

Galatians

**The Pilgrim Way Commentary on
the Book of Galatians**



**by Dr. John Cereghin
Pastor
Grace Baptist Church of
Smyrna, Delaware**

December, 2010

Galatians

The Pilgrim Way Commentary on Galatians
Third Edition
December, 2010

by Dr. John Cereghin
PO Box 66
Smyrna DE 19977
pastor@pilgrimway.org
website- www.pilgrimway.org

Galatians

Table of Contents

Apology
Introduction
Booklist
Galatians 1
Galatians 2
Galatians 3
Galatians 4
Galatians 5
Galatians 6
Bibliography

Apology for This Work

This commentary on Galatians follows in a long line of other works by divines of the past as they have sought to study and expound this very important epistle.

This work grew out of over 25 years of both preaching through Galatians in three pastorates in Maryland, Delaware and North Carolina as well as teaching through the epistle as an instructor at Maryland Baptist Bible College in Elkton, Maryland. I needed my own notes and outlines as I taught and preached from Galatians, so this fuller commentary flows from those notes and outlines. Thus, the layout of this commentary is a practical one, written by a preacher to be preached from in the pulpit or to be taught in a Sunday School. It was not written from an isolated study of a theologian who had little contact with people or practical ministerial experience. There are many such commentaries on the market and they tend to be someone dull and not very practical in their application.

This commentary cannot be easily classified into any single theological system. I believe that no single theological system is an accurate presentation of Scriptural truth in and of itself. When Charles Spurgeon once wrote "There is no such thing as preaching Christ and Him crucified, unless we preach what nowadays is called Calvinism. It is a nickname to call it Calvinism; Calvinism is the gospel, and nothing else", he displayed a most unfortunate theological hubris. Calvinism is a human, flawed, limited and uninspired theological system, as any other human theological system. There is some truth there, as there is in any theological system, but it ranks no better than other competing systems, such as Arminianism (which is nothing more than a modified version of Calvin's teachings), dispensationalism, covenant theology, Lutheranism, Romanism, Orthodox theology, pre-wrath rapture, take your pick. All these systems are flawed as they are all the products of human attempts to understand and systematize Biblical presentations. They can all make contributions to our overall understandings of the truth but none may claim to be the only correct such presentation, at the expense of all others. Knowing the human impossibility for absolute neutrality and the human love for theological systems, I readily admit that I cannot be as dispassionate and uninfluenced by human teachings in these pages as I would like. No man can be. But I have made every attempt not to allow my own personal systems influence my understanding of what the clear teachings of Scripture is.

I have freely consulted a wide variety of commentaries and sermons for insights and other views of various texts that I might have missed. As the old preacher once remarked "I milked a lot of cows but I churned my own butter." Direct quotes are attributed to their proper source to prevent that unpardonable sin of literary theft. But simply because I quoted a writer should not be viewed as an endorsement of all that he wrote or of his theological system. I selected the quote because I found it interesting and useful, not because I am in any degree of agreement regarding the rest of his teachings.

Galatians

This commentary is based on the text of our English Received Version, commonly referred to as the King James Version or the Authorized Version. I believe that this is the most preserved English translation available to us and that it is the superior translation in English. I can see no good reason to use or accept any of the modern versions, especially the current “flavor of the month” of the apostate professing church, the corrupt and mis-named English Standard Version. When it comes to these modern, critical text versions, I reject them for a variety of reasons. One major reason is that they have not been proven on the field of battle. I have liver spots older than the English Standard Version, but I am expected to toss my English Received Text, over 400 years old, and take up this new translation, whose ink is still barely dry? How many battles has the ESV won? How many missionaries have done great exploits with an NIV? What revivals have been birth and nurtured with an NASB? We will stick with the translations and texts that our fathers have used and that God has blessed. We are also favorably inclined to the Geneva Bible, Tyndale Bible, Matthews Bible, and other “cousins” of our English text. The Greek text used is the underlying text of our English Received Text and its 1769 revision, which is the text most widely in use today by God’s remnant.

Each verse is commented upon, with the English text, with Strong’s numbers and grammatical coding, such as Greek verb tenses and parts of speech (for the Greek text). The English grammatical notes are limited to the tenses of the corresponding Greek verbs, for I believe the study of the verb tenses is the most important element of the usage of the Greek text, even moreso than word studies. Not every Greek word is commented upon, only unusual or important ones. I am guilty of “picking and choosing” my word studies instead of presenting complete word studies for every word. That system would simply be too unwieldy for my purposes.

The presupposition of this commentary is that what the Bible says is so and that we will not change the text to suit our theological fancy. It says what it says and that is what we must accept, else we will be found unfaithful stewards of the Word of God, a judgment we fear. We will not amend our text but will take it as it is the best we can.

This commentary certainly is not perfect, nor is it the final presentation of my understanding and application of the book of Galatians. A commentary over 25 years in the making can never truly said to be finished. As new insights are granted by the Holy Spirit and as my understanding of the epistle deepens, additional material will be added and sections will have to be re-written. One is never truly “finished” with any theological book. As one deepens and grows in his relation with the Lord, so does his theological understandings and that should be reflected in one’s own writings.

This book was also written as a theological legacy to my four children. They will need to be mighty for God in their generation for their days will certainly be darker than the generation their father grew up in. This book is an expression not only of the heart of a preacher in the early 21st century but also of a Christian father for his children, so they may more fully understand what their father believed and preached during his ministry.

Galatians

It is my sincere prayer that this unpretentious contribution to the body of Christian commentary literature will be a blessing to the remnant of God's saints in the earth as we approach the coming of our Lord.

Introduction to Galatians

The book of Galatians contains 6 chapters, 149 verses, and 3,084 words in our English Received Text.

Authorship

The Apostle Paul. On this, there is little or no discussion, even among the liberals.

Date

We would fix an early date, probably no later than 50-55. This is because we would place its writing not too long after the Jerusalem conference in Acts 15. Galatians is one of Paul's earliest books.

Place written from

We are unsure as to where Paul was when he wrote Galatians. Ephesus, Antioch and Corinth have all been suggested.

Purpose of writing

1. *Vindication.* Paul's ministry and apostleship had come under attack by the Judaizers who had undone the bulk of Paul's work among the Galatians. Paul here defends his call and apostleship. These Judaizers had ignored the decrees of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 and went on ahead and propagated their heresies anyway. Paul writes to counter and undo the damage they had wrought in Galatia.

2. *Defense of the doctrine of justification by grace without the deeds of the law.*

3. *Repudiation of the Judaizers and their teaching which mixed faith and works.*

Their gospel ran "Saved by grace, kept by works of the law." They taught that a Christian must observe the Law of Moses before they could be saved. After Paul had left the area and moved into Europe, the Judaizers came in behind him and undermined his work, turning the Galatian churches against Paul's teaching and against him personally.

The Area of Galatia

Galatia has been called the (Gallia) of the East, Roman writers calling its inhabitants Galli. They were a mixture of Gauls and Greeks, and hence were called Gallo-Graeci, and the country Gallo-Graecia. The Galatians were in their origin a part of that great Celtic migration which invaded Macedonia about B.C. 280. They were invited by the king of Bithynia to cross over into Asia Minor to assist him in his wars. There they ultimately settled, and being strengthened by fresh accessions of the same clan from Europe, they overran Bithynia, and supported themselves by plundering neighboring countries. They were great warriors, and hired themselves out as mercenary soldiers, sometimes fighting on both sides in the great battles of the times. They were at length brought under the power of Rome in B.C. 189, and Galatia became a Roman province B.C. 25. This province of Galatia, within the limits of which these Celtic tribes were confined, was the central region of Asia Minor. During his second missionary journey Paul, accompanied by Silas and Timothy (Acts 16:6), visited the (region of Galatia), where he was detained by sickness (Galatians 4:13), and had thus the longer opportunity of preaching to them the

Galatians

gospel. On his third journey he went over (all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order (Acts 18:23). Crescens was sent there by Paul toward the close of his life (2 Timothy 4:10).

The Epistle to the Galatians was probably written very soon after Paul's second visit to them. Its abruptness and severity, and the sadness of its tone, are caused by their sudden perversion from the doctrine which the apostle had taught them, and which at first they had received so willingly. This fickleness is a specimen of the impetuous, mobile and impressible spirit which marks the characteristics of the Gaulish race. From Josephus (Ant. 16:6, 2) we know that many Jews were settled in Galatia, but Galatians 4:8 would lead us to suppose that Paul's converts were mostly Gentiles.

Paul's work among the Galatian churches

This is recorded in Acts 13:13-14:23 and again in Acts 16:1-8 during a revisit. Paul had gone through this region, in modern-day Turkey, and established several churches. The cities mentioned are (much of this information comes from McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia):

1. **Perga** (Acts 13:14). The capital of Pamphylia, located on the river Cestrus, about seven miles from its mouth. It was celebrated for the worship of Artemis (Diana), whose temple stood on a hill outside the town. The city consisted of an acropolis on its north side and the major part of the city that lay at its feet on the south. The city was divided into four quarters by two colonnaded streets. It was celebrated in antiquity for the worship of Artemis (Diaina), whose temple stood on a hill outside the town, and in whose honor annual festivals were celebrated. The goddess and the temple are represented on the coins of Perga. The Cestrus was navigable to Perga, and Paul landed here on his voyage from Paphos (Acts 13:13). He visited the city a second time on his return from the interior of Pamphylia, and preached the Gospel there (Acts 14:25). Perga was originally the capital of Pamphylia; but when that province was divided into two, Side became the chief town of the first, and Perga of the second Pamphylia.

2. **Antioch in Pisidia** (Acts 13:14). We have a lengthy sermon that Paul preached here recorded in Acts 13:14-41. Antioch in Paul's day centered on two paved squares, the Square of Tiberius (built during the emperor's reign, A.D. 14-37) and the Square of Augustus (constructed just before the birth of Christ).

3. **Iconium** (Acts 14:52-14:5). The capital of ancient Lycaonia. It was first visited by Paul and Barnabas from Antioch-in-Pisidia during the first missionary journey. Here they were persecuted by the Jews, and being driven from the city, they fled to Lystra. They afterwards returned to Iconium, and encouraged the church which had been founded there. It was probably again visited by Paul during his third missionary journey along with Silas. It is the modern Konieh, at the foot of Mount Taurus, about 120 miles inland from the Mediterranean. It was formerly the capital of Lycaonia. It was on the great line of communication between Ephesus and the western coast of the peninsula on one side, and Tarsus, Antioch, and the Euphrates on the other. We see this indicated by the narrative of Xenophon and the letters of Cicero. When the Roman provincial system was matured, some of the most important roads intersected one another at this point. These circumstances should be borne in mind when we trace Paul's journeys through the district. Iconium was a well-chosen place for missionary operations. The apostle's first visit was on

Galatians

his first circuit, in company with Barnabas; and on this occasion he approached it from Antioch in Pisidia, which lay to the west. A.D. 44. From that city he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews (Acts 13:50, 51). There were Jews in Iconium also; and Paul's first efforts here, according to his custom, were made in the synagogue (14:1). The results were considerable both among the Hebrew and Gentile population of the place. We should notice that the working of miracles in Iconium is emphatically mentioned (Acts 14:3). The intrigues of the Jews again drove him away; he was in danger of being stoned, and he withdrew to Lystra and Derbe, in the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia (Acts 14:6). After an interval, however, he returned over the old ground, revisiting Iconium, and encouraging the Church which he had founded there (Acts 14:21, 22). A.D. 47. These sufferings and difficulties are alluded to in 2 Timothy 3:11. On leaving Iconium, Paul and his party traveled to the northwest; and the place is not mentioned again in the sacred narrative, though there is little doubt that it was visited by the apostle again in the early part of his third circuit (Acts 18:23). From its position it could not fail to be an important center of Christian influence in the early ages of the Church. The Church planted at this place by the apostle continued to flourish until, by the persecutions of the Saracens, and afterwards of the Seljukians, who made it one of their sultanies, it was nearly extinguished. But some Christians of the Greek and Armenian churches, with a Greek metropolitan bishop, are still found in the suburbs of the city, not being permitted to reside within the walls.

4. **Lystra** (Acts 14:6-19). Here Paul preached the gospel after he had been driven by persecution from Iconium (Acts 14:2-7). Here also he healed a lame man (8), and thus so impressed the ignorant and superstitious people that they took him for Mercury, because he was the chief speaker, (and his companion Barnabas for Jupiter, probably in consequence of his stately, venerable appearance; and were proceeding to offer sacrifices to them (13), when Paul earnestly addressed them and turned their attention to the true source of all blessings. But soon after, through the influence of the Jews from Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium, they stoned Paul and left him for dead (14:19). On recovering, Paul left for Derbe; but soon returned again, through Lystra, encouraging the disciples there to steadfastness. He in all likelihood visited this city again on his third missionary tour (Acts 18:23). Timothy, who was probably born here (2 Timothy 3:10, 11), was no doubt one of those who were on this occasion witnesses of Paul's persecution and his courage in Lystra. We are told in the 14th chapter of the Acts that Paul and Barnabas, driven by persecution from Iconium (verse 2), proceeded to Lystra and its neighborhood, and there preached the Gospel. In the course of this service a remarkable miracle was worked in the healing of a lame man (verse 8). This occurrence produced such an effect on the minds of the ignorant and superstitious people of the place that they supposed that the two gods, Mercury and Jupiter, who were said by the poets to have formerly visited this district in human form, had again bestowed on it the same favor, and consequently were proceeding to offer sacrifice to the strangers (verse 13). The apostles rejected this worship with horror (verse 14), and Paul addressed a speech to them, turning their minds to the true Source of all the blessings of nature. The distinct proclamation of Christian doctrine is not mentioned, but it is implied, inasmuch as a Church was founded at Lystra, which in post-apostolic times was so important as to send its bishops to the ecclesiastical councils. The adoration of the Lystrians was rapidly followed by a change of

Galatians

feeling. The persecuting Jews arrived from Antioch in Pisidia and Iconium, and had such influence that Paul was stoned and left for dead (Acts 14:19). On his recovery, he withdrew, with Barnabas, to Derbe (verse 20), but before long retraced his steps through Lystra (verse 21), encouraging the new disciples to be steadfast. It is not absolutely stated that Paul was ever in Lystra again, but, from the general description of the route of the third missionary journey (Acts 18:23), it is almost certain that he was.

