

Title: Hypocrisy, Gentiles, and the Gospel

Text: Galatians 2:11-14

Central Idea: Paul's apostolic authority demonstrated in the reproof of Peter in Antioch

Number: 1024Ga2.11-14(13)

Date: October 13, 2024

[i] Scripture Reading and Prayer

11 But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned. 12 For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision. 13 And the rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy, so that even Barnabas was carried away by their hypocrisy. 14 But when I saw that they were not acting straight-forward concerning the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all: "If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how [is it that] you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?"

This passage marks Paul's last defense of his apostolic authority that was being challenged by false teachers (Judaizers) who had infiltrated these 1st c. Gal. CHs.

Because we have so much to cover today, I'm not going to remind you of t/previous 3 defenses Paul has made.

1st in 1:11-17 / 2d in 1:18-24 / 3d 2:1-10.

These vv. contain the longest and richest autobiographical material we have from the pen of Paul.

We're going to jump right into 2:11-14.

I. Paul's Fourth Defense: Peter Reproved in Antioch (2:11-14)

In this section Paul gives his 4th defense of his 1:11-12 thesis: that t/Gospel he preaches comes directly from JC.

Here in 2:11-14 we see Paul's confrontation of Peter over his hypocrisy in regard to t/Gospel.

Paul's apostolic authority is proven in the reproof of Peter in Antioch. ~Paul Reproves Peter the Pillar~

x5: Context; Circumstance; Consequence; Crux; Comment.
Close w/some pract. applications.

A. The Context (11a)

Where do we place this section in history. What's going on?

11 But when . . .

1. "Ὅτε δὲ - same time marker we see in 1:15

There it marks t/time of Paul's conversion to X.

Paul's entire biography in these 1st 2 chaps. unfolds w/these "time markers." Four of them; last being in v. 11 ==>

11 But when . . .

2. Here it marks off a contrast with the events of 2:1-10

Contrast here, as Paul might say it ==>

"In Jerusalem Peter and I agreed as to the nature of t/Gospel. But he came to Antioch, well that was a different story."

3. In verse 11 we have a scene shift: from Jerusalem to Antioch (arrival of Cephas in Antioch)

a. Let me tell you a little about the city of Antioch

Antioch was Syria's foremost city, noted for its splendor & polit. imp. Served as t/capital city of Syria (Rom province).

A series of Rom. emperors beg. w/Julius Caesar turned A. into t/"Rome of t/East," outfitting it w/theaters, aqueducts, a great basilica, public baths, & a main street adorned w/pavements of marble.

Later, in the 6th c., a fire nearly destroyed t/city & it was also hit by 2 devastating earthquakes. In t/7th c. it fell to the invading forces of Islam (along with Jer. & Alexandria).

"Antioch" is known today as "Antakiya" - a town of some 200k (about ½ of what it was in t/1st c.).

(1) We've seen Antioch before

(a) Where Paul started his first missionary journey with Barnabas (Acts 13)

That journey incl. a trip of S. Galatia.

Antioch became home base for the expansion of Xnty o/s of Jer. (name "Xn" was first used of X's followers in Antioch).

Antioch was about 200 mi directly N of Jerus. & came to represent Gentile Xnty in contrast to the Jewish CH in Jerus.

Not to say there weren't Jews there. 10s of 1000s of Jews made their home in/around Antioch (in spite of t/persecution they regularly suffered at t/hands of their Roman overlords).

b. At some point Peter arrived there

11 But when Cephas came to Antioch . . .

(1) Why did Peter go to Antioch?

We don't know. Perhaps to get a 1st hand look at what was going on (reports of revival among t/Gentiles & a thriving CH)

Some think that Peter's trip to A. may be related to t/persecution of Herod Agrippa I who had t/Apostle James beheaded & Peter arrested (Acts 12).

After Peter is miraculously delivered from t/prison & reports to t/disciples who had been praying for him, Luke adds this cryptic note in 12:17 that Peter then "went to another place." Maybe that was to Antioch?

