

Title: "Hypocrisy, Gentiles, and the Gospel" (Part 2)

Passage: Galatians 2:14

Theme: Part four of Paul's defense of his 1:11-12 thesis

Number: 1114Ga2.14(15)

Date: November 16, 2014

---

{{Read Passage}}

[i] We began this passage last week – so this is part 2 of "Hypocrisy, Gentiles, and the Gospel"

Peter's hypoc. in regard to t/Gsp. as it related to t/Gentiles in Antioch.

That theme not only covers vv. 11-15 – it goes beyond it all t/way to t/end of t/Chapt. almost imperceptibly moving from Paul's rebuke of Peter to Paul's Defense of t/Gospel before t/Galatians.

[ii] Question here of quotation marks

Paul is writing to these largely Gentile Xns who were in S. Galatia - who were part of several CH's t/o that region.

He / Barn. had evangelized t/region. They preached t/rites of X slain for guilty sinners – many were converted.

Acts 13:46–48 46 And Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly and said, “It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken to you [Jews] first; since you repudiate it, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold, we are turning to the Gentiles.<sup>47</sup> “For thus the Lord has commanded us, ‘I HAVE PLACED YOU AS A LIGHT FOR THE GENTILES, THAT YOU SHOULD BRING SALVATION TO THE END OF THE EARTH.’”<sup>48</sup> And when the Gentiles heard this [Gospel], they began rejoicing and glorifying the word of the Lord; and as many as had been appointed to eternal life believed.

**[iii] Where God sows wheat Satan sows tares**

No sooner had P&B left t/area – FT's arrived & began to undermine t/truth. Cf. 1:6-7. Judaizers. Apparently a ringleader. Cf. 5:10.

They were claiming that Paul was a 2d-rate A. under t/auth. of t/pillars in Jer. that he went rogue & was teaching 1 thing to Jews & another to t/Gentiles. He was under attack.

Paul begins this letter with a 4 part defense of his apostolic authority. Not for t/sake of having authority – wasn't some megalomaniac on a power trip – his authority was connected to t/truth of t/faith.

Like my going to a remote village, preaching X there & seeing a CH est. After I leave, FT's arrive saying “*don't listen to him – he's a hack. He doesn't have any auth. /understanding of t/Bible & good theol.; listen to us.*”

For Paul t/stakes were much higher – this is t/apostolic age & t/embryonic stage of t/NT CH.

Paul is defending his veracity as a true A. of JC.

**[ii] Question here of quotation marks**

Punct. wasn't part of t/original text.

Look at v. 14 . . . Follow the words . . .

May end at v. 15. Maybe v. 19. Then v. 21?

Gradual / indistinguishable shift from Paul's rebuke of Peter to Paul's Defense of t/Gospel. Why Paul is writing – not for Peter's sake for t/Galatians.

**[iv] This is Part 2 of "Hypocrisy, Gentiles, and the Gospel"**

These verses (chapt. 2:11 ff.) also mark Paul's 4<sup>th</sup> and last defense of his 1:11-12 thesis ==>

**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 from man, nor was I taught it, but [I received it] through a revelation of Jesus Christ.**

[v] 1:13-17 ==> Paul's First Defense "Jesus Not Jerusalem"

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

He reminds his readers of his past: A Pharisee who quickly outranked his contemporaries in t/Law & zeal (1:13-14).

But he was utterly transformed. The God who elected him from eternity was pleased to reveal His Son, JC in him, calling him to be t/apostle to t/Gentiles.

When that happened, Paul didn't run off to Jer. to join t/fraternity of t/Apsls. He went off to t/Nabatean desert. Spent some time there before returning to Damascus.

Paul wasn't under t/authority of t/Jerusalem Apostles. He wasn't converted there // taught by t/likes of Peter/John/James.

When he was converted in Dam., he went to Arabia & back to Dam.

[vi] 1:18-24 ==> Paul's Second Defense "Only a Fortnight in Jerus"

It wasn't until 3 years later (v. 18) that he went to Jerusalem – and that was to become acquainted with Peter and he only stayed 15 days (fortnight +1).

Paul's first trip to Jerusalem following his conversion was to be introduced to Peter – not to the gospel!

### [vii] Paul's Third Defense: A Litmus Test in Jerusalem (2:1-10)

LT = Titus who becomes a test case as to whether a Gentile convert must be circumcised to be saved. 2:1-10 {review}

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

There was no schism between Paul and t/Jer. Apsles.

The Pillars and Paul sing in unison.

### I. Paul's Fourth Defense: Correcting Cephas in Syria (2:11-14)

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

~Paul Reproves Peter the Pillar~

Scene shifts. We were in Jerusalem (2:1-10); scene shifts to Antioch a few 100 mi. N. Jeru. representing not only t/epicenter of Judaism in gen. but also Jewish Xnty. Antioch in Syria rep. Gentile Xnty.