5. **Derbe** (14:20). Derbe was a small town on the eastern part of the upland plain of Lycaonia, about 20 miles from Lystra. Paul passed through Derbe on his route from Cilicia to Iconium, on his second missionary journey (Acts 16:1), and probably also on his third journey (18:23; 19:1). On his first journey (14:20, 21) he came to Derbe from the other side; i.e., from Iconium. It was the native place of Gaius, one of Paul's companions (20:4). He did not here suffer persecution (2 Timothy 3:11). No incidents are recorded as having happened at Derbe.

6. **Phrygia** (16:6). An inland province of Asia Minor. Once it seemed to include the greater part of the peninsula of Asia Minor, then it was divided into Phrygia Major and Minor, and the Romans again divided it into three parts, Phrygia Salutaris on the east, Phrygia Pacatiana on the west, and Phrygia Katakekaumene ("the burned") in the middle, for this part was volcanic. The country was fertile, and its rich pastures made it famous for its breeds of cattle. It is the Greater Phrygia that is referred to in the New Testament. The towns of Antioch in Pisidia, Colosse, Hierapolis, Iconium, and Laodicea were situated in it. In the passages (Acts 16:6; 18:23). By Phrygia we must understand an extensive district, which contributed portions to several Roman provinces, and varying portions at different times. The Phrygians were a very ancient people, and are supposed to have formed, along with the Pelasgi, the aborigines of Asia Minor. Jews from Phrygia were present in Jerusalem at the Feast of Pentecost (Acts 2:10). All over this district the Jews were probably numerous. They were first introduced there by Antiochus the Great (Josephus, Ant. 12:3, 4); and we have abundant proof of their presence there from Acts 13:14; 14:1, 19, as well as from Acts 2:10.

7. **Mysia** (16:7). Mysia was a province in the north-west of Asia Minor. On his first voyage to Europe (Acts 16:7, 8) Paul passed through this province and embarked at its chief port Troas. The greater part of Mysia was unproductive, being covered with mountains and marshes; but it was celebrated for the fine wheat of Assus, for quarries of the lapis Assius (which had the power of decomposing dead bodies), and for its oyster beds. It was inhabited by various tribes, mostly barbarous, until, as a part of the kingdom of Pergamus, it was ceded to the Romans, by whom it was eventually formed into a province. Paul passed through this province, and embarked at its chief port, Troas, on his first voyage to Europe (Acts 16:7, 8). The best description that can be given of Mysia at this time is that it was the region about the frontier of the provinces of Asia and Bithynia.

8. **Troas** (16:8). A city on the coast of Mysia, opposite the southeastern extremity of the island of Tenedos, and near Troy. It was formerly called Antigonía Troas, having been built by Antigonus; but it was embellished by Lysimachus and named Alexandria Troas in honor of Alexander the Great. It flourished under the Romans and, with its environs, was raised by Augustus to be a colonia. Troas was the city from which Paul first sailed, in consequence of the "Macedonian Call", to carry the Gospel from Asia to Europe (Acts 16:8, 11) where he rested for a short time on the northward road from Ephesus (during the

Galatians

next missionary journey), in the expectation of meeting Titus (2 Corinthians 2:12,13); where, on the return southwards (during the same missionary journey), he met those who had preceded him from Philippi (Acts 20:5, 6), and remained a week, the close of which (before the journey to Assos) was marked by the raising of Eutychus from the dead during the protracted midnight discourse; and where, after an interval of many years, the apostle left (during a journey the details of which are unknown) a cloak and some books and parchments in the house of Carpus (2 Timothy 4:13). Under the Romans it was one of the most important towns of the province of Asia. It was the chief point of arrival and departure for those who went by sea between Macedonia and the western Asiatic districts; and it was connected by good roads with other places on the coast and in the interior. The Romans had a peculiar feeling connected with the place, in consequence of the legend of their origin from Troy. Suetonius tells us that Julius Caesar had a plan of making Troas the seat of empire.

The North and South Galatian Theories

The commentators disagree whether Paul ministered in the northern or southern section of Galatia. D. Edmond Hiebert, in his *An Introduction to the New Testament: The Pauline Epistles*, pages 74-75, gives the problem: "The ambiguity as to the meaning of "Galatia" is reflected in the two theories as to the location of the Galatian churches, known as the North Galatian and South Galatian theories.

1. **The North Galatian Theory** holds Paul founded these churches in ethnic Galatia on the second missionary journey. It points to Acts 16:6 as the time of their founding and holds that he revisited them on the third journey (18:23). Ancyra, Pessinus and Tavium, and perhaps even Julipolis, are named as the cities where these churches were located. This location was taken for granted without discussion by the ancient interpreters of this epistle. This view was very attractively presented by J.B. Lightfoot. The problem with this is that Lightfoot proposed it when little was known about the ancient geography of Galatia (*Expositor(s) Greek New Testament* 3:127). There is also a problem that there is no historical record of Paul founding any churches in this region.

2. **The South Galatian Theory** holds the churches were located in southern Galatia and must be identified with the churches established by Paul and Barnabas during the first missionary journey as recorded in Acts 13:13-14:23. On his second journey, Paul revisited these churches and from there went on to Europe. This view was first proposed by J.J. Schmidt in 1748 but it received only scattered support until it was championed by the voluminous writings of W.M. Ramsay. Ramsay was an authority on the history and archaeology of Asia Minor and was definitely led to espouse this position through his researches in that region. Since the opening of this century this view has been making rapid gains."

I accept the South Galatian view because it has the best Biblical support.

The Galatians

They were called by the Romans "Galli" and were a stream from that torrent of barbarians that poured into Greece in the third century B.C., and that recoiled in confusion from the cliffs of Delphi. Crossing over into Asia Minor they lost no time in spreading over the

Galatians

peninsula with their arms and devastation, dividing nearly the whole of it among their three tribes. They levied tribute on cities and kings and hired themselves out as mercenary soldiers. It became a Roman province under Augustus, reaching from the borders of Asia and Bithynia to the neighborhood of Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, "cities of Lycaonia." Henceforth this territory was a part of the Roman Empire. The Galatians had little religion of their own and easily adopted the superstitions and mythology of the Greeks. Paul introduced the gospel among them (Acts 16:6; 18:23; Galatians 1:6-12), visiting them in person. They readily accepted Paul's message, only to forsake it when Paul's enemies followed behind him with an amended version of his gospel. It seems the Galatians were an open and malleable people, ready to accept practically any religion that was presented to them. In this context, they would be fickle and unstable.

Other comments

Galatians has been called the Magna Carta of Christian Liberty, our Declaration of Independence from the Law. Luther used Galatians as his battering ram against the doctrines of Rome and called the epistle "My Katrina", after his wife.

Outline of Galatians

1. Introduction 1:1-5
2. "Another Gospel" 1:6-9
3. The Divine Origin of Paul's Gospel 1:10-12
4. Paul's Former Conversation 1:13,14
5. Paul's Early Ministry 1:15-24
6. Paul at the Jerusalem Conference 2:1-10
7. Paul's Confrontation With Peter 2:11-15
8. Justification By Faith 2:16
9. Is Christ the Minister of Sin? 2:17,18
10. Dead to the Law, Alive to Christ 2:19,20
11. Frustrating the Grace of God 2:21
12. The Vanity of Returning to the Law 3:1-4
13. Receiving the Spirit by Faith 3:5
14. The Faith of Abraham 3:6-9
15. The Curse of the Law 3:10
16. The Just Shall Live By Faith 3:11,12
17. Redemption by Faith 3:13
18. The Blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant Through Faith 3:14 -18
19. The Purpose of the Law 3:19,20
20. All Under Sin 3:21-23
21. The Law Our Schoolmaster 3:24,25
22. Children of God by Faith 3:26
23. Baptized into Christ 3:27
24. No Nationality in Christ 3:28
25. Abraham's Seed 3:29
26. Spiritual Childhood 4:1-3
27. The Time and Purpose of the Virgin Birth 4:4,5

Galatians

28. No Longer Servants but Sons 4:6,7
29. The Folly of Returning to the Law 4:8-11
30. Paul's Ministry Among the Galatians 4:12-16
31. The Ministry of the False Teachers Among the Galatians 4:17,18
32. Paul's Desire For The Galatians 4:19,20
33. The Allegory of Hagar 4:21-31
34. Stand Fast in Liberty 5:1
35. The Problem of Circumcision 5:2,3
36. Fallen From Grace 5:4
37. Faith Over Circumcision 5:5,6
38. Who Did Hinder You? 5:7-10
39. The Offence of the Cross 5:11
40. Paul's Desire For The Troublers of the Galatians 5:12
41. Liberty Not License 5:13-15
42. Walk in the Spirit 5:16-18
43. The Works of the Flesh 5:19-21
44. The Fruit of the Spirit 5:22,23
45. Live in the Spirit 5:24-26
46. Spiritual Restoration 6:1
47. Fulfilling the Law of Christ 6:2-5
48. Exhortation to Teachers 6:6
49. Sowing and Reaping 6:7-9
50. Ministering to the Household of Faith 6:10
51. Paul's Large Letter 6:11
52. A Fair Show in the Flesh 6:12,13
53. Glorifying in the Cross 6:14
54. A New Creature 6:15
55. Benediction to Those Walking by Faith 6:16
56. Paul's Marks 6:17
57. Conclusion 6:18

Outline by J. Vernon McGee, *Notes on Galatians*:

I. Introduction, Chapter 1:1-10

A. Salutation — **cool greeting**, vv. 1-5

B. Subject stated — **warm declamation**, vv. 6-10

II. Personal, Chapters 1:11— 2:14 ***Authority of the apostle and glory of the gospel***

A. Experience of Paul in Arabia, Chapter 1:11-24

B. Experience of Paul with apostles in Jerusalem, Chapter 2:1-10

C. Experience of Paul in Antioch with Peter, Chapter 2:11-14

III. Doctrinal, Chapters 2:15 — 4:31 ***Justification by Faith***

Faith vs. Works, Liberty vs. Bondage

A. Justification by faith — **doctrine** stated, Chapter 2:15-21

B. Justification by faith — **experience** of Galatians, Chapter 3:1-5

C. Justification by faith — **illustration** of Abraham, Chapter 3:6 — 4:18

D. Justification by faith — **allegory** of Hagar and Sarai, Chapter 4:19-31

Galatians

IV. Practical, Chapters 5:1 — 6:10 *Sanctification by the Spirit*

Spirit vs. Flesh, Liberty vs. Bondage

A. Saved by faith and **living by law** perpetrates **falling from grace**, Chapter 5:1-15

B. Saved by faith and **walking in the Spirit** produces **fruit of the Spirit**, Chapter 5:16-26

C. Saved by faith and **fruit of the Spirit** presents **Christian character**, Chapter 6:1-10

V. Autographed conclusion, Chapter 6:11-18

A. Paul's own **handwriting**, v. 11

B. Paul's own **testimony**, vv. 12-18

1. Cross of Christ vs. circumcision, vv. 12-15

2. Christ's handwriting on Paul's body, vv. 16-18

(The new circumcision of the new creation)

Book List For Galatians

The following summaries of commentaries come from the following sources:

- * *Biblical Viewpoint*, published by Bob Jones University
- # Charles Spurgeon, *Commenting and Commentaries*
- \$ Cyril Barber, *The Minister's Library*
- % Reviewed by the author, Dr. John Cereghin
- @ Review from the webpage of Still Waters Revival Books (swrb.com)
- ^ *The Master's Journal* from The Master's Seminary
- & *An Annotated Bibliography of Reference Works and Commentaries on the Greek New Testament* by Jon Weatherly, Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary
- + *An Introduction to the Pauline Epistles* by D. Edmond Hiebert
- = *The Treasure House of Good Books* by James Alexander Stewart

*Alford, Henry, *Galatians* in Vol. III of the Greek Testament. 4 volumes, 1871, 67 pages. Concise comments on the Greek text. He identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 15 (12); holds that the conflict between Peter and Paul shows James' authority and the indecision of the early church concerning the Jewish Law (19); emphasizes the syllogistic construction of some verses (27); harmonizes the 430 years of 3:17 (31); teaches baptismal regeneration (97); thinks that Paul wrote the entire epistle with his own hand (64).

*Allan, John, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*, 1951, 91 pages. Liberal. Defends south Galatian view (25-6); thinks Luke is in error (41) and Paul's argument is "logically worthless" (65); holds the "elements" are spirits (70); admits that Paul thought Christ shared the glory of the Father in eternity past (71); perceives that Paul's argument rests on the authority of the inspired Word of God, though for Allan it is only a "picturesque illustration" (76).

#Bagge, Henry, *Galatians*, 1856. Simply a revised text and critical notes.

*Barclay, William, *The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians*, 1958, 61 pages. Liberal comments with historic background. He gives parallels between Paul's letters and the papyri; explains some Greek words Paul used; illustrates the ancient custom of coming of age (37); suggests Paul had malaria (42); shows the Jewish method of interpretation of the Old Testament (44); gives careful definitions of the words for the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit (51-57).

#Bayley, E., *Commentary on Galatians*, 1869. Upon each portion there is a commentary, a paraphrase and a sermon and thus the author conveys a considerable amount of instruction. He is thoroughly evangelical and his style is clear.

*Beet. Joseph Agar, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1885, 256 pages. Comments from an Arminian view. He advocates the north Galatian view (9); dismisses Ramsay's position in the Preface (xvif); opposes the view that Titus was circumcised (39);

Galatians

thinks that the Lord's brothers are sons of Joseph by at former marriage (60); attacks baptismal regeneration (99); argues for a Christian day of rest (114-122); concludes with special studies comparing Galatians with Acts (186ff), with Romans (194ff), with James (203ff) and with I John (210ff).

+ Verse-by-verse exposition by a Wesleyan theologian. Provides doctrinal summaries as a contribution toward systematic theology.

*Bishop, George Sayles. *Grace in Galatians*, 1912, 148 pages. Brief comments. He argues for the King James Version against the manuscripts (Preface); stresses free grace alone in salvation (10,13,49); holds to eternal security (19,55,80); advocates the Calvinistic system: the covenants of works and of grace (72ff); gives seven imperial arguments for justification by faith (39-46); attacks socialism, Spiritualism, Christian Science (40), liberalism (63), sacramentalism (96) and Arminianism (105).

*Bligh, John, *Galatians in Greek*, 1966, 239 pages. Technical Greek notes. Although the author is a Jesuit, there is no special pleading for the Catholic interpretation. Manifests a remarkable perception of the structure of Galatians (2ff); gives many useful parallels in classical constructions and New Testament parallels; brings out the forces of the Greek and notes cases and tenses; teaches justification by faith (130-1); takes "elements" to be angels (158); sometimes gives social rather than a theological interpretation (207).