At some point after t/events of 2:1-10 (Paul's visit to Jerusalem w/Barn. & Titus) & before t/Great Jerus. Council of Acts 15, Peter made a visit to Antioch.

A. The Context (11a)

B. The Circumstance (11b-12) (spend much time here)

11 But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned.

1. Here we have Paul rebuking Peter for what we'll later see was his hypocrisy as it related to the Gentiles and the Gospel

Paul's apostolic authority is proven in the reproof of Peter in Antioch. ~Paul Reproves Peter the Pillar~

a. Could Peter whom the early church revered as the great Apostle have been wrong?

Could Peter, whom t/RCC claims as t/1st Bishop of Rome, have been in error? Even as it related to t/Gospel? Yes!

(1) BUT some Early Church Fathers found that to be too difficult a pill to swallow

They went to great lengths to explain this account away.

Example: Clement of Alexandria claimed that this wasn't Peter t/Apostle, but another Peter.

Others such as Origen, St. Jerome & Chrysostom said that this was all an act. Peter and Paul were faking it.

Peter pretended to be doing wrong so that Paul could correct him and t/CH instructed. Very first use of Drama in t/CH!

This view was also championed by Erasmus in t/16th c.

16th c. Reformers followed Augustine who rejected this idea

John Calvin speaks of: . . . the absurdity of the interpretation given by Jerome and Chrysostom, who represent the whole transaction as a feigned debate, which the apostles had previously arranged to take place in presence of the people. . . . Augustine is therefore right in asserting, that this was no previously arranged plan, but that Paul, out of Christian zeal, opposed the sinful and unseasonable [hypocrisy] of Peter, because he saw that it would be injurious to the Church.

[Calvin, comment on Galatians 2:11]

Such interpretations are desperate attempts to salvage Peter's reputation. It is better to acknowledge that even apostles sinned and fell short of God's glory. [Schreiner, 139]

11 But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned.

Word "condemned" isn't being used here in sense of 1:8-9. Peter wasn't guilty of believing in a false gospel; was hypoc.

B. The Circumstance (11b-12) Verse 12 ==>

12 For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.

2. What is that all about?

Peter changed tables at dinner. What's the big deal?

a. It was a big deal (you have to understand the cultural background)

Ancients didn't have nearly as many social events as we do. Eating tog. was a big part of community life.

To eat a meal w/someone = you accepted them as family.

Mark of fellowship / solidarity.

Passover in the OT was a meal.

Lord's Table in t/NT was associated w/a Love Feast – a meal

(1) For the Jews . . .

How you ate, w/whom you ate & ESP what you ate — all served as a way to separate t/covt. people of G. from t/pagan nations around them.

(2) Hence you have the dietary laws of the Mosaic Covenant

(1) Laws of 'unclean' foods (animals that could not be eaten)

(2) Laws of "ritual slaughter" that t/blood be properly drained from t/animal's body

(3) Laws requiring that food sacrificed in pagan temples not be eaten

Add to that t/myriad of rules later added by t/Jews All of this made entire subject of food, eating & drinking a matter of ritual purity & Jewishness.

(3) 2d c. BC Maccabean crisis

Jews revolted against t/madman Antiochus Ephiphanes.
Food laws were a test of national loyalty & religious faithfulness.

They looked to the Prophet Daniel in that regard ==>
Daniel 1:8/12 8 But Daniel made up his mind that he would not defile himself with the king's choice food or with the wine which he drank; so he sought permission from the commander of the officials that he might not defile himself.
12 "Please test your servants for ten days, and let us be given some vegetables to eat and water to drink."

I think Paul was reflecting on this acct. in Daniel when he writes in Rom. 14 ==>

2 One person has faith that he may eat all things [that is, t/food laws of t/M.C. are no longer in effect], but he who is weak eats vegetables only [kosher to t/nth degree]. Merism.

(4) Food laws were for Israel the nation:

Letter of Aristeas (2d c. BC): 142 "To prevent our being perverted by contact with others or by mixing with bad influences, [Moses] hedged us in on all sides with strict observances connected with meat and drink and touch and hearing and sight, after the manner of the Law."

