

Title: "The Litmus Test in Jerusalem" (Part 3)

Passage: Galatians 2:6-10

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

Number: 1014Ga2.6-10(13)

Date: October 26, 2014

---

{{Read Passage}}

[i] I had a doctor's appointment last week

Toward t/end of my visit, my doctor remarked that it was about time for her recertification – something that's req. very 10 years.

*“That would be good for preachers – in-depth theological examination. No lack of malpractice issuing from the contemporary American pulpit.”*

No doubt that's how Paul felt. He was dealing w/preachers (pseudo-Christians) who were theological quacks.

Medical Dr. to be guilty of mal. = physical harm // death of body.

Preacher/teacher to be guilty of mal. = spiritual harm // death of t/soul.

That was TAP's concern.

Galatians 1:7–9 7 . . . there are some who are disturbing you, and want to distort the gospel of Christ. 8 But even though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we have preached to you, let him be accursed. 9 As we have said before, so I say again now, if any man is preaching to you a gospel contrary to that which you received, let him be accursed.

[ii] We refer to these false teachers as the Judaizers

That moniker comes from Acts 15:1

. . . [men] from Judea [who were] teaching the brethren, “Unless you are circumcised according to t/custom of Moses, you cannot be saved”

[iii] They claimed to follow Christ but they wed him to Moses

They claimed to believe, to be saved & members of God's covt. ppl., but in attempting to join grace & law, they obliterated grace & remained under God's wrath.

5:2 Behold I, Paul, say to you that if you receive circumcision, Christ will be of no benefit to you.

[iv] Understand - it's not just about circumcision

After all if it was just about circum. then ½ of t/CH would be unaffected. Women are exempt.

[v] Circumcision stands representative of the entire Mosaic Law

Cert. circum. predates t/law – in that sense it's a mark of God's covt. w/Abraham. But in a greater sense it represents t/entire Law. Used in that sense we might call it a synecdoche - a fig. of speech where t/part refers to t/whole. ==>

6:13 For those who are circumcised do not even keep the Law themselves . . .

[vi] These churches spread about southern Galatia were under attack

P&B est. these local congregs during their first MJ in Acts 13-14. Trip started when they were sent out from Antioch, they went to Cyprus & on to Galatia. Went 1<sup>st</sup> to t/Jews, but when they rejected t/Gospel, they moved on to t/Gentiles. Many believed. CH's est.

After P&B moved on false teachers arrived telling t/people that Paul had it wrong. He wasn't a “real” apostle (hadn't been w/Jesus like Peter and John). They said that Paul was under t/authority of Jerusalem & had changed his message to reach Gentiles.

First order of business for Paul was to reestablish his credentials.

**[vii] 1:11-12 – Paul's Thesis**

In these 2 vv. TAP gives main point he goes on to defend in chaps 1&2  
**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.**

Paul didn't get his message from men; he got it directly from JC who is in His Person and Work t/essence of t/Gospel.

**[viii] Paul takes up 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 of his ministry and message.

**[ix] 1:13-17 ==> Paul's First Defense “Jesus Not Jerusalem”**

He reminds his readers of who we was as a X-rejecting Jew – he was an upcoming rabbinic scholar who added brawn to brains & persecuted t/CH w/the intent of obliterating it from t/earth.

But God had a sov. plan for Paul (as for us) ==>

15/16 But when He who had set me apart, even from my mother's womb & called me thru His grace, was pleased to reveal His Son in me Purpose differs ==>

that I might preach Him among the Gentiles,

I did not immediately consult with flesh and blood, 17 nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me; but I went away to Arabia, and returned once more 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.

[x] 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!

[xi] Then we come to chapter 2:1-10 – Paul's Third Defense

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

Up to this point, you might get t/impression that there was a rift between Paul and t/Jer. Apsles. That perhaps what they taught as to how a sinner can have peace w/God wasn't t/same. No ==>

The Pillars and Paul sing in unison.

I. 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.

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

**Then, fourteen years later, I went up again to Jerusalem . . .**

14 yrs can refer to any time between a little over 12 years up to 14. Closer to 12. Prob. counting t/years from his Dam. Rd. exper. (1:18).