+ Holds that its structure proves that Paul wrote Galatians with great care, not in haste as is often thought.

+ Bligh, John, "Galatians. A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle" in *Householder Commentaries*, 1969. An extensive work by an accomplished Roman Catholic scholar. Prints the author's own translation. Adopts the south Galatian view and assigns the letter to the third missionary journey but postulates that 2:15-5:13 was actually composed by Paul some years before. The commentary, presented in question-and-answer form, does not take up philological matters...but seeks to elaborate the theology of Paul. Heavy use is made of Philo as well as ancient, medieval and modern commentaries on Galatians. Irenic in spirit.

*Bring, Rangar, *Commentary on Galatians*, 1961, 304 pages. A closely-reasoned exposition by a Swedish Lutheran. He links the apostolic office with the 'Shaliach' (19); does not think Galatians and Acts can be harmonized (57) or that Galatians 2 is a purely historical narrative (59,80); attacks the idea that Paul had Titus circumcised (64); teaches baptismal regeneration (112-3, 180-1); has an interesting treatment of the fulfillment of the law (121-2) and the place of the law (154); teaches the vicarious atonement (144); defends the incarnation (196).

+ Divides the epistle into two major divisions: 1:6-5:12 dealing with Paul's understanding of law and gospel; 5:13-6:10 presenting Paul's view of Christian ethics.

*Brown, John, *An Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*, 1853, 481 pages. A thorough exposition. He declares that the Bible is a test of a system (viii);

Galatians

stresses vicarious atonement (30); identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 15 (70); thinks Titus was not circumcised (74); gives a thorough summary of justification (91f); gives many interpretations of Galatians 3:20 (155f); holds that 3:27 refers to Spirit baptism (179); recognizes "third use of the law" (264); has a thorough explanation of sowing and reaping (335-342); gives a number of appendices on special topics (389-415).

Brown is a modern Puritan. All of his expositions are of the utmost value. The volume on Galatians is one of the scarcest books in the market.

& Bruce, F. F. *A Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. NIGTC, 1982. Probably Bruce's best commentary: clear and thorough on the Greek text.

*Burton, Ernest DeWitt, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 1920, 630 pages. Thorough liberal commentary on the Greek. Favors the south Galatian view (xliv); list an extensive bibliography (lxxxii-lxxxix); discusses differences in interpretation (22-24); stresses the universal church (45); identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 15 but thinks Acts is "inaccurate" (117); interprets Paul's mention of baptism "as a protest against precisely that doctrine of the magical efficiency of physical rites which the mystery religion had made current" (205); has notes on important Greek words Paul used.

*Calvin, John, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and the Ephesians*, 1548, 1955, 188 pages. Old, but helpful comments. He regularly attacks "the Papists"; holds that the pope is antichrist (62); thinks James was the son of Alpheus (44); identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 12 (46); charges that those who try to undermine the certainty of Scripture are "giddy minds" raised up by Satan (86); holds that believers ought to keep the law, but cannot be justified by it (91); holds that Epicureans are more dangerous than Papists; attacks the diabolical conspiracy to extinguish all fear and worship of God, to root out the remembrance of Christ (144).

*Cole, R. Alan, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, 1965, 188 pages. A closely reasoned exposition which considers and evaluates many different interpretations. He discusses the north and south Galatian views, favoring the south (15-20); examines different interpretations of Paul's trip to Jerusalem (60ff), the clash with Peter (72ff); is not dogmatic in personal views. Sometimes criticizes the NEB (33,35) and sometimes commends it (58); regularly gives word studies.

^ 1989 edition, 240 pp. This is a revision of a work of twenty years earlier. It interacts with scholarly studies since then. It is a good evangelical commentary, well-informed, solid, clear with occasional good help on problem verses.

*Darby, J.N., *Notes in the Epistle to the Galatians*, n.d, 112 pages. Brief notes. He emphasizes overwhelmingly grace rather than law; attacks apostolic succession (2), the Roman Catholic doctrines (4,5), "the clergy" (18), the observance of Christmas and other days (84,85).

+ Duncan, George S., "The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians" *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary*, 1934. Uses the Moffatt translation, but offers an independent study of the

Galatians

original. A clear, thorough exposition which approaches Galatians from an historical point of view but brings out the essential meaning of the epistle. Advocates the South Galatian view and equates Galatians 2 with Acts 11.

+ Eadie, John, *Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, 1869. Greek text. A thorough, very helpful exposition for those knowing Greek, but due to its age lacks the insight of more recent investigation. Supports the North-Galatian theory; has an extended note on the identity of James, the Lord's Brother (57-100).

Edmunds, John, *Galatians*, 1874. Thoroughly ritualistic.

*Ellicott, Charles, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1854, 198 pages. Greek text, uses Tischendorf's; regularly compares the Greek, Latin and Syriac; holds that Titus was not circumcised (26); gives sacramentarian interpretations (70,71); rejects the idea that Paul had eye trouble (86); ends with an English translation.

*Erdman, Charles, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*, 1930, 128 pages. Careful exposition. Favors the north Galatian view (13); holds the theme of Galatians is Christian liberty (14); gives a detailed outline (21); defends the reality of Paul's conversion (36); points out the meaning of the Greek tense (42); defends Paul's accuracy (69); gives some background of ancient customs (75,77).

*Faussett, A.R. "Galatians" in volume 6 of *A Commentary Critical, Experimental and Practical*, ed. Jamieson, Faussett and Brown, 1871, 29 pages. Conservative. Dates Galatians after AD 54 (x); defends genuineness of the text (375); emphasizes the grace received in baptism (385); holds Paul's infirmity was "some bodily sickness" (388); attacks Roman Catholic interpretations (391).

*Findlay, George, "The Epistle to the Galatians", *The Expositor's Bible*, 1889, 461 pages. Exhaustive. Advocates the north Galatian view (16,17); "The Pauline doctrine has its root in Paul's conversion" (59); identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 15 (101); holds that Titus was not circumcised (106); argues for the word "testament" rather than "covenant" (200); questions the idea that Paul had weak eyes (278); has a careful exposition of the allegory of Hagar and Sarah (286-301); is most thorough on "Whatsoever a man soweth..." (410-418).

^ Fung, Ronald Y.K., *The Epistle to the Galatians*. New International Commentary on the New Testament, 1988. 342 pages. This replaces Hermann Ridderbos's earlier work in the same series. It is thorough, usually reaching traditional conservative views, with many satisfactory and even some excellent explanations. Fung is lucid and detailed on some verses, but bypasses some real problems such as the meaning of falling from grace (5:4). The same weakness applies to what it means to be "crucified with Christ." He follows the south Galatian theory and adopts an early date of A.D. 48. His reasonably good introduction updates scholarly discussion and relates 2:1-10 to the famine visit in Acts 11:27-30.

Galatians

The author, resident scholar and adjunct lecturer at the China Graduate School of Theology, Hong Kong, initiated this project while doing graduate work under F. F. Bruce at the University of Manchester. His goal has been to provide a scholarly treatment in a "user friendly" format for pastors and students, "especially for an examination of the letter specifically as Paul's most direct defense and exposition of justification by faith . . ." (xi). With the characteristic imprint of his mentor, Fung skillfully guides the reader into the text. His succinct treatment of introductory issues has numerous, occasionally lengthy, footnotes with documentation and technical details. It is so succinct that some treatments are less than full. For example, the rudimentary discussion of the location of the Galatian churches (1-3) is noticeably brief, referencing instead the works of others. On the other hand, he treats the date of composition extensively (9-28), finally accepting the conclusion of his mentor that "Galatians may well have been written on the eve of the Jerusalem Council (ca. A.D. 48)" (28) and identifying the Jerusalem visit of Galatians 2:1-10 with the famine relief visit of Acts 11 (86). Fung's analysis of the text is, for the most part, quite helpful as it touches upon the central features and their meaning. Yet he frequently fails to reveal little more than what is elementary and cursory. His discussion of the "different gospel" in 1:6-7 is quite brief.

He rejects the conventional distinction between the two Greek adjectives in this passage, concluding, "As in 2 Cor. 11:4, no essential distinction is intended; this becomes all the more likely in the light of the consideration that the word 'another' ('gospel' has been supplied in translation) seems to be used somewhat pleonastically in order to introduce the following 'only' or 'except that'" (45). The discussion of the fruit of the Spirit is insightful and thorough (262-73). It has an extended description of each quality, tracing each through the Pauline writings as well as through the NT. He carefully explains the difference of terminology and meaning when comparing 6:2 with 6:5: "While that verse [6:2] speaks of 'heavy loads' that one finds unbearable and requires assistance in carrying, this verse [6:5] speaks of a person's 'own proper burden,' like the traveler's own pack. The reference is probably to the ineluctable duties of life that fall to each person, including answerability to God for one's own conduct and performance" (291). The extensive indexes of subjects, authors, and Scriptures provide a quick reference tool and enhance the value of this exclusively English work. Though brevity in both the text and the footnotes regarding some major interpretive issues reduces the commentary's usefulness, it will still serve as a beneficial resource for pastor, teacher, and student.

*Girdlestone, Robert Baker, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, n.d., 192 pages. Careful exposition. There are added studies on certain subjects pertaining to Galatians. Attacks spiritualism (95); is premillennial (188); stresses a literal interpretation (192).

Godwin, John, *Galatians: Translation with Notes and Doctrinal Lessons*, 1871. A helpful translation with good textual notes.

*Grayston, Kenneth, *The Epistles to the Galatians and to the Philippians*, 1957, 74 pages. Liberal Methodist notes. Does not settle the date (12-3); weakens "anathema" to "banned from preaching" (17); holds that Titus was not circumcised (24); identifies Galatians 2 with

Galatians

Acts 15 (24ff); holds that "orthodox Trinitarian doctrine is necessary when we try to think coherently about the being of God" (53).

Greene, Oliver B., *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*, 1962. A basic commentary, probably largely transcribed from Greene's "The Gospel Hour" radio broadcasts. Orthodox and reliable, except we have been concerned over some occasional plagiarisms from Albert Barnes in some of Greene's commentaries that he never acknowledged.

+ Guthrie, Donald, "Galatians", *The Century Bible. New Series*, 1969. Based on the Revised Standard Version. A 50-page introduction adequately discusses various introductory problems. Leans to the South-Galatian theory and an early date for Galatians. The phrase-by-phrase interpretation provides a conservative unfolding of the teaching and dynamic faith of Paul. Appendixes on the centrality of Christ in Galatians and the source of opposition at Galatia add to the value.

Haldane, James, *Exposition of Galatians*, 1848. This work has never been popular because he discusses in the third chapter the question of baptism. This is a fault of which we may say as the Papist said of venial sin: "It deserves to be forgiven."

\$ Hendriksen, William, *Expositions of Galatians*, 1968. Conservative. Prefaced with an extensive introduction giving the arguments for both the north and south Galatian theories. Complete exposition and applies the text in a meaningful and practical manner. Not all will agree with the "two covenants" of 4:24. Deserves a place on every pastor's bookshelf.

*Hogg, C.F. and W.E. Vine, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*, n.d., 360 pages. Careful exposition with emphasis on the Greek. Holds to south Galatian view (4); discusses James, the Lord's brother (49-51); explains the idea "redeem" (133,134); argues for immersion (172,173); lists many titles for the Holy Spirit (192,193); has careful word studies for the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit (281-297).

\$ Holds to a late date for the writing of Galatians.

*Huxtable, E. and T. Croskery, "Galatians" in volume 20 of *The Pulpit Commentary*, edited by H.D.M. Spence and J.S. Excell, 1950, 347 pages. Homiletical expositions of uneven value. They date Galatians AD 57-58 (xix); emphasize the duty of intolerance (65,66); hold that Titus was not circumcised (71); identify Galatians 2 with Acts 15 (93); harmonize the 430 years in 3:17 (135).

+ Johnson, Robert L., "The Letter of Paul to the Galatians", *The Living Word Commentary*, 1969. Comments based on the Revised Standard Version but brings out the force of the original. The variant views concerning introductory matters receive fair presentation, but the viewpoint adopted is conservative. Leans to the South-Galatians view and equates Galatians 2 with Acts 15.

Galatians

*Lenski, Richard Charles Henry, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians and Philippians*, 1937, 323 pages. Thorough Lutheran exposition. Defends south Galatian view (12); stresses the Greek; stresses the difference of the "fake gospel" (35); holds that Titus was not circumcised (77); defends the inerrancy of Biblical inspiration (94) and the substitutionary atonement (118); teaches baptismal regeneration (187,188); attacks Roman Catholic doctrine (261,262); stresses numerical construction (285, 290).

+ Prints the author's own literal translation.

*Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians*, 1865, 384 pages. The best commentary on the Greek text. He describes the character of the Gauls (14-17); holds the north Galatian view (18ff), a date of AD 57-58 (40); has special notes on Paul's stay in Arabia (87); holds that Titus was not circumcised (104); identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 15 (123-8); holds that Paul's infirmity was a disease but does not decide which (186-191); has special dissertations on the "Brethren of the Lord" and "St. Paul and the Three" (252ff). He is extremely helpful on the historical background (166) and Greek words (217).

+ Thoroughly grounded in classical Greek, some of Lightfoot's views need some modification in the light of recent Koine studies.

^ Longnecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary, 1990. 323 pages. This noted evangelical scholar is professor of New Testament at Wycliffe College, University of Toronto. His long introduction to Galatians surveying scholarly issues precedes a verse-by-verse commentary. Each pericope has its own bibliography, translation, notes, and literary analysis. The author leaves few stones unturned, at least the more crucial ones. His discussions of problems and summations are helpful. He has an earlier fine commentary on Acts and also has written Paul, Apostle of Liberty.

% We must beware of commentaries in this series as they are sanctioned by the apostate Fuller Theological Seminary and are at times quite liberal.

*Luther, Martin, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1535, 567 pages. Lectures delivered at the University of Wittenberg. Defends the deity of Christ (45); regularly attacks "the Papists" and Rome; attacks the idea that the church is above scripture (70); admits he once thought John Hus a heretic (82); vigorously defends justification by faith only, without works (90); holds Titus was not circumcised (101); holds that Acts teaches justification by faith as Galatians does (202); teaches baptismal regeneration (340); holds that Paul's infirmity in the flesh was his suffering from persecution (400).