Book of Jubilees (part of the Jewish Pseudepigrapha):
"Eat not with them . . . for their works are unclean." [22:16]
Apocryphal 4 Macc 4:26 equates eating unclean food with renouncing Judaism (ἐξόμνησαι τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμόν).

3. Peter the Jew "used to eat with the Gentiles"

Not only in fellowship with them, but also partaking of foods that were considered unclean under t/Law. More later...

4. Something happened

12 For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.

a. What changed?

(1) We have a time element here (“prior” or “before”)

B4 certain men from James came Peter ate w/the Gentiles.
Rem. this is in Antioch.

Certain men from James came to Antioch. We understand James to be same James of 1:19 / 2:9 – James t/Lord's bro.

Some men from James traveled to Antioch from Jerus.
Why were they there? We don't know. Did they truly represent James? Hard to say. Paul doesn't tell us.

No reason to throw James under the bus here.
Paul doesn't indicate that James was in error, only Peter.

b. Note the 2 verbs

12b . . . **But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself . . .** (“withdraw” & “separate”)

(1) “withdraw” = a military term - “retreat”

Imperfect tense ind. this was a gradual slide. “began to w.”

(2) “separate” also in the imperfect tense

Here we have Peter's guilt by disassociation.

c. The reason? Fear

12c . . . **fearing those of the circumcision.**

d. We have two groups: men from James and we have those of the circumcision (both in v. 12)

(1) So I think we're talking about 2 groups

IOW - the men from James and those of t/circumcision are different people.

May be that “those of the circumcision” refers to t/same Judaizing group described by Luke in Acts 15:1 ==>
... men ... from Judea ... teaching the brethren, “Unless you are circumcised . . . you cannot be saved.”

May be that “those of t/circumcision” were unbelieving Jews – those who outright rejected JC as Messiah.

e. Whatever the case – Peter began to break fellowship with his Gentile brothers and sisters

(1) He did so out of rank hypocrisy

It was hypocritical because Peter was acting out what he didn't truly believe

Whole context of 2:1-10 – Titus; Peter/James/John & right hand of fellowship. Titus (disavowal necess. of circumcision

5. Remember: this goes back to table fellowship

I said earlier that I think (along w/many scholars) that Peter was eating Gentile food w/the Gentiles.

Peter didn't bring a kosher sack lunch!

(10 Comm. lunchbox w/a Moses thermos)

a. This hypocrisy on Peter's part in Antioch happened after the events of Acts 10-11 (IMP!)

(1) In Acts 10 we read about a Gentile named Cornelius, a God-fearer (Gentile who worships YHWH)

Angel visits him saying, “Cornelius! Your prayers and alms have ascended as a memorial before God. Send for a man named Simon Peter.”

Meanwhile Peter's praying. He's hungry. Then has a vision of a great sheet coming down out of t/sky, lowered by four corners to the ground. One it were all sorts of animals that were unclean under t/Law of M. A voice came to him, “Arise, Peter, kill and eat!” Peter says, “By no means, Lord, for I have never eaten anything unholy and unclean.”

A voice comes to him a second time, “What God has cleansed, no longer consider unholy.”

Peter's puzzled as to t/meaning & what happens? Men from Cornelius arrive. And they said, “Cornelius, a centurion, a righteous & God-fearing man well spoken of by t/entire nation of t/Jews, was divinely directed by a holy angel to send for U to come to his house & hear a message from you”

Next day Peter travels to Caesarea. Cornelius was waiting for him, and had called together his relatives & close friends. Peter says ==>

“You yourselves know how unlawful it is for a man who is a Jew to associate with a foreigner or to visit him; and yet God has shown me that I should not call any man unholy or unclean. I most certainly understand now that God is not one to show partiality, but in every nation t/man who fears Him & does what is right, is welcome to Him.