**[In the fourteenth year], I went up again to Jerusalem . . .**

Paul's 2d trip. When was t/first? ==> 1:18 (only a fortnight / acquainted w/Peter not t/Gospel.

**with Barnabas, taking Titus along also.**

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

(likely t/prophesy of Agabus in Acts 11:28) – famine relief visit where Paul and Barnabas are sent by t/CH in Antioch to Jerus. w/relief aid for t/poor in Judea.

During that visit =>

**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.**

Here's Paul's 1<sup>st</sup> opportunity to cf. theological notes w/the Jerus. Apsls – and it's over a dozen years after his conversion! Only fear was that there might be a rift between t/Jer. & Gent. CH's.

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

It was a private meeting but not behind closed doors as we might think of private. While Paul was meeting w/Peter, James, and John some others wormed their way in.

Paul calls them “false brethren”

**. . . secretly brought in, who had sneaked in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus in order to enslave us.**

5:1 **IT was for freedom that Christ set us free; therefore keep standing firm and do not be subject again to a yoke of slavery.**

**We did not yield to them in submission for even an hour, so that the truth of the gospel might remain with you.**

**But not even Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.**

### **C. The Confirmation in Jerusalem: Gospel of Grace Affirmed (vv. 6-9)**

Here's where so much of Paul's argument comes full-circle.

Verses 6–10 return to the thoughts of vv. 1-2. These 5 vv. comprise 1 long sentence in t/Gk. text.

Negative statement followed by a positive.

Neg ==>

#### **1. Contributing Nothing to Paul (v. 6)**

**But from those who were of reputation--what they were makes no difference to me (God is not a respecter of men)--for those of reputation contributed nothing to me.**

a. Before we look at what Paul means by “contributed nothing to me” we need to look at where he begins==>

**But from those who were of reputation--what they were makes no difference to me (God is not a respecter of men)--**

**(1) Clearly he's referring to the big 3: Peter, James, and John**

He names them in v. 9.

What does he mean==>

**But from those who were of reputation . . .**

**(2) We saw this in verse 2 and we'll see it again in verse 9 (δοκεω)**

No doubt they were exalted by t/Judaizers. They gave them a 'high reputation.' Beyond that, they were men who deserved great respect. Beyond that ==>

**. . . what they were makes no difference to me (God is not a respecter of men)--**

**(3) Why was Paul ambivalent in regard to the reputation of the Jerusalem greats?**

Was he unimpressed? Did he think he was better than they were? Was Paul insecure? Bitter? Some sort of a pride issue?

No, because ==>

**(God is not a respecter of men)--**

**(a) Literally: “God does not receive face”**

Luke 20:21 **And they questioned Him, saying, “Teacher, we know that You speak and teach correctly, . . . You teach the way of God in truth [and] are not partial to any = καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον**

**i. A Hebraism**

In t/OT t/face stood for who a person was. Could be pos. or neg. For t/face of God to be for you was good // against you was bad. For God to receive your face was good // reject it was bad.

What it means here can be summed up in t/words of 1 Samuel 16:7: **“But the LORD said to Samuel, 'Do not look at his appearance or at the height of his stature . . . God sees not as man sees, for man looks at the outward appearance, but the LORD looks at the heart.'”**

God does not evaluate us on t/basis of “face” or “face value” - your prestige, wealth, power, notoriety, celebrity, beauty, popularity, how smart you are, if you hold an advanced degree, your gender or ethnicity. God judges the thoughts and intentions of the heart.

ii. For the believer: who we are solely by the grace of God

Goes back to 1:15 . . .

1 Cor 15:10 – **but by the grace of God I am what I am**

Everything and anything good in my life is by God's grace.

Everything and anything bad in my life is overcome by God's grace.

Both are a gift.

If I don't preach well and God blesses it – it's solely by His grace.

If I preach well and God blesses it – it's solely by His grace.

Same with you . . . When you do well in your life with Christ – God has been gracious in using you.

When you don't do so well . . . when you fail, sin, God has been gracious in forgiving you and restoring you.

For those of us who struggle with insecurity these are words that we need tattooed on our brains.

It doesn't matter what others think of me – good or bad.