^ MacArthur, John. *Galatians*. MacArthur New Testament Commentary, 1987. 221 pages. With sensitivity to grammar and word meaning, this fairly thorough evangelical treatment explains in a clear way the meaning of sections and verses. The author sees "the Israel of God" in 6:16 as literal Jews who have been saved, not as people of the church per se among the Gentiles. In most respects the commentary is articulate in helping pastors and lay people grasp matters of the gospel of grace and freedom of the Christian life. The first printing of the commentary had a discrepancy regarding the date of writing (pp. xii, 118).

Galatians

+ McDonald, H.D., *Freedom in Faith, A Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1973. Prints the Revised Standard Version. A non-technical, verse-by-verse commentary by a conservative English scholar and intended for the average Christian who desires to come to grips with the New Testament teaching of the believer's freedom in faith. No discussion of introductory problems.

= McHull, Marion, *Precious Hours*, 1937. This is a little treasure from a medical doctor who knew his Greek.

Perkins, William, *Commentary on the First Five Chapters of Galatians*, 1604. Perkins was justly esteemed by his contemporaries as a master in theology. This commentary is deeply theological and reads like a body of divinity. Truth compels us to confess that we find it dull.

@ Darling, in his *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica* (page 2337) writes, "A learned and pious Calvinistic divine... He excelled in a distinct judgment; a rare dexterity in clearing the obscure subtleties of the schools, and in an easy explication of perplexed subjects. As a preacher, he was greatly admired. Several of his works have been translated in Latin, French, Dutch, and Spanish." Perkins covers the first five chapters of Galatians in this work, while Cudworth completes the final chapter. 613 pages.

Pridham, A. *Galatians*, 1872. Pridham is, we suppose, of the moderate Brethren school, but he is not carried away by any theory, being essentially a man of sober mind.

+ Ramsay, William M, *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, 1899. The major emphasis is on the background for the epistle. The author uses his vast knowledge of the historical and archaeological backgrounds of Asia Minor to support his strong defense of the South-Galatian view. Identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 11 and thinks Paul's thorn in the flesh was malaria.

*Rendall, Frederic, "The Epistle to the Galatians" in volume 3 of *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1907, 79 pages. Thorough commentary on the Greek text. Advocates south Galatian view (125-7); harmonizes Galatians with Acts 15 (141-4); argues that Galatians is Paul's earliest epistle (144-7) and word order (166); holds that Paul did not allow Titus to be circumcised (158); gives helpful historical background (174); thinks Paul had ophthalmia (178); has an appendix on Pauline chronology (193ff).

*Ridderbos, Herman, *The Epistle of Paul to the Churches of Galatia*, 1953, 238 pages. A thoroughly helpful exposition. Favors south Galatian view (30-31); identifies Galatians 2 with Acts 15 (76-80); argues for substitutionary atonement (127); stresses the one-sided nature of the New Covenant (130-131); denies the "elements" were spirits (153); attacks the idea that Paul's infirmity was a disease (166-7).

+ Non-technical, with grammatical and lexical matters kept to the footnotes.

% Ruckman, Peter, "Galatians" in *The Bible Believer's Commentary on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians*, 1973, 190 pages. Usual interesting yet occasionally

Galatians

caustic comments. Full of practical applications, premillennial and dispensational. Ruckman expresses his contempt for "the Greek" (any manuscript, including the Texas Receptus) every chance he gets and continually attacks other commentaries. Sets the date at AD 51 at Acts 15:35 (2); has Paul going to Mt. Sinai during his stay in Arabia (38); ties in Galatians 2 with Acts 15 (47); has Titus as being uncircumcised (48); has unique interpretation on spiritual circumcision (80); extensive remarks on 3:11 (88-92).

*Stamm, Raymond T. and Oscar F. Blackwelder, "Galatians" in Volume 10 of *The Interpreter's Bible*, 1953, 164 pages. Thorough liberal exposition. Prefer south Galatian view (437); think that Galatians was written between two other epistles: 2 Corinthians 10-13 and 2 Corinthians 1-9 (441); claim that the key to Paul is "grace" (446); attack the idea of an infallible book (486); hold that baptism opens the door into the church (519); disparage attempts to determine what Paul's infirmity was (534); admit that Paul does not regard Genesis as "unhistorical myth" (540); commend Albert Schweitzer (550).

+ Stott, John R.W., *The Message of Galatians*, 1968. A valuable series of nineteen expository messages on Galatians by a conservative Anglican scholar-preacher.

*Strauss, Lehman, *Devotional Studies in Galatians and Ephesians*, 1957, 100 pages. Favors south Galatian view (9-10); references Greek words; stresses Paul's independent authority (25); explains Habakkuk 2:4 in the light of New Testament quotations (41ff); expounds the allegory of Sarah and Hagar (66-71); warns against legalism (74ff) and license (79ff).

+ Tenney, Merrill C., *Galatians: The Charter of Christian Liberty*, 1950. Not a commentary in the usual sense, but an invaluable aid to help the student grapple personally with the text. Excellent as illustrating various methods of Bible study. Provides much helpful material for the actual interpretation of Galatians.

\$V os, Howard, *Galatians: A Call to Christian Liberty*, 1971. Emphasizing the need for biblical "freedom".

+ A conservative exposition well suited to the lay Bible student.

\$ Williams, A. Lukyn, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*, 1910. A handy, helpful, exegetical study.

+ A scholarly, independent elucidation of the Greek text.

+ Wilson, Geoffrey, B., *Galatians. A Digest of Reformed Comment*, 1973. A concise verse-by-verse treatment, freely quoting various writers to present the view of Reformed interpreters of Galatians. Well suited to the lay reader.

+ Wuest, Kenneth S., *Galatians in the Greek New Testament for the English Reader*, 1944. A simplified commentary on the original text carried over into English for the student who does not know Greek; presents an expanded translation and exegetical comments and word studies

Galatians Chapter 1

To set up the purpose of Galatians, John Phillips, in *Exploring Galatians*, page 20-21, lays out the basis of the Judaizer's attack against Paul: "Of course, you Gentiles must understand that this Paul is an upstart. He has no real authority, you know. He's a latecomer to the cause. Indeed, for some years he was its bitterest foe—we have widows in Jerusalem who can bear witness to that! Paul's not really an apostle at all, you know. We know that he talks about some vision he had on the Damascus road, but anyone can have visions.

"The Jerusalem church, of course, is the mother church. It was at Jerusalem that the church was born. Think of it—three thousand people, saved in a single day. Peter was the man God used for that. Peter, James, and John—they are the chief men among the brethren—at least James the Apostle is dead now, martyred by Herod; but James, the Lord's brother, has taken his place. There are only twelve apostles, you know. They are all men who spent time with Jesus in the days of His flesh. They heard His teaching firsthand. They saw all of His miracles. They observed Him; studied His character; witnessed His death, burial, and resurrection; and were appointed and commissioned to be His special messengers. They founded the Jerusalem church. They are the only ones who have the authority to define the gospel, say what it is and what its precepts and parameters are, accredit its agents, and define its mission. This man Paul is certainly not one of the Twelve; he never was. The true apostles received their authority from Christ. We'd hate to speculate where Paul got his."

It was a devastating attack. But that was no means all. Craftily, they would have to concede something to Paul. "Mind you," we can hear them say, "this Paul is very clever. He was trained to be a rabbi. Indeed, he even sat at the feet of Gamaliel, one of our greatest rabbis. He had a promising career in the Jew's religion. He is a man of uncommon talent. The Jerusalem apostles recognized that fact, so, after his conversion, they decided to let bygones be bygones. In spite of his leading role in the martyrdom of Stephen—Ah! There was a man for you, more than a match for this clever Saul of Tarsus when it came to debate—and in the persecution of the church, they forgave him in a true Christ-like spirit, gave him the right hand of fellowship, and even decided to use his talents and zeal in the cause of Christ, They instructed him in the gospel and gave him their blessing."

They were lies, of course, all lies, cleverly mixed with truth—the way of error in all times and places from the very beginning. We can hear these enemies of Paul as they complete their attack.

"Well, when Paul launched out on his own, determined in his headstrong way to make a name for himself among the Gentiles, he made changes to the gospel. He could see that such old-fashioned (to his mind) biblical truths as circumcision, keeping the Sabbath, minding the traditions of the elders, abiding by the ritual requirements of the Mosaic Law would be unpalatable to the Gentiles. They always have been, of course. That is why so few Gentiles have ever become real proselytes of the Jewish religion. Paul decided to jettison half of the Bible. He betrayed his own birth, background, and beliefs. He cast off his ancestral heritage and invented a lawless 'gospel' of his own. His

Galatians

'gospel' is only half a gospel. It certainly does not have the endorsement of the true apostles and the mother church in Jerusalem. Why, not very long ago, Peter had a first-class row in Antioch with this Paul of yours over the whole question of the need for Gentiles to keep the Mosaic dietary laws."

No wonder Paul opened his epistle with a pen dipped in flame and fire.

"It wasn't like that at all!" he says. "What they say is not true. I *am* an apostle, every bit as much an apostle as Peter, John, or any of the others. But I did not receive my appointment and commission from either them or their accredited agents. I received it directly from 'Jesus Christ, and God the Father'—just as they received theirs. There is no particle of difference between my apostleship and theirs. Mine has been the mighty ordination of the nail-pierced hands."

1. Introduction 1:1-5

1:1 Paul,^{a-b} an apostle,^c (not of men,^d neither by man,^e but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father,^f who raised^g him from the dead;)^{g-h}

1a **Paul**, meaning "little or small", fitting as he was a Benjamite, the smallest tribe. The shift from "Saul", in honor of the first king of Israel, to the little "Paul" showed the change in Paul's thinking of himself, from an arrogant little rabbi to a humble servant of Christ. The gospel will change any man in a similar fashion.

1b Paul wrote this epistle without a secretary. It is pure Paul, in his own voice and hand, with no editing or influence from outside. The urgency and severity of the Galatian apostasy may have compelled Paul to write this in some haste

1c **an apostle** This title is used in Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians and Colossians.

Paul is stressing his apostolic authority to the apostate Galatians and reminds them that his apostleship was bestowed upon him directly by Christ. Paul's apostolic authority did not derive from men or from the other apostles. No doubt there were many who questioned Paul's apostolic authority since he was not one of the original Twelve. The Galatians were also guilty of this in their abandonment of Paul's gospel and ministry. Paul's apostolic authority was divine, not human. By Paul reminding them of his apostolic authority, he prepares the Galatians for the rebuke and reinforcement of sound doctrine to follow.

1d **not of men** Not by the councils of men, such as denominations, fellowships of ordination counsels. Paul did not draw his apostolic authority from any such institutions

1e **neither by man or not even by man**, strongly emphatic. Paul did not draw his apostolic authority from any single man, no matter how great or spiritual he might have been. "**Neither by man**" stands in a stark contrast with the following phrase "**but through Jesus Christ**". No man was responsible for Paul's call or ministry, and that would include the apostles, especially including Peter. Paul's call was direct from God and not filtered through men or endorsed by men.

1f **Jesus Christ, and God the Father**, notice how Paul separates them. The United Pentecostal heresy states that there is no Trinity, that Jesus is the Father, Jesus is the Son and that Jesus is the Holy Spirit. Yet Paul clearly shows these two personalities in the Godhead to be distinct and separate. See similar language in 1:3.

Galatians

1:2 And all the brethren which are with me,^a unto the churches of Galatia:^{b-c-d}

1:3 Grace^a be to you and peace from God the Father,^b and from our Lord Jesus Christ,

1:4 Who gave^{aorist present participle} himself for our sins,^a that he might deliver^{aorist} us^b from this present^{perfect active participle} evil world,^c according to the will of God and our Father:

1g William Perkins, in his *Commentary or Exposition Upon the First Five Chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians*, page 4, lists the 3 types of ministry and calls:

1. Men who are called by men and not by God. These are false teachers.
2. Men who are called by God and not by men, as are all ordinary ministers of the Gospel.
3. Those called directly by Christ, as was Paul.

1h **who raised Him from the dead** The Risen Christ called Paul to his apostleship. The resurrection is one of Paul's favorite themes and Paul always works it in. The resurrection of Christ is central to the gospel. "By adding this qualifying phrase, Paul emphasizes the fact that whereas the other apostles were commissioned by the Lord Jesus while He was in His humiliation, he himself was given his commission by the resurrected glorified Christ (Kenneth Wuest, *Galatians in the New Testament*)."

2a Paul was not alone in his controversy with the Judaizers. He had his allies and supporters, although he does not name any of them to the Galatians. This is Paul's letter and he does not want to "drop names" and be accused of "hiding behind someone else's authority", like, perhaps, Barnabas.

2b Galatians is a circular letter, directed to a group of churches in this province. Paul planted these churches in Acts 13-14 and would include the churches in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe.

2c Paul simply addresses the **churches** of Galatia, not the "saints" in those churches. It's hard to call someone a saint when they take up false doctrine and stab you in the back.

2d "There are no words of affection or commendation to describe **"the churches of Galatia."** The church of the Thessalonians is said to be **"in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus Christ"** (1 The. 1:1) or **"in God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ"** (2 The. 1:1). The church at Corinth is described as being **"of God"** (1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1). The Christians in Rome are **"beloved of God"** (Rom. 1:7). Those in Ephesus, Philippi, and Colosse are **"saints"** (Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:1). But here in Galatians, no doubt due to the occasion of the letter, it is just **"churches."** (Laurence Vance, *Galatians Chapter 1 and 2*, page 7)."

3a **Grace** has two ideas:

1. Grace and beauty, especially in a non-theological sense
2. Undeserved generosity

3b Despite their apostasy and attacks upon him, Paul still has enough grace to wish them grace and peace, a courtesy they may have not returned to him. This is the standard greeting that Paul prefaces to his epistles. It is still a rather cool greeting, as Paul greets or commends no one by name among the Galatian churches.

4a On the cross, the substitutionary death of Christ in our place. He suffered the judgments of hell on the cross for our sins so that we would not have to, as the Just dying for the unjust.

Galatians

1:5 To whom be glory for ever and ever.^a Amen.^b

2. Another Gospel 1:6-9

1:6 I marvel^{2296-a-present} that ye are so soon removed^{b-present middle} from him that called^{aorist active participle} you into the grace of Christ unto another^{2087-c} gospel:^{d-e-f}

4b The verb is in the middle voice, suggesting that the One who delivers us has a personal interest in the successful conclusion of this redemptive act. It has the idea of plucking something and thus delivering it from danger.

4c **this present, evil world** or present evil world system, with its philosophies and worldviews. Not so much the physical world of nature but the world of mankind. What is evil about this world?