Very next chapter (11) we read:

1 . . . the apostles and the brethren who were throughout Judea heard that the Gentiles also had received the word of God. 2 And when Peter came up to Jerusalem, those who were circumcised took issue with him, 3 saying, “You went to uncircumcised men and ate with them.”

Again, I don't think Peter brought a kosher lunch to t/meal!

I understand other interpretations that claim this was ONLY about ppl, not food.

I don't think this is an either/or proposition. Both/And

To say this vision had nothing to do w/food raises some ?s. Such as G. using an object lesson that is false is problematic. IOW - G. showed Peter a vision of unclean foods, claimed to have cleansed them, but not really, they are still defiled. Something breaks down there (to me anyway).

(2) Also point you to Mark 7

(a) Jesus is teaching about ceremonial cleanliness

Verse 15, he says that nothing you eat, that's o/s you, can defile you. Afterward, his disciples were puzzled. Reply?=> 18 "Are you so dull?" he asked [them]. "Don't you see that nothing that enters a person from the outside can defile them? 19a For it doesn't go into their heart but into their stomach, and then out of the body."

(b) Mark (who wrote this Gospel) adds an editorial comment:

19b (In saying this, Jesus declared all foods clean.)

i. That word "clean" is from the Gk. v. καθαρίζω

BAG: "A Levitical cleansing of foods: 'make clean, declare clean.'"

This is t/same word used in Acts 10:15 when God told Peter who was looking at a vision of unclean foods

. . . "What God has cleansed [aorist of καθαρίζω], no longer consider unholy."

(d) Peter and Mark...

We have Peter in Acts 10 // Mark writing his gospel, saying that Jesus declared all foods clean as an editorial comment. Rem. Mark wasn't an eye-witness / wasn't there . . .

Where did Mark get his info. for his gospel? From Peter! Peter who was t/one who saw t/vision in Acts 10!

I see a connection between G. cleansing non-kosher animals in Acts 10 and Mark's editorial comment that Jesus declared all foods clean. Same word for "clean" is used both places.

Yes, Peter's vision applied to t/Gentile Cornelius.

But food was a key element in table fellowship.

Gentiles and what they ate couldn't really be separated.

(e) Dietary laws were given to Israel the nation

Weren't given to other nations // t/CH.

We don't sep. ourselves from t/world by our diet. To do so would be to encroach upon t/Gospel

i. The Church under the New Covenant?

1 Timothy 4 we read that in "later times some will fall away from the faith, paying attention to deceitful spirits and doctrines of demons." How are those deceitful spirits known? By "men who forbid marriage and advocate abstaining from foods which God has created to be gratefully shared in by those who believe and know the truth. For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with gratitude."

ii. Before Sinai and the nation of Israel?

Go back to Noah after he left t/ark. God told him ==>

“Every moving thing that is alive shall be food for you; I give all to you . . .” [Gen. 9:3]

I realize that Noah brought clean / unclean animals on t/Ark. Clean animals were for sacrifice (8:20). That was t/issue, not diet. (ANE nations had clean/unclean distinctions as well.)

B4 t/flood people had a plant-based diet. After t/flood “Every moving thing that is alive” was lawful to eat — apart from t/spec. laws later given to Israel (Lev. 11).

Dietary laws were inaugurated for t/nation of Israel to keep them distinct from t/nations around them. That’s when they began. They ended w/the N.C.

6. Back to Galatians . . .

12 For prior to the coming of certain men from James, [Peter] used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.

a. For the sake of argument . . .

If “those of the circumcision” were t/Judaizers: what would be t/issue IF Peter & t/Gentiles WERE eating ceremonially clean foods? What’s t/issue?

Judaizers were okay w/that. Rem. they demanded that t/Gentiles who believed in Jesus be circumcised (Titus wasn’t) & observe t/Law of Moses.

If they were all eating Kosher, Peter would have no reason to withdraw from t/Gentiles out of fear.

B. The Circumstance (11b-12)

C. The Consequence (13)

13 And the rest of the Jews [the Christian Jews] joined him in hypocrisy, so that even Barnabas was carried away by their hypocrisy.

