goes back to 1:16:

[God was pleased] to reveal His Son in me, that I might preach Him among the Gentiles ...

e. Where did it happen? (v. 2b) - "in private"

... but I did so in private to those who were of reputation ...

4 times in this passage Peter, James, & John are described as "those of reputation" - literally "those who appear" or "those who seem." Phrase used in Greek to refer to people of influence; those who were of high standing.

6 But from those who were of high reputation (what they were makes no difference to me; God shows no partiality

Some have taken this to be a slight by Paul. As Tom Schreiner writes:

It could be understood as a dismissive comment: the leaders in Jerusalem have a name that is unwarranted. Alternatively, the term can be read positively: Peter, James, and John deservedly enjoyed a high reputation. Perhaps an interpretation between these two options is best. Paul did not doubt the stature and position of these leaders. Nevertheless, he cautioned against overestimating their authority. Final authority does not reside in any person but only in the gospel (1:8). Leaders are to be respected but not venerated, honored but not exalted above the gospel. [Schreiner, 121–122]

Why was this meeting private? Paul tells us (last ?) ==>

**f. What was Paul's concern? (v. 2c)**

**And I declared to them the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles, but I did so in private to those who were of reputation, lest somehow I might be running, or had run, in vain.**

**(1) What is that all about?**

New Century Version:

. . . in private I told their leaders the Good News that I preach to the non-Jewish people. I did not want my past work and the work I am now doing to be wasted. That basically captures t/idea.

What Paul isn't saying is that he had doubts about what he taught // concerned that his gospel wasn't accurate. That sort of schizophrenic interpretation doesn't fit t/context.

Paul was an A. by t/direct ordin. of God (1:1) // warned about those who 'distort' t/Gospel & prom. God's wrath upon them (1:7-9). 1:11-12

**f. What was Paul's concern? (v. 2c)**

**. . . but I did so in private to those who were of reputation, lest somehow I might be running, or had run, in vain.**

Paul's concern was that should his mission & message be rejected by those in Jerusalem, great damage would be done to t/cause of X.

Judaizers would have a heyday. But as we'll see later, Paul's anxieties were unfounded.

Paul's second trip to Jerusalem proves that there's harmony between Jerusalem and Antioch. --- The Pillars and Paul sing in unison.

## *I. Paul's Third Defense: A Litmus Test in Jerusalem (2:1-10)*

### *A. The Consequent Journey to Jerusalem: Paul's Second Trip (vv. 1-2)*

#### *1. Company of Five Faithful Friends*

##### *a. When was the trip? (v. 1a)*

14 years after his conversion. Ties into Acts 11 – famine relief to Jer.

##### *b. Who went? (v. 1b)*

Paul, Barn. (son of encouragement), Titus (uncircumcised Gentile)

##### *c. Why did they go? (v. 2a)*

It was because of a “revelation” (Agabus pred. of coming famine).  
Ultimately, so that t/Gospel would be vindicated.

##### *d. What happened? (v. 2b)*

Paul declared to the “pillars” / “those of reputation” (Peter, James, John) the gospel he preached to the Gentiles.

##### *e. Where did it happen? (v. 2b)*

Privately. Why? ==>

##### *f. What was Paul's concern? (v. 2c)*

Should Jer. reject his message t/CH's he founded may be disheartened  
& t/Judaizers given even greater ability to wreck havoc in t/CH.

---

Well I covered more than 1 word. More than 1 verse (2 vv.).

I'd hoped to get to our second main point ==>

### *B. The Confrontation in Jerusalem: Titus and the Test Case (vv. 3-5)*

3 C's ==>

#### *1. Circumcision and Titus (v. 3)*

#### *2. Christians In Name Only (v. 4)*

#### *3. Celebrating the Freedom of the Gospel (vv. 4-5)*

Save that for next time.

### 3. *Celebrating the Freedom of the Gospel* (vv. 4-5)

John 8:36 – application to believers. Easy to fall into t/bondage of performance; unrealized expectations; feeling that you have to earn God's love; weight of sin – Gospel liberates and continues to do so.

If you're not a genuine believer . . .

### 2. *Christians In Name Only* (v. 4)

John Piper ==>

“Saving faith is the cry of a new creature in Christ. And the newness of the new creature is that it has a new taste. What was once distasteful or bland is now craved. Christ Himself has become a Treasure Chest of holy joy. The tree of faith grows only in the heart that craves the supreme gift that Christ died to give: not health, not wealth, not prestige, but God!” [www.whatchristianswanttoknow.com/john-piper-quotes-28-top-sayings/#ixzz3Fw1hwN3K]

Jesus Christ is the Gospel – In His very Person He is t/revelation of t/sinner's hope, joy, and redemption.