1. Men are evil (Luke 11:13);
2. Men's hearts are evil (Mark 7:21);
3. Men's nature is evil (Ephesians 2:1-3);
4. This world is evil (text);
5. The god of this age is evil (2 Corinthians 4:4).

This present world system is **evil** not good. God has given up on it and will not redeem it, but rather judge it. And we are to separate from it and keep ourselves unspotted from it. Christians should not be wasting any time or energy in attempting to redeem it or improve it either. Everything about this generation is thoroughly corrupt, from government to art to science to education to theology, and it cannot be redeemed, only judged by fire. It's important to realize that the Bible has a negative view of this world system and Christians should also have a negative, pessimistic view of it as well. The only age without evil will be the Millennium and beyond

This **present evil world** is defined by Trench as "all that floating mass of thoughts, opinions, maxims, speculations, hopes, impulses, aims, aspirations, at any time current in the world, which constitute a most real and effective power, being the moral or immoral atmosphere which at every moment of our lives we inhale, again inevitably to exhale."

Evil here is *poneros*, an evil that is not happy or content unless it is corrupting someone else. It is like a very bad high school girl who is heading for hell. Seldom would she be content just to condemn herself but she is intent to corrupt as many as she can along with her, since misery loves company. *Kakos* would be content to perish in its own evil.

5a **for ever and ever** Literally, "into the ages of the ages".

5b **Amen** "Let it be so." A word of confirmation.

6a This is a quite unexpected and unpleasant development. Paul is completely floored and amazed at the speed and the depth of the Galatian apostasy from the truth that he had so recently taught them and that they had accepted. The present tense indicates the apostasy was still in progress.

"**marvel**" Strong's #2296 θαυμάζω *thaumazô*; to wonder, wonder at, marvel, to be wondered at, to be had in admiration.

6b The Galatian apostasy was bad enough. What really upset Paul was the speed of it, in that the Galatian churches hardly put up any resistance to the Judaizers. They had practically surrendered to the false teachers. This is also in the present tense, showing that the apostasy was continuing at the time of Paul's writing and that it was not yet finished. That meant there was still hope to stop it and reclaim the Galatians.

"**Removed**" is in the present tense. It was still in progress and not finished. There was still hope and time to recover the Galatians before their apostasy became final and irreversible. They were removed at that present time and were still in the process of removing.

Galatians

6c The Greek words for "**another**" in 1:6,7 are two different words:

1. In 1:6, it is Strong's #2087 ετερος heteros, another of a different kind.
2. In 1:7, it is Strong's #243 αλλος allos, meaning another of the same kind.

So we can expand the translation of 1:6-7 as follows: "*I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another (of a different kind) gospel: Which is not another (of the same kind) but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.*"

6d "**another gospel**" A Judaizer's gospel, one that mixed works with grace. It was a compromise position between the Old Testament law and Paul's doctrine of salvation by grace. It would be somewhat popular among Jewish converts but these Gentile converts in the Galatian churches were also carried away with it. That is because both Jew and Gentile would gravitate towards a works-based (either in full or in part) plan of salvation since that is what fallen human nature likes best. Men are offended by a gospel of pure grace and will always choose legalism over grace if left to themselves.

Modern-day exponents would include Seventh-Day Adventists, Assemblies of Yahweh and Messianic Jews (not all of them but many).

This "**other gospel**" is really no gospel at all for it contains no good news, only a sure ticket to the pit.

But there are several different kinds of gospel mentioned in the New Testament:

1. Gospel of Jesus Christ- Mark 1:1
2. Gospel of the grace of God- Acts 20:24
3. "My (Paul's) gospel"- Romans 2:16; 2 Timothy 2:8
4. Gospel of God- Romans 15:16
5. Gospel of Christ- 1 Corinthians 9:18
6. Glorious gospel of Christ- 2 Corinthians 4:4
7. Gospel of uncircumcision- Galatians 2:7
8. Gospel of peace- Ephesians 6:15
9. Gospel of the Blessed God- 1 Timothy 1:11
10. Everlasting gospel- Revelation 14:6
11. Gospel of His Son- Romans 1:9

Paul is not condemning the preaching of non-church age "gospels" such as the tribulation "everlasting gospel" but rather the preaching of any other gospel that is not grounded upon salvation by grace through faith, devoid of works. That is the "gospel of legalism" that the Galatians had adopted. In this dispensation, only the gospel of grace may be preached without coming into condemnation. To preach any "plan of salvation" that involves works of any sort is to be guilty of preaching a false gospel and come under the apostolic condemnation for so doing.

6e "In one of the outstanding commentaries, we read that at the time of Paul, the Galatians had written more than seventy gospels! (Oliver B. Greene, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians.*)"

6f "God Himself has not, and cannot, have another gospel. He cannot forget the work of His Son, in which He has found complete satisfaction, in which He has been fully glorified. He cannot set forth another gospel, or add something on man's part, as though the work of Christ were imperfect, and lacked something to complete it. Christ, as Man, sits at God's right hand, because He has accomplished the work of salvation for all believers, having by Himself purged their sins. And when He had sat down on the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, the work which saves us was announced to be finished. And then all teaching that requires anything else, that assumes to add something of man to complete it, denies the perfection of the work of Christ that is to say, denies that He has completed the work of redemption...He will not allow man to add anything to that work; whatever it might be, it would deny, in so far, the sufficiency of the work of Christ. These heretics do not say that Christ has not finished the work; nor did the false judaizing teachers among the Galatians say it. But they insisted that man must on his part add his works, the law, circumcision. They said God had done His part, and now it remained for man to do his

Galatians

1:7 Which is not another;^{243-a} but there be^{present} some that trouble^{5015-b-present active} you, and would^{2309-present active participle} pervert^{3344-c} the gospel of Christ.^{d-e}

1:8 But though^a we,^b or an angel from heaven,^c preach any other gospel^{2097-present middle/passive subjunctive} unto you than that which we have preached^{2097-d-aorist middle} unto you, let him be^{2077-imperative} accursed.^{331-e-f-g}

(John Nelson Darby, Notes on the Epistle to the Galatians in volume 34 of his *Complete Works*, page 49)."

To paraphrase Paul in this section:

1. You accepted the gospel of the grace of God that I preached to you.
2. As soon as Paul left the area, the Judaizers moved in and seduced the Galatians away from Paul's teachings.
3. After that, you turned on me and began to attack me.
4. Yet this new gospel you accepted in the place of mine is not a gospel at all. It cannot save as it is based on works.
5. Whoever preaches such a gospel to you should be cursed, even if it's an angel that is doing it.

7a This "other gospel" is not a true gospel. It is not really a "good news" (which is what "gospel" means) for there is no salvation possible in it.

"another" Strong's # Strong's #243 *ἄλλος* allos, meaning another of the same kind

7b This Greek word is also used in Acts 15:24, where the idea of "subverting your souls" is added.

"trouble" Strong's #5015 *ταρασσω* tarassô; translated all 17 times in the Authorized Version as "trouble"; to agitate, trouble (a thing, by the movement of its parts to and fro), to cause one inward commotion, take away his calmness of mind, disturb his equanimity, to disquiet, make restless, to stir up, to strike one's spirit with fear and dread, to render anxious or distressed, to perplex the mind of one by suggesting scruples or doubt.

7c "pervert" has the idea of transforming something into something else of an opposite character. The ESV has "distort" but that is not the same idea as "perverting" it. When you "distort" something, it is blurred and becomes fuzzy and unclear. When something is perverted, it is changed from what it once was into something worse.

Strong's # 3344 *μεταστρεφω* metastrephô; from *meta* μετα (Strong's #3326), with, and *στρεφο* strephô (Strong's #4762) turn; to turn around, turn around.

7d Two sins of the Judaizers:

1. They pervert the gospel by their private interpretations
2. They troubled the Galatians by their apostasy and their activities.

7e There were many gospels floating around in Paul's day, just as there are in our day, but 99.9% of them are not the "gospel of Christ" but are gospels of men, denominations, theological systems and churches. Man-made gospels cannot rightly be called a "gospel of Christ". Paul's gospel was truly the "gospel of Christ" because he received it directly from God. No man would ever have conceived of such a gospel of free grace as Paul was preaching, since man likes works-based and ritualistic "gospels".

8a "though" has the idea of suggesting something that has never happened, a case that has never occurred, a hypothetical situation.

8b Emphatic.

8c No "angel from heaven" would preach "any other" gospel anyway.

Galatians

8d What might include some "other gospels" that are not true gospels?

1. **Baptismal regeneration.** This includes the Church of Rome and many Protestant groups that teach that babies need to be baptized for whatever reason. This is one heresy from Rome that many Protestants never forsook. Not only do babies need to be baptized but some groups, like the Church of Christ and some Pentecostal groups (like the "Church of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Apostolic Faith", a United Pentecostal-like black denomination) teach that even adult converts need to be baptized in order to be saved, thus adding works to grace.
2. **Salvation by works.** A similar heresy is "saved by faith, kept by works", which is the legalism of the Galatians and the Seventh Day Adventists. Just about all the cults are guilty of this (Jehovah Witnesses, Mormons). Even some hyper-evangelists and hyper-evangelicals are guilty of this, who hint that if you do not go out "soulwinning" on a regular basis that you may not really be saved. Some Baptists fall into this category. The Roman Catholic Church also teaches this.
3. **Salvation by church membership.** Some Baptists are guilty of this in claiming that only a "Baptist Church" (their kind of "Baptist Church") is the only true church and you must belong to such a church to be saved. Landmark Baptists and even the Church of Christ would be guilty of this. This is really nothing more than a Baptist version of Roman Catholicism.
4. **Salvation by character.** Modernism and liberalism. Unitarianism would fall into this category. This would also include salvation by morality.
5. **Salvation by sacrament.** Church of Rome and Greek/Eastern Orthodoxy. This also overlaps the "salvation by church membership" as these organizations are also very exclusive.
6. **A denial for the need of salvation,** as Universalism in teaching that all men (even Satan) will be saved eventually. I have in my library several books by a Universalist Presbyterian preacher named Robert Short who wrote on the theological aspect of the *Peanuts* comic strip by the late Charles Schultz (who was not theologically orthodox), like *The Parables of Peanuts* and *The Gospel According To Peanuts*. Short uses Schultz's cartoons (with Schultz's blessing) in discussing and promoting the view that everyone is already saved whether they realize it or not and salvation is nothing more than the realization of this "salvation". "Hell" is living without this realization. Short's theology may make for some interesting reading (in a technical sense to understand this error) but he is still thoroughly apostate. Christian Scientists would also fall in here as they deny any such thing as "sin" at all. Many modernist/liberal churches also hold to this.
7. **Social Gospel** (soap, soup and salvation). A liberal form of a works-based salvation. Salvation by politics, social action or some other means to bring in the Kingdom at the ballot-box are variations of this heresy. Most politically liberal groups are guilty of this. While groups such as Habitat for Humanity may do some good work, we wonder if some people who support or participate in this does so for religious reasons to earn their salvation.
8. **Anyone who preaches Acts 2:38 as the New Testament plan of salvation.** This would include many modern groups. Notice that no one in Acts 2 is asking (what must I do to be saved) and the context is the nation of Israel in the light of their rejection of their Messiah. This would condemn the Church of Christ sect and many Pentecostal groups like "The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Apostolic Faith," headquartered in Philadelphia. It is interesting that these groups like to camp out in Acts 2:38 yet will ignore what the Apostle to the Gentiles wrote concerning salvation by faith and grace without works, as expounded in the Church Epistles. These people want a works-based salvation and they are not about to let Paul talk them out of it.
9. **Salvation by speaking in tongues or a second (baptism/blessing of the Holy Spirit).** Some Pentecostal groups teach that you must be baptized (usually in the name of "Jesus Only") and speak in tongues as a demonstration of the "initial evidence of the Holy Spirit."

8e The penalty for preaching another gospel is hellfire and damnation, regardless if it is preached by man or angel. This warning is so severe that Paul repeats it in back-to-back verses (1:8,9). The strongest condemnation in Scripture is not for the murderer or the adulterer but it is reserved for the false

Galatians

1:9^{a-b} As we said before,^{perfect} so say^{3004-present} I now again,^c If any man preach any other gospel^{present middle} unto you than that ye have received,^{aorist} let him be accursed.^{331-9f-present imperative}

teacher, the one who leads souls to hell by his teachings and preachings, just as the Judaizers were doing with the Galatians.

8f “**accursed**” This is the same word as used in 1 Corinthians 16:22. Paul would pronounce such a curse on two types of men;

- 1. For preaching another gospel (Galatians 1:8);
- 2. For not loving the Lord Jesus (1 Corinthians 16:22).

The word literally means “let him drop into hell” which is a fitting punishment for preaching a false gospel that will damn the soul of anyone who accepts it. If anyone gives a sinner a plan of salvation that is based on anything other than by faith in the shed blood of Christ, you’ll that false teacher/preacher will go to hell for it! If anyone is sending souls to hell because they are an apostate or because they are ignorant as to what the true gospel is, then that person are accursed. And Paul says it twice so we can’t miss it. This is why preaching the gospel is such a fearful thing. If you mess it up or fail at it or are unfaithful in it, innocent people could end up in hell because of you. You had better make sure you completely and totally understand the gospel before you presume to preach it to anyone. Ignorance is no excuse here, nor can it be tolerated since souls are at stake. If you make a mistake and preach a false gospel that someone accepts and goes to hell because of it, you will answer for it. Nor can that be undone. The soul is lost and you are responsible. James 3:1 warns us that “teachers” would receive a “greater condemnation” for propagating false doctrines.

In Scripture, the strongest language is not directed toward the murderer or the adulterer, but toward the false teacher, the religionist and the apostate.

The various dispensational gospels do not fall under this condemnation as they are not heretical, as long as they are kept dispensationally accurate as to when they are effective. They may not be “true” or “accurate” in one dispensation but they will be in another. The “gospel” in the Old Testament is clearly different than what we see in Revelation 14:6 and the angel preaching the Everlasting Gospel of the Tribulation. With changes in dispensation comes alterations to the plans of salvation. Basically, salvation is always by faith, but the objects and requirements of that faith do vary from dispensation to dispensation. Our gospel today that we are to be preaching is defined in 1 Corinthians 15:1-4. To add from it or to subtract from it will bring you under Paul’s curse. And error comes from teachers preaching one dispensational plan of salvation in a wrong dispensation. To preach that one must “endure to the end to be saved” (Matthew 24:13) in this dispensation is a heresy. But to preach it in the tribulation (where that passage belongs) would be orthodox.