1. Hypocrisy as it relates to the Gospel

Our hypocrisy affects our witness // not just ourselves, but others. Hypocrisy is a deadly evil that pollutes our own souls & brings reproach to t/name of X.

2. Good news – repentance

We know that this story ends well. Know that from Peter's life & letters. We also know that from t/Jerus. Council of Acts 15 (which was after this account of hypocrisy in Antioch).

Peter goes on to stand firm for t/gospel in Acts 15 (later dies a martyr's death).

All goes back to the Gospel ==>

D. The Crux (14a)

By "crux" I mean t/central point of all this. It's about t/Gosp.

14a But when I saw that they were not acting straightforward concerning the truth of the gospel . . .

1. Three things here:

a. Number 1: Paul saw (14a)

Implication seems to be that Peter & Barnabas arrived in Antioch while Paul was absent. So this was going on for some time while Paul was away. When Paul arrived in Antioch he saw a change in how Peter, Barnabas, and the rest of t/Jews were acting toward t/Gentiles.

b. Number 2: They were not acting straight-forward

Some transl. have: “not in step,” “not following,” “not in line,” “not uprightly.” All come from 1 Gk. verb: ὀρθοποδεο. Ὀρθος = straight, & πους = foot. Idea is to walk a straight line.

c. Number 3: Concerning the truth of the gospel

This isn't just any issue. Many kinds of hypocrisy that Xns can be guilty of. This is t/worst kind because it's about THE truth of THE gospel (τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου).

(1) We saw something similar in 2:5 (Titus)

2:5 But we did not yield in subjection to them for even an hour, so that the truth of the gospel (ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου) might remain with you.

E. The Comment (14d)

14d **“I said to Cephas in the presence of all: ‘If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how [is it that] you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?’”**

1. In effect what Paul is saying is this:

“Peter, before you were concerned about what others thought, you lived like your Gentile brethren. You ate with them. You hung out with them. You treated them as co-equals in God's KD. But now you've changed. Now you are acting like a strict Jew. When t/Gentiles see your behavior they are compelled to act like you because you're giving t/impression that to truly be a Xn, one must keep t/Law.”

a. See that word “compel”?

14d . . . **you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?”**

(1) Same word used in 2:3

3 But not even Titus who was with me, though he was a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised. 4 But it was because of the false brethren who had sneaked in to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, in order to bring us into bondage.

Peter is acting like 1 of the “false brethren” / “sham Xns”

Peter, by his behavior, was compelling t/Gentiles to act like t/Jews just as t/false brothers tried to compel Titus to be circum.

Tom Schreiner writes ==>

Peter’s actions, then, put him in the same category as the false brothers. He was deviating from the truth of the gospel and compelling Gentiles to adopt the Jewish law in order to be saved.

Still, Paul does not identify Peter as a false brother, for Peter was acting hypocritically, not in accord with his convictions. Those who tried to force Titus to be circumcised were not genuine Christians, because they believed that one had to be circumcised to be saved. Peter, however, was a genuine believer, for his actions contradicted his beliefs. We have here another piece of evidence supporting the idea that Peter repented at Paul’s rebuke, for if he did not, Paul would have considered him to be a false brother like those described in 2:3–5. It is clear . . . that Paul was convinced that Peter was a genuine Christian. Nevertheless, Paul severely reprimands Peter, for his behavior had the inadvertent effect of compromising the gospel, of suggesting that Gentiles had to observe the food laws to belong to the people of God. [Schreiner,

146–147]

Whenever you add works / merit / Law to t/Gospel you are saying that X alone is insufficient.

Paul's apostolic authority is proven in the reproof of Peter in Antioch. ~Paul Reproves Peter the Pillar~

II. Observations and Application

Football season . . .

A. “Illegal Procedure” (Should Paul Have Publicly Rebuked Peter?)

Matt. 18 Jesus says that if you're bro. sins, go correct him in private. First step. Here Paul corrects Peter in front of t/entire Antioch CH.