In Jer. Peter extended to Paul t/RHOF; In Antioch he's rebuked by Paul for his hypocrisy.

### *I. Paul's Fourth Defense: Correcting Cephas in Syria (2:11-14)*

(Context; Circumstance; Consequence; Crux; Comment)

#### A. The Context (11a)

**But when . . .**

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

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

2. Here in particular it marks off a contrast with the events of 2:1-10 The Litmus Test in Jerusalem. Contrast here, as Paul might say it ==> “In Jerusalem Peter and I agreed as to the nature of the gospel, but he came to Antioch, well that was a different story.”

a. At some point Peter arrived there

**But when Cephas came to Antioch . . .**

**B. The Circumstance (11b-12)**

**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~

**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.**

Peter changed tables. When you were in school think about who you ate with. Different tables. Geeks, Jocks, Pretty and popular. not so pretty and not so popular. When I was a freshman in H.S. I would never have thought to go sit with the seniors. Table ranks.

William Carey t/English Baptist missionary known as the "father of modern missions. When Carey and his co-laborers carried the gospel to India, they confronted a similar situation that related to t/entire caste system there. Carey felt that the holding of caste was incompatible with faith in Christ. He refused to baptize anyone who continued to

maintain caste distinctions that included the refusal to share together in a common meal. When Carey's first Hindu convert, a man named Krishna Pal, became a Christian and decided to break caste by taking dinner with the missionaries, William Ward, one of Carey's fellow workers, declared: "Thus the door of faith is open to the Gentiles. Who shall shut it? The chain of caste is broken; who shall mend it?"

[cited in George, 182-183]

Any such factions that existed among believers were dissolved in X.

3:28 **There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free man, there is neither male nor female; for you are all 1 in Christ Jesus.**

## 2. Peter "used to eat with the Gentiles"

He sat with them. He ate with them. No doubt, he ate the same foods as them – foods that were unclean under t/Old Covt. But Peter was now a child of t/New Covt. He ate meals w/Gentiles; he celebrated t/LT w/them, a time of intimate fellowship.

## 3. Something changed – certain men from James came to Antioch

**. . . when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.**

### a. Paul doesn't give us much detail here

(1) This sounds like James (same J. as in v. 9) is somehow to blame

I don't think we should read it that way. We don't know that t/men from James were truly rep. him. We don't know what kind of news they brought. Different ways this can be read.

==>

*For prior to the coming of certain men who claimed to be from James but weren't, they were Judaizers, Peter used to eat with the Gentiles. But when these Judaizers came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.*

*For prior to the coming of certain men from James who informed us that the Jews were intensifying their persecution of t/Xns in and around Jerusalem, Peter used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came bringing this news, Peter began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision, that is, the Jews.*

**d. Whatever the case – Peter wrongly broke fellowship w/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 fell.).

Peter saw Jesus share meals with Gentiles.

Luke 15:2 **And both the Pharisees and the scribes began to grumble, saying, “This man receives sinners and eats with them.”**

Mark 7 ==> 18 . . . **“Are you so lacking in understanding also? Do you not understand that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him;<sup>19</sup> because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated?”** (Thus He declared all foods clean.)

We looked at the events of Acts 10-11 last time. Peter's vision of unclean animals & t/conversion of a Gentile named Cornelius.

Chapter 11 of Acts 1 . . . the apostles and the brethren who were throughout Judea heard that the Gentiles also had received the word of God.<sup>2</sup> And when Peter came up to Jerusalem, those who were circumcised took issue with him,<sup>3</sup> saying, “You went to uncircumcised men and ate with them.”

Peter relates his story and concludes:

17 “If God therefore gave to them the same gift as He gave to us also after believing in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could stand in God’s way?”

This is why Peter's actions in Antioch were so hypocritical. Even cowardly. He was standing in God's way!

Our sin has consequences that impact others.

### C. The Consequence (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. Emphasis here is on Barnabas

Was B. who had introduced Paul to the Jer. Xns who feared him, refusing to believe that he was truly a follower of X.

Was B. who sought out Paul in Tarsus and persuaded him to become a part of the ministry team at Antioch.

Was B. who stood with Paul in Jerusalem to defend t/liberty of the gospel against t/sham Xns.

Was B. who had accompanied Paul on t/1st MJ – who witnessed t/conversion of many Gentile believers to X.

Was B. who worked in Galatia. They knew him.

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.