8g “**accursed**” Strong’s # 331 *αναθεμα* anathema; a thing set up or laid by in order to be kept, a thing devoted to God without hope of being redeemed, and if an animal, to be slain; therefore a person or thing doomed to destruction, a curse, a man accursed, devoted to the direst of woes.

9a The Geneva leaves out the more direct mention of “any other Gospel”, as it did in 1:8. This makes the Geneva weaker than the King James in verses 8 and 9.

9b Paul repeats 1:8 for sake of emphasis. And for sake of emphasis, we’ll summarize 1:8 by saying “If you tell a sinner that there is any way to get to heaven besides faith and belief in the shed and applied blood of Christ and the free gift of the grace of God, God will curse you to hell.” And includes any preacher, no matter how much of a “big-shot” he is or any “layman”.

9c Repeated for emphasis. This is so important that Paul felt it important to repeat it, just in case his reader missed it the first time. The perfect tense is used for “said before” showing that what Paul said the first time, he meant and that he was not about to change his mind.

3. The Divine Origin of Paul's Gospel 1:10-12

1:10 For do I now persuade^{3982-a-present} men, or God?^b or do I seek^{present} to please^{infinitive} men?^c for if I yet pleased^{imperfect} men, I should not be^{imperfect} the servant of Christ.^{d-e}

10a Strong's #3982 *πειθω* peithô; persuade, to make friends of, to win one's favor, gain one's good will, or to seek to win one, strive to please one, to tranquillize, to believe, to listen to, obey, yield to, comply with, to trust, have confidence, be confident

10b The Tyndale, Coverdale and Geneva Bibles all render this along the lines of "Am I preaching man's doctrine or God's?"

10c No one could ever accuse Paul of being a man-pleaser! But the Judaizers were accusing Paul of trying to gain a crowd and be popular through the gospel he preached. Yes, we do indeed try to **persuade** men by logic, argument and reason. We persuade- we do not force. Only God can bring the change of heart as the fruit of our persuasion.

10d You cannot serve- or please- both God and mammon (Matthew 6:24). You can only serve and please one master so you must decide who it will be- God or man. We must also make such a decision in our own lives. Will we base our ministries after God or man? Will we follow God or will we construct an idol for ourselves?

Fundamentalists must make a declaration of heart in such a matter for we have many Fundamentalists who are guilty of idolatry in trying to please man before pleasing God. I have two editions of a magazine called *The Independent Baptist Contender*, put out by Pastor Tom Neal (in the mid-1990s), of the Berean Baptist Church of Orange Park, Florida. Neal is an idolater as he strives to please a dead man, Jack Hyles. Some of Neal's man-pleasing statements include:

1. "I, of course, would be disappointed and somewhat confused as to why you would criticize Brother Hyles' ministry or his family to which he gave nearly 42 years of his life (6:4, February/March 2003, page 3)."
2. "My loyalty was to him (Hyles). (Ibid, page 6)."
3. On pages 35-37 is a report from the "2nd Annual Jack Hyles Memorial Conference". Everything in the conference was "100% Hyles". Not "100% Christ" mind you, but "100% Hyles".
4. Hyles' immoral son, David, was an honored guest at the conference and was working on Neal's staff, despite the fact that he disqualified himself from the ministry multiple times on moral grounds.
5. "Hyles is our hero" (ibid, page 36).
6. "Why should it alarm anyone that as an Independent Baptist preacher I would want to follow and honor Dr. Jack Hyles? (Ibid)."
7. "But, let me remind you...that I stood with your father-in-law, Dr. Jack Hyles, to the very end, and I AM STILL STANDING FOR HIM TODAY (ibid, page 5)." (Does Neal also stand FOR CHRIST with the same zeal?)
8. An advertisement in the November/December 2002 issue of this same magazine (6:3) reads "Are you a Genuine Independent Baptist? Do you identify yourself with the brand of fundamentalism taught by Dr. Jack Hyles? Are you interested in perpetuating REAL independent Baptist fundamentalism? Then maybe you should advertise your church in *The Independent Baptist Contender*. (Page 10)." Translation- you are not a genuine Independent, Fundamental Baptist unless you are a follower of Hyles and advertise your church in Neal's paper. If you advertised in *Sword of the Lord*, *Revival Fires!* or *The Flaming Torch*, you were a pseudo-Fundamental Baptist backslider.

Galatians

1:11 But I certify^{1107-a-b-present} you, brethren,^c that the gospel which was preached^{aorist passive participle} of me is^{present} not after man.^d

1:12 For I^a neither received^{aorist} it of man, neither was I taught^{aorist passive} it, but by the^b revelation of Jesus Christ.^c

In other places, Neal commented how it was his desire to “please” Hyles and that he hoped that Hyles was proud of him. In other words, Neal (and others like him) is seeking after the praise and applause of men. And Neal is not the only one. John R. Rice idolized D.L. Moody, R.A. Torrey and Charles Finney. Calvin idolized Augustine. You can see how much Calvin quotes Augustine in *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Other Baptists idolize Spurgeon or Hyles or Rice or Calvin or some other man instead of seeking after the approval that comes from God alone. How many people idolize John Calvin, as if he was the fourth member of the Godhead? There are those who put Spurgeon, Wesley or Luther on spiritual pedestals. This is an element of fallen human nature, to impress flesh and to receive the praise of men. But Paul would have none of it. After all, any man (regardless of who he is) is a sinner with failings and flaws at best. Paul never wasted any time or effort to impress the other apostles or other men, for he realized that one cannot please flesh and please God at the same time. It is no sin to honor a man. We certainly should do everything we can to **persuade** men as to the truths of the gospel, but **pleasing** men should not be a priority with us. Honoring the memory of good men is a notable and worthy task but venerating them is bordering on idolatry. False teachers are consumed with pleasing men. Genuine Bible teachers and preachers are consumed with pleasing God. That’s how you tell the difference between the two.

10e “**servant of Christ**” Is there any higher title for a Christian? The pope likes to style himself as the “servant of the servants of Christ” in his false humility, but it is better to serve Christ than to even serve the brethren. Men like to glory in their titles, such as “Bishop”, “Reverend” or “Doctor” but Paul stressed the greater title of “servant”.

11a “**I certify you**” Paul reminds them that his gospel is not of human origin. Man would never create a grace-only gospel. Man wants a works-based salvation that he can glory in and take credit for. Man is religious and likes rites, rituals and works. It makes him feel as though he has “earned it”. But Paul was preaching the most unpopular “gospel” of them all- pure grace, where man is unable to earn any favor at all from God. No wonder the Galatians abandoned Paul’s gospel for an “easier” and “more popular” one.

11b “**certify**” is stronger in the English than in the Greek here. “**Certify**” is simply Strong’s #1107 γνῶριζω gnoρίζō, to make known, to gain knowledge of, have thorough knowledge of.

The ESV leaves out this “certification”, making their’s a weaker rendering than that of the other translations.

11c “**brethren**” Despite their apostasy and attacks on Paul, Paul still calls the Galatians “brethren”. Paul had the grace to do this to churches that had turned on him!

11d This is because fallen man would never design such a gospel as that which Paul preached. See notes under 1:7.

12a Emphatic.

12b The ESV has “a revelation” while the other translations all have “the revelation”. It may be a minor change but it certainly is an unnecessary one.

12c Paul stresses that the gospel that he preached was not his own creation nor did he receive it from another man but was revealed directly to him by God, probably during the time Paul was alone in the

4. Paul's Former Conversation 1:13,14

1:13 For ye have heard^{aorist} of my conversation^a in time past in the Jews' religion,^b how that beyond measure I persecuted^{imperfect} the church^c of God, and wasted^{imperfect} it:

1:14 And profited^{imperfect} in the Jews' religion^{13b-2454-a} above many my equals in mine own nation, being^{present active participle} more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers.^b

deserts of Arabia. This would counter the charge by the Judaizers that Paul's gospel was developed by Paul himself and was merely a man-made, uninspired doctrine. Where would Paul have gone to learn such a gospel from man? Who besides Paul was teaching this at this time? Which "Bible College" was teaching this in this day?

13a One evidence of the divine origin of Paul's gospel was that how it totally transformed his life and turned him 180-degrees around, from a fierce persecutor of the church to one of its leading lights (2 Corinthians 5:17). Could the Judaizer's gospel do that? Did it have that kind of power to change a man's heart like that?

13b "**The Jews' religion**" (also in 1:14) as if Paul did not want to identify the Judaism of his day with the classic, Old Testament Judaism of the prophets and patriarchs. He won't call it "the truth" but only "the Jew's religion". This is because the Judaism of his day was grossly corrupt, apostate and formalistic, something that would have been attacked and rejected by any Old Testament prophet.

The Tyndale has "the Jews ways" while the Coverdale uses "leweshippe" ("Jewshipp? Jewish worship?"). The ESV just uses "Judaism". That might not be the best word to use because as we said, Paul is making a distinction between the true Jewish faith and the dead orthodox Judaism of his day that God saved him out of. "Jew's religion" in this context would not equal true Judaism.

13c Acts 7-9 details Paul's persecutions, including his approval of the murder of Stephen.

14a This "**profiting**" could involve many things, from financial profiting to social profiting to the benefits that came with "climbing the ecclesiastical ladder". Religion can pay well, if one knows how to manipulate it and "play his cards right".

14b The Jews put a lot of emphasis and value upon tradition above the Scripture, just like the Catholics of our day. Charismatics place their "prophecies" above the Word of God as well. And many Baptists will place Baptist traditions or the teachings of Spurgeon or Hyles or Rice or some other big-name preacher above the Scripture as well, making them no better than any Roman Catholic.

A zealot is an uncompromising partisan, but the word can have both a good and a bad meaning, depending upon context. You can be zealous of good works in Titus 2:14 and be zealous of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 14:12.

"**traditions of my fathers**" "The five books of Moses can be written out in about 350 pages. The Talmud, which first swamped and then virtually replaced it, takes up 523 books and is printed in 23 volumes. It is a wordy, rambling and inconsistent conglomeration of songs, sermons, fables and fancies (John Phillips, *Exploring Galatians*, pages 45-46)." It was that very mass of traditions that Paul was zealous for before his conversion.

Galatians

5. Paul's Early Ministry 1:15-24

1:15 But when it pleased^{aorist} God, who separated^{aorist active participle} me from my mother's womb,^a and called^{aorist active participle} me by his grace,^b

1:16 To reveal^{aorist infinitive} his Son in me, that I might preach^{present middle subjunctive} him among the heathen;^a immediately I conferred^{aorist middle} not with flesh and blood:^b

1:17 Neither went I up^{aorist} to Jerusalem to them which were apostles before me;^a but I went^{aorist} into Arabia,^b and returned^{aorist} again unto Damascus.

1:18 Then after three years^{a-aorist} I went up to Jerusalem to see^{aorist infinitive} Peter^b and abode^{aorist} with him fifteen days.

15a Jeremiah had a similar testimony (Jeremiah 1:5).

15b Paul was not called because of any merit or talent he had but was called by the grace of God. God had His own reasons for calling Paul into the ministry. It was all of both the grace and the sovereignty of God.

16a Paul's ministry was to the heathen (Gentiles), not necessarily to the nation of Israel, although Paul never neglected the Jews wherever he found them.

16b Since flesh and blood did not call him into the ministry, why confer with it? This also shows Paul's independence from the other disciples as he began to formulate the doctrines that God revealed to him. Once God shows you something or commands you to do something, why confer with flesh and blood?

17a Paul readily acknowledged the apostolic authority of the Twelve while striving to maintain his independence from them.

Again, this shows the limited contact Paul had with the apostles. No one could claim that Paul got his gospel of grace from the apostles or any other man.

17b Most of the commentators place this outside of Damascus but I would have Paul going to the Mount Sinai area, as did Moses, Elijah and probably the Lord during His 40-day fast and temptation-battle with Satan. Here, Paul could be alone, away from the Jews who wanted to murder him, and away from the theological influences of men and even from the other apostles, so that God could deal with him directly regarding the revelation of the mystery of church and of salvation by grace. Paul had a lot to think about, a lot to go over, a lot to meditate on and a lot of doctrines and truth to work out and he had to do it alone-with God.

18a Not the time he spent in Arabia, but rather dating from his conversion.

18b I do not place this in Acts 15 but believe this was not recorded in Acts. Paul went up to meet Peter, talk with him, even to "interview" him, but not to seek Peter's approval on his ministry of theology. No doubt Paul had a lot of questions for Peter about the Lord's earthly ministry, information that Paul would have known nothing about. Peter filled Paul in to many of the details of the Lord's ministry and teaching from a first-hand viewpoint.

Galatians

1:19 But other of the apostles saw^{aorist} I none, save James the Lord's brother.^a

**1:20 Now the things which I write^{present} unto you, behold, before God, I lie^{present}
middle not.^a**

1:21 Afterwards I came^{aorist} into the regions of Syria and Cilicia;^{a-b}

**1:22 And was^{imperfect} unknown^{present passive participle} by face unto the churches of
Judaea which were in Christ:^{a-b}**

**1:23 But they had^{imperfect} heard^{present active participle} only, That he which
persecuted^{present active participle} us in times past now preacheth^{present middle} the faith
which once he destroyed.^{a-imperfect}**

1:24 And they glorified^{imperfect} God in me.^{a-b}

19a James was the Lord's half-brother (not a cousin or a half-brother from a previous marriage of Joseph's), who was not a believer during the Lord's earthly ministry but was converted afterwards. This again shows that Mary had other children after Jesus was born and that she was no sort of "perpetual virgin" as the Romanists make her out to be. After Jesus' birth, Mary and Joseph had normal relations and Mary had at least 6 more children "the old fashioned way" (Psalm 69:3; Mark 6:3; John 7:5).

20a How much of a stronger affirmation could Paul make? This is a Jewish way of strongly affirming an oath, as he would not wish to be found as a false witness before God. The independency of his ministry and message was being attacked and it was up to Paul to affirm as strongly as he could that he was not lying in these assertions.

21 a The area of Paul's hometown of Tarsus. **Syria** and **Cilicia** were adjoining provinces, to the north of Israel.

21b The Geneva merges verses 21 and 22 together

22a Paul was still unknown at this time, having had limited contact with the apostles or the apostolic churches, meaning that they also had next-to-no influence on Paul, his ministry or his doctrine.

22b The Geneva renumbers verse 23 as verse 22 and will be off by one for the rest of the chapter.

23a What a testimony that must have been to the grace and power of God! The Church's number one persecutor was now preaching the faith he tried to destroy! You can argue a man's doctrine but there is no response to a changed life.