Matt 18 isn't the only text on church discipline. We also have 1 Tim 5:20 – of CH leaders – Those who continue in sin, rebuke in the presence of all, so that the rest also may be fearful of sinning.

Leaders, whether they be 1st c. Apostles or 21st c. elders, are held to a higher standard. They are an example in their leadership for good, and an example in their sin for bad (“the rest may be fearful of sinning” – probl. t/rest of t/elders).

Also, since their sin is by nature more public because it's higher profile - so they are to be corrected in public.

Augustine: “It is not advantageous to correct in secret an error which injured openly.”

John Calvin referred to this instance as “. . . the most dangerous of all scandals, that the Church would be rent [divided], that Christian liberty was in danger, that the doctrine of the grace of Christ was overthrown; and therefore this public offense must be publicly corrected.”

B. “Wide Right” (Even the Best of God's People Blow It)

James (same James we've read about in Galatians) wrote in 3:2 of his epistle: “We all stumble in many ways”

Here we have Peter . . . Barnabas . . . Others (no doubt other, good sincere men & women) who followed Peter in his hypocrisy.

Bible speaks plainly about the sins & weaknesses of the saints. From those of t/OT (Abraham's duplicity; David's adultery; Elijah's cowardice) – to those of t/New (Paul's thorn in t/flesh & fearfulness in Corinth; Peter's hypocrisy) – t/Scripture never presents anyone outside of JC as being t/perfect (or near-perfect) standard.

Fenelon, 17th c. French RC theol. at least had this right when he said:

“It should be remembered that even the best of people leave much to be desired. And we must not expect too much. Do not allow yourself to turn away from people because of their imperfections. I have found that God leaves, even in the most spiritual people, certain weaknesses that seem to be entirely out of place.” [Fenelon, 17th c. French Saint, cited by John Piper “Persevering in

Ministry,” Cassette Message Dated Sept. 27, 1997, © Desiring God Ministries, 720 13th Ave. South, Minneapolis, MN 55415]

We compare ourselves against ourselves & we think we do well. Compare yourself against a holy God who dwells in the blazing light of his perfections and how does your best look?

"There is enough sin in my best prayer to send the whole world to Hell." ~ John Bunyan

Cf. to God we are maggots writhing around on a dead carcass boasting of who's on top.

John 15:5 applies to t/most seasoned Xn as well as t/most raw: "Apart from Me you can do nothing".
All of God's grace. Our salv / sanct.

Our strength comes not from ourselves but the Lord. We are utterly dependent on the grace of God for every step of growth we take.

This is also a reminder that we can't live today on yesterday's grace.

We need grace every moment of every day.
That's what it means to "walk by the Spirit"

Another lesson: When we fail, God is there to restore us.

Luther wrote: "Samson, David, and many other excellent men, fell into grievous sins. Job and Jeremiah cursed the day of their birth. Elijah and Jonah became weary of life and prayed for death. Such offenses on the part of the saints, the Scriptures record for the comfort of those who are near despair. No person has ever sunk so low that he cannot rise again. On the other hand, no man's standing is so secure that he may not fall. If Peter fell, I may fall. If he rose again, I may rise again. We have the same gifts that they had, the same Christ, the same baptism and the same Gospel, the same forgiveness of sins."

Third point follows from t/2d

C. “We’re Not the 72 Dolphins” (There’s No Perfect Church)

72 Dolphins known to football fans as t/only team to have a perfect season. No perfect CH (we affirm that) – no near-perfect CH.

“Whatever else one learns from the incident at Antioch, it should be clear that the early church was just as complex as the church is today, and social struggles and church conflicts were just as messy then as they are now. These early Christians had as much trouble with consistently living out the implications of the Gospel as we do today . . .”

[Ben Witherington, 166]

As people of grace we have to extend grace to others. Mandate. We who have received mercy have no right to withdraw mercy from our brothers and sisters. We address sin, but only when it's truly sin. We do so with humility ==> 6:1–2 1 BRETHREN, even if a man is caught in any trespass, you who are spiritual, restore such a one in a spirit of gentleness; each one looking to yourself, lest you too be tempted.2 Bear one another’s burdens, and thus fulfill the law of Christ.