**But when I saw that they were not acting straight-forward concerning the truth of the gospel . . .**

### 1. Three things here:

#### a. Number 1: Paul saw

**But when I saw . . .**

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

**. . . that they were not acting straight-forward . . .**

Some translations have: “not in step,” “not following,” “not in line,” “not uprightly.” All come from 1 Gk. verb: ὀρθοποδεο. Ὄρθος = 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).

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 (14b)

**I said to Cephas in the presence of all: . . .**

(may have been a formal meeting called for this purpose/impromptu)

Here come the quotations marks==>

**“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. What is Paul saying?

*“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”?

**. . . 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 if they hoped to be saved, 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 or merit to t/equation you are saying that X alone is insufficient.

Illustrated. Take a sheet of paper. Draw three circles. In one write “works” in 2d write “works + X” in t/3rd write “X”. Ask yourself, “how can I have any hope of being saved? Of having my sin forgiven & being at peace w/God? What is my hope of eternal life in X.?”

Circle #1 = // #2 // #3.

Peter was acting like it's circle #2 – X+Law. Cannot be Christ plus anything. Solus Christus.

## II. Acts 15 – Jerusalem Council

### A. Timeline (helpful for you to read Acts chapters 1-15)

#### 1. Acts chapter 9 –

Paul is on his way to persecute Xns in Damascus & while on his way JC appears to him “Saul, Saul...” He's converted.

Galatians 1:15–16 **15 . . . He who had set me apart, even from my mother's womb, and called me through His grace, was pleased 16 to reveal His Son in me . . .**

Later in Acts 9 Barnabas befriends Paul convincing t/rest of t/Jews incl. t/Apostles Peter and James, that he was no longer a threat. Corresp. to 1:18-24 – Paul's 1<sup>st</sup> trip to Jerusalem – only a fortnight.

#### 2. Acts 11 –

Paul is in his hometown of Tarsus. Barnabas goes there to enlist his help w/the CH in Antioch. Paul goes w/him. They're in A. Agabus, a prophet, declares that a great famine was going to hit t/region. T/CH in Antioch takes up a collection for t/believers in Jer. (were hit esp. hard by t/famine). Paul & Barn. are t/couriers who carry t/collection to Jer. That fam. rel. visit = Gal. 2:1-10.

#### 3. Acts 12 –

Persecution of t/CH by Herod. James t/Brother of John is put to death. Peter is arrested, put in prison. An angel is sent from t/Lord to deliver him. He's miraculously freed / chains fall off his wrists & he is reunited w/the disciples who had been diligently praying for him.

May be right about this time, while he was being hunted down by Herod's men for his jail break, that Peter went to Antioch (2:11ff).

#### 4. Acts 13 –

Back in Antioch. Peter's no longer there, but Paul and Barnabas are. HS sets them apart for an evangelistic campaign that sends them, among other places, to Galatia. CH's est.

Prob. toward t/end of that journey (Acts 14) that Paul writes this letter to t/Gal. CH's.

#### B. Jerusalem Council of Acts 15

Keep in mind that by t/time you get to Acts 15, Paul has already written Galatians. He's already met w/James, Peter, and John in Jerusalem and later confronted Peter in Antioch. At this time = AD 49

1 AND some men came down from Judea and began teaching the brethren, “Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved.”

Judaizers – same group that had already by this time infiltrated t/Gal. CH's. Their message? Believe in JC and Keep the Law or you cannot be saved. Justification = X + Law.

2 And when Paul and Barnabas had great dissension and debate with them, the brethren determined that Paul and Barnabas and certain others of them should go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders concerning this issue.

Paul, Barn. other believers who prob. went along as witnesses.

3 Therefore, being sent on their way by the church, they were passing through both Phoenicia and Samaria, describing in detail the conversion of the Gentiles, and were bringing great joy to all the brethren.

4 And when they arrived at Jerusalem, they were received by the church and the apostles and the elders, and they reported all that God had done with them.

Namely, t/same thing we just saw in v. 3 [^]

5 But certain ones of the sect of the Pharisees who had believed, stood up, saying, “It is necessary to circumcise them, and to direct them to observe the Law of Moses.”

I take it that these Pharisees were of t/same cloth as t/Judaizers who were t/reason for t/council in t/first place.

Not just about circumcision. Rem. if that were true then only ½ of t/CH could be saved. Circumcision = represents not only male headship under t/Old Covt. but also t/entire Mosaic Law.

Galatians 5:3 **And I testify again to every man who receives circumcision, that he is under obligation to keep the whole Law.**

We have men from Judea teaching this false gospel; men/Pharisees in Jerusalem teaching much t/same thing.

6 And the apostles and the elders came together to look into this matter.

First church council. From vv. 12&22 we see that they weren't alone – other believers were there as well.

7 And after there had been much debate, Peter stood up and said to them, “Brethren, you know that in the early days God made a choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the

gospel and believe. 8 “And God, who knows the heart, bore witness to them, giving them the Holy Spirit, just as He also did to us; 9 and He made no distinction between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith.