24a The brethren did not glorify Paul for what God had done in him, but they correctly glorified the God Who had done that work. Do not praise the piece of pottery, but rather the potter whose skill created it. The pottery itself had nothing to do with how it was made or regarding any beauty it may have. And the Father was getting what He desired and deserved out of Paul's conversion and early ministry- glory and a good testimony. That is something He should be getting out of all of us, laboring to give Him in both our lives and ministries.

24b Again, the Geneva and Bishops Bibles both have some differences in the numbering of the verses.

Galatians Chapter 2

6. Paul at the Jerusalem Conference 2:1-10

2:1 Then fourteen years^a after I went up^{aorist} again to Jerusalem^b with Barnabas, and took^{aorist active participle} Titus with me also.^c

2:2 And I went up^{aorist} by revelation,^a and communicated^{aorist middle} unto them that gospel which I preach^{present} among the Gentiles, but privately^b to them which were of reputation,^{present active participle} lest by any means I should run,^{present subjunctive} or had run,^{aorist} in vain.^c

1a Fourteen years after what? The trip to Jerusalem recorded in Galatians 1 or his salvation? I think it would have to be 14 years after his conversion, for you might have too long a span if the 14 years were between Paul's two visits to Jerusalem.

1b Paul's (recorded) visits to Jerusalem:

1. The visit after he left Damascus (Acts 9:26-30)
2. The "famine" visit (Acts 11:27-30)
3. The visit to attend the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1-29)
4. The visit at the end of the second missionary journey (Acts 18:22)
5. The final visit that resulted in Paul's Caesarean imprisonment (Acts 21:15-23:35)

1c Paul returned to Jerusalem to attend the Jerusalem Conference of Acts 15. Paul went up because it was the will of God for him to go to Jerusalem to participate in the Jerusalem Conference and to help hammer out the issue with the Judaizers. Paul did not go to Jerusalem to get any endorsement or approval from the original apostles for his ministry or doctrine, for Paul really had no need for it. At issue was the contentions made by some of the Judaizers and believing Pharisees were two points: You had to do something to get saved and you had to do something to stay saved:

1. **A man had to be circumcised to be saved.** This same idea is embodied in Covenant Theology which incorrectly tries to replace circumcision with infant baptism. Baptizing your babies put the baby into a so-called "Covenant of Grace" (an unbiblical term) just as circumcision put a Jewish boy into the Abrahamic Covenant. This theological system doesn't make any sense. If New Testament baptism is the counterpart of Old Testament circumcision (and there is no verse that makes such a statement), then how can a girl "get into the covenant of grace?" No girls were circumcised in the Old Testament yet they are supposed to be baptized to get into the "covenant of grace." Doesn't this break the type? If an Old Testament girl didn't (and couldn't) have to be circumcised, then why does she have to be baptized?
2. **A man also had to keep the law of Moses in order to be saved.** Seventh-Day Adventists and other legalistic, law-keeping groups promote something similar. They teach that your observance of the Law of Moses (especially the Jewish weekly Sabbath) proves you are saved and that you love God.

The first time Paul went to Jerusalem he was alone. This time, at the Jerusalem Conference, he brought Barnabas and Titus with him.

2a Paul said he went up by revelation, meaning the Lord told him to go to the conference and declare how God had saved Gentiles without circumcision or the Law. Nobody in Jerusalem asked Paul to attend but the church at Antioch and the Lord both sent him on this errand.

Galatians

2:3 But neither Titus, who was with me, being^{present participle} a Greek, was compelled^{aorist passive} to be circumcised:^{a-aorist passive infinitive}

2:4 And that because of false brethren^a unawares brought in, who came in privily^{b-aorist} to spy out^{c-d-perfect} our liberty which we have^{present} in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:^{e-aorist middle subjunctive}

2b Paul had a private meeting with Peter, James and John as he explained his revelations of grace and concerning the Gentiles. As a result, they did not compel Titus to be circumcised in order to be considered a Christian. With this, the battle with the Judaizers was won (2:3). Some things are better discussed in private with the mature leadership than in church business meetings where immature Christians may end up stumbling at the polemics.

2c Paul was never worried about the "rightness" of his doctrine since he know he received it directly from the Lord, but he saw the danger in allowing the Judaizers to have free course in the Church. Their legalism would undermine all the work he had done among the Gentiles, which would have caused all of Paul's work to have been in vain.

The debate was still hot and heavy, with the Judaizers, whom Paul called "false brethren" who were sneaking in this legalism "unawares". They pressed their contention that Christians were under obligation to the Law. Paul took the other position, saying the Law had no claim on Christians because of the fulfillment of its demands by Christ on the cross. This was one topic Paul had no intention of compromising on whatsoever. If the Jerusalem Council or Paul had compromised on any point of doctrine with the Judaizers, they would have taken the compromise and blared it all over the Empire, saying that the Council had conceded this point to them, thus magnifying their stature. Paul charged the Judaizers of desiring to bring Christians back under the bondage of the Law after they had been set free from it in Christ. They loved the bondage of the law and hated the liberty that is in the gospel. Paul knew from practical experience that this sort of legalism would not accomplish any spiritual good. If the Law had not done any spiritual good for the Jews, then what sort of good could be expected for Gentiles if they put themselves under that sort of bondage? Paul's position was clear- Christians are freed from the demands and penalties of the Law and from Jewish ceremonialism.

These "false brethren" excel in sneaking in unawares into local churches and sowing this kind of discord. They desire to spy out our liberty in Christ and to bring us into some form of spiritual bondage. It is their "life's call" and "ministry."

3a This is because Titus, a full-blooded Gentile, was the test case regarding the question as to whether Gentiles had to keep Jewish religious rituals. Paul made it clear that Titus was saved, sanctified and filled with the Holy Spirit just as much as any Jewish believer was, and that God had used Titus in a definite way despite being uncircumcised. Titus' lack of circumcision obviously did not affect his spirituality or service in any way.

4a They professed to be orthodox Christians that were in agreement with apostolic doctrine, but their teachings and activities revealed them to be otherwise. They would style themselves to be orthodox to get an audience with the brethren and be accepted of them. It is easier to sow false doctrine from within the church than from without.

4b "**privily**" The Old English word for "privately". We still use the word "privy" to describe an outhouse or latrine, a place where you want privacy as you "do your thing".

4c "**privily...spy out...**" is a common practice for false teachers. Those who carry the truth and preach the truth always do things above board and out in the open. They have nothing to hide and have no ulterior motives. One sure way to spot a false teacher is to see how he operates. Does he hesitate in his

Galatians

2:5 To whom we gave place^{aorist} by subjection, no, not for an hour;^a that the truth of the gospel might continue^{aorist active subjunctive} with you.

2:6 But of these who seemed^{present active participle} to be^{infinitive} somewhat, (whatsoever they were,^{imperfect} it maketh no matter^{present} to me: God accepteth^{present} no man's person;) for they who seemed^{present active participle} to be somewhat in conference added^{aorist middle} nothing to me:^a

answers? Does he always hold private meetings and secret sessions? Are his answers clear and open or complicated and confused?

4d “**spy out...**” has the idea of “to spy out a city”, in preparation to overthrow it. The Judaizers were fully intent of overthrowing Paul's gospel of grace. They came looking for holes and weak spots in Paul's gospel that they could exploit.

4e The false brethren heard about this liberation from legalism that Paul was preaching. They saw it as a threat to their Judaizing and works-based false gospel. In order to undermine it and eventually destroy such a doctrine, they first needed to gather intelligence on it. That is the “spying out” part. Once they had what they needed, they concocted doctrines and teachings to undermine it. It was hoped by them that they could damage Paul's teaching and reputation enough to convince his followers that they needed to return to the observance of the law, and, by extension, to their authority. These false brethren feared losing power and income to Paul's gospel, so they had to do anything they could to hurt Paul. If they could accomplish that, they could bring Paul's followers back under bondage- bondage to the law and bondage to them, the Judaizers.

5a No compromise! No dialogue! No quarter given! Paul was hard-nosed, closed-minded and bigoted toward the Judaizers. Paul would allow no man to intimidate him when it came to the truth. He would drive modern Christians crazy with this attitude. To even recognize their arguments would have given them some legitimacy. Paul completely cuts off any possibility of discussion with these issues of legalism and justification. There was an enemy out there that was seeking to bring those who had been liberated from the false gospel of the Judaizers back into spiritual bondage. With souls and the truth of God at stake, Paul insisted there would be no room of compromise or dialogue on this issue.

6a Paul had gotten this revelation straight from the Lord and any additional input from man was meaningless. While he may have appreciated any support he received, it mattered nothing to him. If Paul was the only man in the world preaching free grace, that would not have bothered him at all for he knew he was right. Paul refused to be intimidated by the “big names” at the Jerusalem conference. He also could not be flattered by anyone, no matter how much of a “big wig” he was. He came to Jerusalem to declare the truth about grace, regardless of who liked it or not. Paul did not need their permission, commission or blessing to continue his ministry, although he certainly would not have minded their support and fellowship. Even the “first pope” (supposedly Peter), who was at Jerusalem at this time, could add nothing to Paul's ministry or message. What a slap against Peter! If Paul was a good Romanist, then why is he insulting “Pope Peter I” by saying that Peter added nothing to his ministry?

Notice Paul's attitude toward “ministerial big-shots”. Peter, James and John were men of high repute in the Church and their opinions carried a lot of influence. But human authority and reputation will only carry you so far in the Lord's Work. Something is not “right” because the “nationally-known evangelist” said so. Technically, one preacher's opinion on an issue should not carry more weight simply because he pastors a “big” church or has a bigger Sunday School or because he is a denominational bigwig. Paul certainly respected Peter, James and John as apostles but they were not right simply because they were apostles. Peter needed a good rebuke by Paul later in this chapter and by the Lord Himself in Acts 11. God is the final authority in matters of faith and practice, not man, no matter how “important” that man may be. Never let yourself be intimidated by an ecclesiastical “big shot” who would

Galatians

2:7 But contrariwise, when they saw^{aorist active participle} that the gospel of the uncircumcision^a was committed^{perfect passive} unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision^a was unto Peter;

2:8 (For he that wrought effectually^{a-aorist active participle} in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty^{a-aorist} in me toward the Gentiles:)^b

2:9 And when James,^a Cephas,^b and John, who seemed^{present active participle} to be^{infinitive} pillars,^c perceived^{aorist active participle} the grace that was given^{aorist active participle} unto me,^d they gave^{aorist} to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship;^e that we should go unto the heathen,^f and they unto the circumcision.^g

usurp the role of the Holy Spirit in your life. Preachers are very good at this as they try to intimidate their members or other preachers of smaller churches. They must be resisted at all costs and rebuked for their pride and arrogance.

7a Two “gospels” are mentioned here:

1. Gospel of the uncircumcision
2. Gospel of the circumcision

There are not really two different gospels but are really the same gospel, just directed at two different groups. Both gospels are “justification by grace without the works of the law”, else they would come under the condemnation of Galatians 1:8. This simply deals with the presentation of the truth and who would preach what to whom. The apostles would concentrate their ministries to the Jew and thus would present the gospel in a Jewish context that would be understandable to the Jew. Paul would go to the Gentiles, but that would require a change in tactic and presentation, but not message. Paul would preach the same gospel as did the apostles, but he would be preaching it in a context that the Gentiles, ignorant of Judaism or the Law of Moses, would be able to understand. We would do the same thing today. We would preach the same gospel to a Jewish gathering as we would a Gentile one, only we would emphasize key points and probably have a different emphasis in preaching to Jews than we would preaching to Gentiles.

8a The ESV leaves out any mention of “wrought effectually” or “mighty”.

8b The conference then realized that Paul had been given special revelations regarding this gospel of grace and that God had set him apart for a special ministry to the Gentiles. This means that Paul's position was accepted and the legalism of the Judaizers was rejected. Paul had pointed out that God was working in the same way through Peter, who was working amongst the Jews, and himself, who had been among the Gentiles. Paul would have pointed this out by showing that God had saved the Levite Barnabas and the Gentile Titus by the same gospel.

9a James is mentioned first, even before the so-called “Prince of the Apostles” Peter! James may have been the pastor of the Jerusalem church.

9b Peter. Why does Paul refer to his old name?

9c “pillars” “Among the Jews, persons of great eminence and importance are represented as pillars and foundations of the world. So Abraham is said to be “the pillar of the universe; for by him to this day are the earth and heavens supported.” Yalcut Rubeni, fol. 29. “Rabbi Simeon said, Behold, we are the pillars of the world.” Idra Rabba, s. 23. (Adam Clarke, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*)”

Galatians

2:10 Only they would that we should remember^{present subjunctive} the poor;^a the same which I also was forward^{aorist} to do.^{b-aorist infinitive}

9d With this realization, Peter, James and John, the "big name apostles" who were at the conference, accepted Paul's ministry and extended to him the right hand of fellowship, officially endorsing his teachings and ministry. This would forever shut the mouth of the Judaizers (not to mention the modern hyper-dispensationalists) who claimed that Paul was preaching a different gospel than were the Jerusalem apostles. But the recognition of Paul by Peter, James and John was their stamp of approval on Paul's message. There was no doctrinal conflict between them and Paul.

9e There is no indication that any of the Jerusalem apostles tried to get Paul to change his ministry of his message. They seemed to be quite supportive of Paul and did what they could to encourage him.

9f It was also agreed that Paul would concentrate his ministry to the Gentiles while the other apostles would work in Israel and among the Jewish Disporsa. This does not mean that there was not ministry to the Jews by Paul or that the other apostles ignored the Gentiles. At this point in church history, these were the "fields" selected. As time marched on, there was a gradual shift toward a Gentile-centered ministry by the entire church as Israel continued to basically reject the gospel while the Gentiles continued to receive it. Both the ministry of the Gospel of the Circumcision and Uncircumcision differed only in sphere of ministry, not in the content itself.

9g The Bishop's Bible adds, in italics, the idea that it was agreed that Paul and Barnabas should be apostles to "the heathen". It is in italics to show that the Bishop's Bible translators added the thought that was not in the text in much the same way the King James translators would. In this case, it probably shouldn't be there as Peter, James and John had no authority to determine apostleship on anyone and the authority of Paul and Barnabas was not at issue here, but an acknowledgement of their ministry and message.

10a The only command the "Mother Church" in Jerusalem (not in Rome- never in Rome!) gave to Paul and his party was that they should remember the poor, something Paul was already doing. Paul was given no other "orders" and was free to minister as he saw fit. These poor would have included the poor saints in Palestine. Paul did not forget them, taking them a gift in Acts 24 and mentioning such a collection in Romans 15:26,27; 1 Corinthians 16:3 and 2 Corinthians 9:1.