It doesn't matter what people think of others – if they sound their praises and think they're so great w/the implication that I'm not. It's ok.

Get t/sense that this is a man, Paul, who is quite comfortable in his own skin==> *Maybe t/Judaizers think that t/Jerusalem Apostles are the end-all. That's okay. God has gifted them, that's by His grace. But in the end, what kind of reputation they have makes no difference to me because it makes no difference to God.*

Paul goes on to say – Neg. speaking

**1. Contributing Nothing to Paul (v. 6)**

**. . . those of reputation contributed nothing to me.**



**b. That is, as it pertains to the gospel**

Peter, James, John could offer no words of correction or clarification as to what Paul taught.

Neg. speaking

**1. Contributing Nothing to Paul (v. 6)**

pos

**2. Contrary Notions (v. 7)**

**But on the contrary, seeing that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised . . .** (Gentiles)

**a. How did they “see” that?**

1:23 {cite}; 2:2 (personal testimony); Add: Very presence of Titus! He's t/litmus test. Titus – the uncircumcised Gentile w/the circumcised heart. Titus, B.A. by God's grace alone thru faith alone in X alone!

**b. Paul was entrusted with the Gospel**

**I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised . . .**

**(1) “Had been entrusted” = perfect tense - implying a permanent commission**

Word Paul uses was also a tech. term used by t/imperial govt of Rome. One could say in a legal sense: “I have been entrusted with x”

ISW – Paul could say in a legal sense ==>

**I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised . . .**

Wasn't a trust given to him by any other apostle or by the Jer. CH. They simply recog. God's sov. work in entrusting t/Gospel message to Paul for him to preach among t/nations.

c. What about Paul saying that he==>

... had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, even as Peter to the circumcised ...

This isn't a recognition of 2 difference Gospels.

(1) This is a recognition of One God calling two men to the same work of a single gospel

seeing that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised (Gentiles) even as Peter to the circumcised (Jews)

Paul's sphere was primarily among t/Gentiles, while Peter's was prim. among t/Jews.

(a) Same God was at work in both

Which is why it can only be one Gospel. t/Triune God isn't divided. From t/time of t/fall, salvation has been t/work of a sov. God calling lost sinners to Himself through faith apart from works.

(b) Abraham – the father of circumcision

Romans 4:2–10 2 For if Abraham was justified by works, he has something to boast about; but not before God.3 For what does the Scripture say? “AND ABRAHAM BELIEVED GOD, AND IT WAS RECKONED TO HIM AS RIGHTEOUSNESS.” 4 Now to the one who works, his wage is not reckoned as a favor, but as what is due.5 But to the one who does not work, but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned as righteousness,6 just as David also speaks of the blessing upon the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works: 7 “BLESSED ARE THOSE WHOSE LAWLESS DEEDS HAVE BEEN FORGIVEN, AND WHOSE SINS HAVE BEEN COVERED.8 “BLESSED IS THE MAN WHOSE SIN

THE LORD WILL NOT TAKE INTO ACCOUNT.” 9 Is this blessing then upon the circumcised, or upon the uncircumcised also? For we say, “FAITH WAS RECKONED TO ABRAHAM AS RIGHTEOUSNESS.” 10 How then was it reckoned? While he was circumcised, or uncircumcised? Not while circumcised, but while uncircumcised; IOW . . .

Only way u could have diff. gospels is if they are based on some sort of work, or merit. This group has to do this to be saved; this group has to do that to be saved.

But a gospel based entirely on grace alone & a salvation received through faith alone is unitary regardless of culture or time.

Expressions of our faith (how we do CH; how we live our lives) that changes according to time and culture.

Essence of our faith (how we stand forgiven b4 God is t/same t/o hist.) Amazing.

#### e. Parenthesis

**(for He [God] who worked [ἐνεργεω] for Peter in respect to [his] apostleship to the circumcised worked [ἐνεργεω] also for me in respect to the Gentiles)**

Not different gospels (cf. 1:6b-7a). Rather 2 diff. spheres of ministry.

#### d. Not to say that these were isolated spheres

Wasn't that Paul only ministered to Gentiles & Peter only to Jews.