Peter is looking back about 10 years to t/conversion of t/Gentile Cornelius in Acts 10-11. The issue of whether to accept Gentiles was settled then and there. Evidence – Peter's words here and in Acts 10:44-46 – God gave t/HS to them by faith just as He did to the Jews.

10 “Now therefore why do you put God to the test by placing upon the neck of the disciples a yoke which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?

IOW – we know from our own experience & history that t/Law only condemns. It cannot save. Why would we put God to t/test (forbidden in t/OT) by requiring t/Gentiles to do t/impossible?

11 “But we believe that we are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in the same way as they also are.”

12 And all the multitude kept silent, and they were listening to Barnabas and Paul as they were relating what signs and wonders God had done through them among the Gentiles.

All of t/events of Paul's 1<sup>st</sup> M.J. as well as Peter's work among t/Gentiles in Caesarea.

13 And after they had stopped speaking, James answered . . .

James – Lord's ½ brother. Same James we've read about in Gal. James, at this point, is foremost among t/apostles in Jerus. (considered 'head of t/Jer. CH).

. . . James answered, saying, “Brethren, listen to me. 14 “Simeon [Simon Peter – Jewish/Jerus.] has related how God first concerned Himself about taking from among the Gentiles a people for His name. James quotes t/OT Proph. Amos (not out of t/Hebrew, but t/Gk/LXX): 15 “And with this the words of the Prophets agree, just as it is written 16 ‘AFTER THESE THINGS I will return, AND I WILL REBUILD THE TABERNACLE OF DAVID WHICH HAS FALLEN, AND I WILL REBUILD ITS RUINS, AND I WILL RESTORE IT,17 IN ORDER THAT THE REST OF MANKIND MAY SEEK THE LORD, AND ALL THE GENTILES WHO ARE CALLED BY MY NAME,’ 18 SAYS THE LORD, WHO MAKES THESE THINGS KNOWN FROM OF OLD.

19 “Therefore it is my judgment that we do not trouble those who are turning to God from among the Gentiles, 20 but that we write to them that they abstain from [four] things:

- [those things] contaminated by idols (v. 29 – food sacrificed to idols)
- from fornication
- from what is strangled
- and from blood.

Not w/i t/scope of our study to delve deeply into t/ramifications of these 4 prohibitions. Main issue = Gentiles not be a stumbling block to Jews. That goes along with Paul in 1 Cor. 10 (meat sacrificed to idols).

In addition to meat purchased at t/local idol grocery store => **meat that is strangled** (not butchered so that t/blood can drain). **blood** ==> eating meat that has t/blood in it – raw.

**Fornication** would seem to be a no-brainer – that transcends any civil or ceremonial aspect to t/Law. But t/Gentiles were known as champion fornicators – maybe why it's added. Or this may be another reference to certain marriage prohibitions in Leviticus.



Regardless, t/truth of t/gospel by grace alone through faith alone in X alone was defended.

Letter is sent to Antioch by Paul and Barnabas, along w/some others.

Note verse 24 ==>

24 “Since we have heard that some of our number to whom we gave no instruction have disturbed you with their words, unsettling your souls,

These might be t/same men as “those sent from James” in 2:12.

That sort of closes t/circle on Galatians 1-2 as it relates to t/various issues involved & their connection to t/BOA.

### III. 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 1<sup>st</sup> c. Apostles or 21<sup>st</sup> 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.”

Paul's correction was tempered by his knowledge of Leviticus 19 ==> 17 ‘You shall not hate your fellow countryman in your heart; you may surely reprove your neighbor, but shall not incur sin because of him. 18 ‘You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the sons of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself; I am the LORD.

### 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, 17<sup>th</sup> 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.

“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.” [Luther]

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. (Barnabas), 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.

Few years ago I was listening to a nationwide radio program. Caller was talking to t/host who, in t/course of t/conv. came to t/realization that his caller was prob. a Xn. He asked him (friendly way): “Are you a believer?” Caller said, “Yes”. Then, t/radio host said something to t/effect of: “You're not one of those believers who thinks that there's only 1 way to God & that if you don't follow that path you're going to hell . . .” Caller sort of stumbled and disingenuously said “Oh no....”

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, an 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 . . .

Beware of those who have t/gift of admonishment . . .

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

**But when I saw that they were not acting straight-forward concerning the truth of the gospel . . .**

ὀρθοποδεω

This is where our sanctified stubbornness meets our love of X.

I am unwavering in my commitment to t/Gospel because it is X.

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

We recently celebrated Reformation Sunday, commemorating that October 31<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 – perhaps for t/first time publicly - 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.]