D. “Offsides” (Our Sin Affects Others)

Peter's sin impacted others. Verse 13 ==>

. . . the rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy, so that even Barnabas was carried away by their hypocrisy.

None of us lives life in a vacuum. Even hidden sins have their ramifications – we're not t/husbands or wives we ought to be; we fail our children; we leave negative footprints that others may follow in to their own suffering.

Esp. true as it relates to t/body of X – we are a body!

When 1 member suffers, all suffer // rejoices ... // sins we are all impacted in 1 way or another. Each person is respons. But we can't forget t/far-reaching tentacles that sin possesses

E. “Out of Bounds” (The Danger of Hypocrisy)

To be a hyp. is to wear a mask (how t/term was used in antiquity – t/hypocrite was t/actor on a stage being something he wasn't).

For we who believe, hypocrisy isn't being something we're not, it's t/failure to be who we really are.

Peter failed to live what he was – free in X – free to fellowship w/Gentiles – free from t/Law.

In his heart he was no sham Xn.

In his conduct he was acting like one.

Equation: Good Doctrine + Bad Behavior = Hypocrisy.

It's easy to deny w/our behavior what we profess w/our lips.

Servant girl to Peter: “You're one of Jesus' disciples, aren't you?”

How often have we acted like that. Before others. At work. At school. Among family. Out in t/marketplace where we're nearly ashamed of our Lord.

We're afraid to speak out. Xn leaders time and again asked by t/secular media where they stand on hot-button issues like homo. Cave like a stack of cards.

Peter feared t/party of t/circumcision.

When t/fear of men drowns out t/fear of God we are in danger of denying t/Gospel in our hypocrisy.

F. “Tight Coverage” (Sanctified Stubbornness)

Saw this in 2:3 What a lesson! Like a pro bowl DB we stick like glue in our defense of t/Gospel.

“Let this be then the conclusion of all together, that we will suffer our goods to be taken away, our name, our life, and all that we have; but the Gospel, our faith, Jesus Christ, we will never suffer to be wrested from us.” [Luther, cited in Stott, 48]

What if Paul had not been stubborn?

Had Paul not stood his ground and spoken out (lone voice) – t/entire CH might have drifted into legalism // Gospel may have been tainted // a permanent rift between Jews and Gentiles in t/CH.

G. “Coachable” (Are we Humble and Teachable?)

I can't say enough about this One of t/biggest frustrations as it relates to t/CH – puzzles me . . .

You can do nothing w/someone who is not teachable, who won't be corrected, who won't take responsibility. That is 1 of the all-time, oft repeated sins – It's someone else's fault. Blame game. Goes back to our first parents.

We are to accept correction w/humility and grace // give . . .

H. “Staying In Bounds” (The Narrow Path of the Gospel)

This is where our sanctified stubbornness meets R love of X. I am unwavering in my commit. to t/Gospel because it is X.

I am unflinching in my love of t/Gospel because it is X

Reformation Sunday is in a few weeks. That is a day when Protestants commemorate that October 31st day in 1517 when Martin Luther nailed his 95 Theses against Indulgences to t/CH door in Wittenberg Germany.

Peter was venerated as t/first Pope, t/visible head of Christ's CH on earth. But Luther insisted that even an apostle could err. In same year that his 1st comm. on Galatians was released (1519), Luther publicly debated John Eck, Professor at the University of Ingolstadt. Debate was over issues of church tradition and authority. It was during that debate that Luther declared that popes could be wrong and had been wrong, that church councils could err and had erred, that Holy Scripture alone is t/final normative authority in matters of faith and practice. (*sola scriptura*).

Luther contended that Paul was correct to have challenged Peter so openly since it was a matter of t/Gospel, not personal pride or position.

“This is the issue at stake here: Either Peter must be severely rebuked, or Christ must be removed entirely. Rather let Peter perish and go to hell, if need be, than that Christ be lost.” [LW 26.119.]