Ben Witherington ==>

One must bear in mind, however, that there were Jewish colonies all over the Roman Empire including in both Antioch and Galatia, and this meant that Peter's missionary work would necessarily overlap with Paul's in the Diaspora, with both of them going to some of the same cities such as Antioch or Corinth or Rome . . . One must also recognize that since Paul says not only that he became the Jew to the Jew in order to win some Jews (1 Cor. 9:20) but also that he suffered punishment from synagogues (2 Cor. 11:24), he probably had preached in synagogues both to Jews and to Gentiles. There was probably considerably more overlap in these Petrine and Pauline spheres of ministry than one might suspect on a superficial inspection of the matter. In other words, Paul did not take this agreement to mean that he would never preach to Jews, or that Peter would never address Gentiles. We are speaking of the major focus and purpose of their respective ministries. [Witherington, 141]

**(1) Peter and Paul are the 2 central figures of the NT church**

Peter dominates t/early chapters of Acts (a book that chronicles early CH history). After t/Jerusalem Council in chap. 15 he disappears as the focus shifts to Paul.

Paul mentions Peter several times in 1 Cor (Aramaic "Cephas" - only 2x "Peter" both in Gal. 2).

Toward t/end of his life, Peter referred to Paul as "our beloved brother" (2 Peter 3:15)

Back to vv. 6-9 ==>

***C. The Confirmation in Jerusalem: Gospel of Grace Affirmed (vv. 6-9)***

***1. Contributing Nothing to Paul (v. 6)***

**But from those who were of reputation--what they were makes no difference to me (God is not a respecter of men)--for those of reputation contributed nothing to me.**

## **2. Contrary Notions (v. 7-8)**

**But on the contrary, seeing that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, even as Peter to the circumcised, (for He who worked for Peter in respect to [his] apostleship to the circumcised worked also for me in respect to the Gentiles)**

3d sub-point ==>

## **3. Cooperation Among Brothers (vv. 9)**

**and knowing the grace given to me . . .**

“knowing” as in “recognizing” - back to v. 7 ==>

**. . . seeing that I had been entrusted with the gospel . . .**

**. . . James and Cephas and John . . .**

### **a. Note the order**

James; John (The Apostle John who wrote Gospel of John, Epistles of John x3; Rev.); Peter (A. Peter);

We're used to hearing about Peter, James and John in t/Gospels. Notorious Three.

Matthew 10:2 **Now the names of the twelve apostles are these: The first, Simon, who is called Peter, and Andrew his brother; and James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother;**

Peter, James and John who would often accompany Jesus apart from t/other disciples // were with Jesus on t/Mt. of Transfiguration // watch and pray in Gethsemane.

b. That's the order in which they're listed: Peter – James - John

Here ==>

... **James and Cephas and John** ...

Likely because this isn't the same James as in t/infamous trio. I think this James is t/same James mentioned in 1:19 (**James, t/Lord's brother**)

c. These same three ==>

... **who are considered to be pillars**, Cf. 2:2, 6.

Paul refers to them in 2 Cor. 11:5; 12:11 as **the most eminent apostles**.

Goes on to say ==>

**in no respect was I inferior to the most eminent apostles, even though I am a nobody.**

Same guy who could say ==>

... **those who were of reputation--what they were makes no difference to me (God is not a respecter of men)** ...

(1) "Pillars" (στῦλοι) was used by Jews to refer to great teachers of the Law

Also referred to t/3 patriarchs (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) as t/3 pillars of t/nation of Israel.

στῦλος was used of t/pillars to Solomon's Temple in t/LXX.

Some think that by calling "Pillars" Paul is saying that James, Cephas and John are t/spiritual foundation of t/new spiritual Temple of God's people, t/CH. I think that's a stretch.

Revelation 3:12 'He who overcomes, I will make him a pillar in the temple of My God' ...

Paul is simply saying that these 3 men ==>

... **are considered (reputed) to be pillars**,

We just don't know whose opinion that was. Persp. of t/Judaizers? // CH in Jerus. or t/CH in gen.? Did Paul agree? If so, in what way? We don't exactly know. May be a combin. of sev. factors.

What's really important is that these stalwarts of t/Jerusalem CH, these men whom t/Judaizers were claiming as their own over against Paul, didn't reject Paul's message // side w/the pseudo-brethren who demanded that Titus be circumcised.

No, they recognized God's work in Paul and t/grace given to him ==> . . . **gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, so that we [should go] to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised.**

#### **d. More than a handshake**

More or less a formal agreement. But it's not a dry, legal sort of thing. Right hand of fellowship / *koinonia*. Partnership. Paul & Barn. may be going to t/Gentiles while James, Peter and John focus on t/Jews, but this isn't a turf war.

#### **(1) Modern Day Turf Wars**

Something that's nagged at me for years is t/turf war mentality CH's and CH leaders have today. Idea that we're all out trying to win more paying customers.

Been times that we've tried to minister in a certain area & there's another CH that's already working there & it doesn't take long before you sense that you're really not welcome. It's their thing, not ours.

Or we hear about how a CH down t/street or across town is growing & we feel that little jerk inside – a hint of jealousy – esp. when good folks drive right past your CH to get there.

We too often have an 'us vs. them' mentality (I'm guilty).

That we could again adopt t/attitude of TAP who could say of preachers who proclaim X “out of selfish ambition, rather than from pure motives,” – whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and in this I rejoice, yes, and I will rejoice. (Phil. 1:17-18)

(2) There can be no fellowship where there is no agreement as to the Gospel

There can be no “right hand of fellowship” w/anyone who denies any of t/cardinal tenets of t/faith once for all delivered to t/saints.

Doesn't matter if they're on t/same page in regard to abortion; or marriage as between a man and a woman. No Xn fellowship apart from t/Gospel of grace. Justification by grace alone through faith alone in X alone.

**and knowing the grace given to me, James and Cephas and John, who are considered to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, so that we [should go] to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised.**

(The word “sinister” is a Latin word for “left-handed.”)

*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)*

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

*C. The Confirmation in Jerusalem: Gospel of Grace Affirmed (vv. 6-9)*

*D. The Contribution to Jerusalem: Remembering the Needy (v. 10)*

**[They] only asked us to remember the poor—the very thing I also was eager to do.**



## 1. Famine relief visit question?

Some have said that if this visit to Jer. is t/same as t/famine relief visit recorded in Acts 11:29-30, why would Peter, John, James ask Paul & Barn. to rem. t/poor? IOW – they came w/a contribution to t/poor so why ask them to do something they already did.

Some have used this as an argument against connecting Gal. 2:1-10 with Paul's visit to Jerus. in Acts 11 in favor of t/more traditional understanding of Acts 15.

Raises another prob.: Paul's second visit to Jerusalem was t/visit recorded in Acts 11. Acts 15 was his 3d trip there.

a. Verse 10 isn't in any way a conflict with our understanding that this visit was the same visit recorded in Acts 11

Key here is that t/word μνημονεω = “to remember” is a present tense verb & I think t/emphasis falls there.

**[They] only asked us to continue to remember the poor . . .**

That would fit. Paul, Barn. and Titus arrive w/a collection for t/neediest saints in Jerusalem. They meet priv. w/James, Peter, John. Issue of t/Gospel, circumcision and t/law is defended. Right hand of fellowship extended. Condition is “*keep on remembering us in our poverty.*”

Paul says that's ==>

**—the very thing I also was eager to do.**

## 2. This did refer specifically to the poor saints in Judea & Jerusalem

As one writer observes:

From its earliest days the Jerusalem church faced a condition of grinding poverty, as can be seen from the dispute over widows

receiving sufficient food and the practice of sharing all things in common to care for the needy (Acts 4:32–35; 6:1–4). A land of soil deprivation and poor irrigation, Judea was also hard hit in this period of history by famine, war, and overpopulation. To all this must be added the ravishing of the church in the persecutions directed by Paul and other leaders of the Jewish religious community. So chronic was the economic deprivation of the Judean Christians that they became known collectively as “the Poor.”

1 Corinthians 16:1–3 **1 NOW concerning the collection for the saints, as I directed the churches of Galatia, so do you also. 2 On the first day of every week let each one of you put aside and save, as he may prosper, that no collections be made when I come. 3 And when I arrive, whomever you may approve, I shall send them with letters to carry your gift to Jerusalem;**

In Rom. 15 Paul spoke of t/CH's in Macedonia & Achaia who were pleased to make a contribution for the poor among the saints in Jerusalem.

Paul took that collection to Rome, a collection that included funds given by t/Galatian CH's, on his last trip there that ultimately ended with his arrest and execution.

### 3. Summary . . .

12 to 13 years after his conversion in Damascus, Paul goes to Jerusalem for t/2d time as a Xn. Barnabas and Titus join him. They are in a private meeting with James, t/Lord's brother, Peter, and John. It's a private meeting, that is, until some ‘false brothers’ intruded. They weren't invited, but were smuggled in.

Paul views his ministry as having been unilaterally authorized by God. He's not there to have his work confirmed; he's there seeking co-operation lest his ministry to t/Gentiles be neutralized.

The focus of t/meeting was Paul's Gospel for the Gentiles. That also involved a discussion about circumcision and the law.

In that regard, Titus is a litmus test. He's living proof of God's blessing upon Paul's ministry. Even though t/Judaizers argued that he needed to be circumcised, he wasn't. Jerusalem Apostles agreed. The Judaizers were t/losers in this debate, a debate that wouldn't finally end until after t/events of Acts 15.

Brings 2:1-10 to a close . . .

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

## II. Observations

### A. False Teachers are nothing new

2 Peter 2:1-2 1 BUT false prophets also arose among the people, just as there will also be false teachers among you, who will secretly introduce destructive heresies . . . 2 And many will follow their sensuality, and because of them the way of the truth will be maligned;

#### 1. Goes back to t/history of t/OT . . .

True prophets of OT Israel spent much of their time warning about false prophets in their midst.

Jeremiah 5:31 The prophets prophesy falsely, And the priests rule on their own authority; And My people love it so! . . .

a. At least 3 things characterized a false prophet in Israel

(1) They lacked divine authority - They didn't speak for God

(2) They told the people what they wanted to hear rather than what they needed to hear

(3) Promised peace when God threatened judgment

That much hasn't changed.

2. The church today is filled w/those who:

a. Lack divine authority

They don't speak for God because they mishandle or ignore His Word in t/Holy Scriptures.

b. Tell people what they want to hear rather than what they need

2 Tim. 4 – sound doctrine will not be endured (tolerated) by t/people. Rather, wanting to have their ears tickled, they will accumulate for themselves teachers in accordance to their own desires; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and will turn aside to myths.

Like those of Isaiah's day ==>

"speak to us pleasant words. Prophecy illusions. We don't want to hear about a Holy God." (Isaiah 30:9-11).

Paul in Gal. 1:10 . . .

c. Promise peace when God threatens judgment

Evident whenever topics like like sin, repentance, suffering, God's absolute sov., hell, true vs. false conversion are avoided.

## B. The Central Issue of False Teaching is a False Gospel

This is t/central issue. Let's not nitpick over secondary matters that in t/end have no eternal import.

I've seen Xns separate – break fellowship - over music; eschatology; how you define t/finer points of Calvinism; definition of spiritual gifts; Bible translations. Not saying that these things can't be imp., but let's not be guilty of majoring on t/minors to t/neglect of t/Gospel.

## C. There is such a thing as a false Christian

We're afraid to even talk about that today. Paul calls out t/ψευδαδέλφος (v. 4) – sham-Xns. There is a faith that doesn't save (James). Evidence by a lack of true love for JC and His word.

We must be exceedingly careful to make sure we understand someone's theology before branding anyone as a false brother or sister. To say works are a necessary evidence of salvation is not the same as saying that works are the ultimate basis of our salvation. As we will see in the rest of Galatians, to base our salvation on our works denies what Christ did on the cross. Any theology that ultimately locates salvation in ourselves and what we do or accomplish is a false gospel. [Schreiner]

## D. Sanctified Stubbornness is a good thing

**We did not yield to them in submission for even an hour, so that the truth of the gospel might remain with you.**

## E. It all comes back to the cross . . .

That is t/locus of our hope; our joy; our everything.