"Next to the preaching of the Gospel, a true and faithful pastor will take care of the poor. Where the Church is, there must be the poor, for the world and the devil persecute the Church and impoverish many faithful Christians. Speaking of money, nobody wants to contribute nowadays to the maintenance of the ministry, and the erection of schools. When it comes to establishing false worship and idolatry, no cost is spared. True religion is ever in need of money, while false religions are backed by wealth (Martin Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*)."

10b "forward to do" "It was my habit and practice to do this anyway and I was already doing it." The ESV has "eager to do" which is not as good as the King James reading or "diligent" as the other translations have.

7. Paul's Confrontation With Peter 2:11-15

After the Jerusalem Conference was over, Paul had to face an unpleasant task of publicly dressing down Peter for his hypocrisy in dealings with the Gentile believers. Peter would fellowship with the Gentile believers as long as no Jewish believers were present. But as soon as any Jewish believers showed up, Peter would excuse himself

Galatians

and fellowship only with the Jewish believers. He was afraid of the criticism he would receive from the Jewish believers for associating with "those Gentiles", even if "those Gentiles" were believers. Peter was thus torn between both groups in trying to please both. Also, Peter's actions made it appear that Peter was favoring the Jewish believers and that he was treating the Gentile believers as second-class Christians. This had to stop. Paul took it upon himself to confront "the first pope" over his sin. Maybe no one

else had the nerve to confront "the Prince of the Apostles" over this. Or maybe no one else had a problem with it except Paul, the Apostle to the Gentiles.

2:11 But when Peter was come^{aorist} to Antioch, I withstood^{aorist} him to the face,^{a-b} because he was^{imperfect} to be blamed.^{c-perfect passive participle}

2:12 For before that certain came^{aorist} from James, he did eat^{a-imperfect} with the Gentiles: but when they were come,^{aorist} he withdrew^{b-imperfect} and separated himself,^b fearing^{present middle/passive participle} them which were of the circumcision.^{d-e}

11a "Paul goes on in his refutation of the false apostles by saying that in Antioch he withstood Peter in the presence of the whole congregation. As he stated before, Paul had no small matter in hand, but the chief article of the Christian religion. When this article is endangered, we must not hesitate to resist Peter, or an angel from heaven. Paul paid no regard to the dignity and position of Peter, when he saw this article in danger. It is written: "He that loveth father or mother or his own life, more than me, is not worthy of me." (Matthew 10:37) (Martin Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*)."

11b Paul did not confront Peter in Jerusalem. For some reason, Peter came to Antioch, the location of Paul's home church. Paul then used the "home field advantage" to confront Peter over his hypocrisy in his dealings with the Gentile believers.

Notice Paul refuted Peter "to his face", and not behind his back. The Judaizers were slandering Paul behind his back but Paul would confront his problems openly. Here is character. If you are going to criticize and talk about someone, have enough character to do it "to his face". Many excel at back-stabbing but few practice "plain speaking". This was an issue that one of my teachers, Dr. O. Talmadge Spence, late founder and president of Foundations Bible College in Dunn, North Carolina, stressed to his students. He told us "If I ever hear something bad about you, I will call you up and discuss it with you before I believe it". Good words. He made that covenant with us and we, his students, returned it back to him. And I did the same with my students when I was teaching in Bible College. It is a practice that all Christians should practice.

11c Peter was being a hypocrite. His practice of "separation" was not a Biblical separation on doctrine or practice but rather based on fear and prejudice, as well as an attempt to avoid criticism. The root problem? The god- Public Opinion- had reared its ugly head!

Both the Geneva and the ESV use "condemned" for "blamed".

12a "did eat" At the love feasts in the early church, Peter would sit right down with the Gentile believers and eat right along with them, often eating ceremonially unclean foods with them. This naturally upset the Hebrew Christians, who accused him of abandoning the Law. Under the storm of such intense opposition, Peter then began excusing himself from the Gentile table during these fellowships and would sit only with the Jewish believers, and he would have nothing to do with the Gentile believers. This then would upset the Gentiles, since it made them feel like second class believers. Peter was continuing to acknowledge the rift between the Gentile and Hebrew Christians and was doing nothing to heal it and he was, in a sense, giving the impression that the Hebrews were a superior brand of Christian, since, when

Galatians

2:13 And the other Jews dissembled^{4942-aorist passive} likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with^{4879-aorist passive} their dissimulation.^{5272-a-b}

pressured, he spend his time with them instead of with the Gentiles. This was causing great contention within the church, yet it seemed that no one wanted to confront Peter about it, especially none of the Gentile Christians, who felt that none of them had the "stature" to do so.

12b "**withdrew**" Has a military connotation, like retreating troops, or furling the sails of a boat. Peter was literally trimming his sails in retreat in his dealings with the Gentile believers because of the criticism from the Jewish believers. Peter surrendered without a shot! 12c "We can well imagine how attractive Christianity must have been to the pagans of the first century. They were sickened by the utter godlessness of heathendom. They were weary to death with the theological inanities and the moral decadence of the pagan religions, and they looked longingly toward the lofty religious ideals of the Jews. They were repelled...by the self-righteous arrogance of many Jews, by their hypocrisy and by their contemptuous attitude toward all things Gentile. They were insulted by the Jewish dietary laws that closed the door on all ordinary social intercourse, and the idea of circumcision as the only way to acceptance into the Jewish faith repelled them. When the Christians offered them salvation by grace through faith in Christ, free from all hindrances of Judaism, they flocked into the church. Soon, the Gentiles far outnumbered the Jews in the Antioch church. Soon, Gentiles would far outnumber Jews in the church everywhere (John Phillips, *Exploring Galatians*, page 71)."

12d "**fearing them which were of the circumcision**" "The fear of man bringeth a snare (Proverbs 29:25)" and Peter was snared by the Judaizers into hypocrisy.

12e If anyone should have a problem with eating with Gentiles, it should have been Paul more than Peter. As a Pharisee, Paul would have really believed that the Gentiles were lower than dogs and would have had no dealings with them at all, more than a "layman" like Peter. Paul got over his prejudices against the Gentiles (Acts 10) better than Peter did. We never see Paul shying away from the Gentiles or having any problems fellowshiping with them. He was the Apostle to the Gentiles after all. Peter also had problems shaking off the "fear of the brethren", something that Paul had little problem with.

13a Peter's conduct confused the Gentile Christians because Peter seemed to be treating them as second-class believers, hence the danger and the need for Paul to take action. This was shown in Barnabas being carried away with Peter's conduct. If Peter was avoiding the Gentiles to keep the Jews happy, then Barnabas must have thought that it was alright too, so he started adopting Peter's conduct. Either this or it could mean Barnabas was upset with Peter's conduct and the entire controversy, got discouraged and was ready to quit the ministry. This problem with Barnabas may have set the stage for the separation of Paul and Barnabas in Acts 15. Barnabas had gone to Jerusalem with Paul and Titus to argue the case for the Gentile believers and now here he was getting carried away with Peter's hypocrisy. That would not sit too well with Paul.

The issue was could Gentiles have fellowship with Jewish believers without conforming themselves to the Jewish institutions? Paul said "yes". The Gentiles did not have to do any conforming to the Jews. The Jews would have discouraged any of this type of fellowship with the Gentiles on the basis that it violated their law. But they forgot that those laws no longer applied to them after they had accepted Christ.

No doubt the Jewish leaders at the Jerusalem Church were viewing with alarm the rise of the Gentile leaders at the other churches, including at Antioch, and how Peter seemed to be gravitating more and more toward them. These "brethren from James" in 2:12 may have been sent from Jerusalem to try to pull Peter back to the Jewish party, and it seemed to work, much to the hurt and the confusion of the Gentile believers.

Galatians

2:14 But when I saw^{aorist} that they walked not uprightly^{a-present} according to the truth of the gospel, I said^{aorist} unto Peter^b before them all,^c If thou, being^{present active participle} a Jew, livest^{present} after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest^{present} thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?^{d-infinitive}

2:15 We^a who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,^b

13b “**dissemble**” has the idea of “to conceal one’s real nature and motives” from the old French word “dissembler”, meaning “to be different”. The Tyndale, Coverdale and Bishops all use “simulation”. The Geneva and ESV are good with their use of “hypocrisy”.

14a “**walked not uprightly**” The NKJV uses “were not straightforward”. We like the older reading as it has the idea of “uprightness” in maintaining a faithful and consistent orthopraxy of life and doctrine.

14b The ESV uses “Cephas” where the other translations use “Peter”.

14c Paul had to put a stop to this and confronted Peter in public and rebuked him for treating Jewish and Gentile believers differently instead of equally as being in one body. To keep the Jews happy (and to deflect their criticism), Peter was willing to revert back to the legalism that was condemned in the Jerusalem Conference. It was a good thing Paul was there to stop him, lest Peter and Barnabas apostatize. Paul publicly rebuked Peter and got away with it. So much for Peter being a “pope” for no missionary would have dared chew out the “Prince of the Apostles” if such an animal had existed. The only man who could go toe-to-toe with Paul for “plain speaking” would be John Wesley.

See what happens when you start bowing to special interest groups instead of to Scripture? This was a mistake Paul never made but that Peter had to be delivered from.

The lesson to be learned was that Jew and Gentile could fellowship together and were to be treated as equals. This was the big pill that Jewish Christians, including Peter and Barnabas, had a lot of trouble swallowing. Paul could have sympathized with that since as a Pharisee, he had to battle with those same prejudices. But Paul realized that he MUST get the victory over these old prejudices if he was going to have any ministry in the church and Peter had to come to that same realization as well. You cannot preach to only a certain, select group or race of people and hope to have any success. If you are too good to preach to people of other races or of lower economic and social classes, then your ministry will be a failure even before it begins. Prejudices will kill every ministry every time.

14d Or, to paraphrase, “Why do you live one way yet compel the Gentile believers to live another way?” Preachers and religious leaders do this all the time, imposing unscriptural requirements upon their congregations that no one, including themselves, could ever hope to keep. This is the kind of hypocrisy that Paul had to rebuke Peter about.

15a Emphatic.

15b God had to justify the self-righteous Jew in the same manner as the Gentile sinner, something the Jew must realize. When it comes to the sin problem, the Jews has as big a problem as the Gentile does and must have that problem saved in the same way as the Gentile- by justification by the faith of Christ.

8. Justification By Faith 2:16

2:16^a Knowing^{b-perfect active participle} that a man is not justified^{present passive} by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ,^c even we have believed^{aorist} in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified^{aorist passive subjunctive} by the faith of Christ,^c and not by the works of the law:^d for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.^{e-f-g-h-future passive}

16a Paul summarizes the problem and its solution. Can a man be justified by faith and works? The answer is a clear No! A man is justified not by the works of the law but by the faith of Jesus Christ.

16b “**knowing**” is in the perfect tense, showing that this is an absolute knowledge, one of absolute certainty that cannot be debated or doubted. This “perfect” truth that is absolute is that a man is not justified by the works of the law but by the faith of Jesus Christ.

16c We are not justified by faith "in Christ" (as the NKJV and ESV incorrectly read both times in this verse. The Geneva makes the same mistake in the first occurrence but not in the second) but by the faith "of Christ". It is not our faith that justifies us but rather the faith of Christ which is imputed on our behalf at the new birth. Faith in Christ saves us but it is the faith of Christ that justifies us. This is a spiritual benefit no Old Testament saint had, for his own faith was important in his eventual justification before God, but not so with the New Testament saint.

16d No man shall be justified by the works of the law.

1. No man can keep the law in order to be justified.
2. God never said to keep the law to be justified. The law is there to condemn man and to define sin, not to save the sinner. When a sinner says that he will earn eternal life by keeping the law, he makes a bargain with God that He never agreed to, thus making it null and void.

16e Let's define our major theological word "justified": it is a legal declaration of innocence whereby the sinner is pronounced to be righteous and not guilty of sin by God. This is only possible through the shed blood and atonement of Christ, for there is no way that God can pardon the sinner and still retain His holiness and respect the demands of the law. The law demands the sinner to die for his sins. Christ, who fulfilled the law by virtue of His perfect, sinless life, dies in the place of the sinner. With a life now given, the sinner is freed from the demands of the law. Since Christ took his penalty, there is no condemnation remaining against the sinner for whom Christ died. With no sin or demands of the law withstanding, the sinner may now be declared just and the law has not been violated.

16f “**no flesh be justified**” There is nothing in the flesh for Christianity and nothing in Christianity for the flesh. Yet this is almost a universal truth among men, that salvation is something that can, yea, that must be earned by works, rituals and church attendance and fulfilling of rituals and rules. Be a good person. Fulfill the Golden Rule. Keep the Ten Commandments. Do this, that and the other thing and you'll earn your way into heaven. If there was ever a universal error and heresy among men, this is it. How difficult it is to talk sinners out of this, to offer them something better! Instead of working, striving and sweating for salvation through your works, accept it as a free gift from God! But such a salvation offends the pride of man. After all, no one likes to “accept charity from anyone” and they would rather work of it than to have anything handed to them. Also, if salvation could be worked for and earned, then it would put them on a much more equal footing with God. When it is based on grace, there is no room for boasting and bragging. When it based on works, that is all you will hear from man, even if he is a redeemed man, and that will get real old, real quick. Man would always rather work for it, then God would have to keep quiet about how man lived, since man earned his salvation and met all the requirements for it. This is why salvation can never be of works, but this is why every false plan of salvation will always be based on works, and never upon grace.

Galatians

16g Summary of Justification

I. What It Is Not

1. It is not regeneration, the impartation of life in Christ; for although it is "justification of life"-- meaning God will give life to the justified, he is justified as ungodly.
2. It is not "a new heart," or "change of heart,"—indefinite expressions at best, but having in them no proper definition of justification.
3. It is not "making an unjust man just," in his life and behavior. The English word justified, as we all know, comes from the Latin word meaning to make just or righteous; but this is exactly what justification is not, in Scripture.
4. It is not to be confused with sanctification; which is the state of those placed in Christ,-- "sanctified in Christ Jesus"; and consequently the manner of their walk in the Spirit.

II What It Is

1. It is a declaration by God in heaven concerning a man, that he stands righteous in God's sight.
2. God justifies a man, on the basis or ground of the "redemption that is in Christ Jesus" (Romans 3:24). We are "justified by His blood";--the blood the procuring ground, or means; God the acting Person.
3. God who has already acted judicially, in pronouncing the whole world guilty (Romans 3:19), now again acts judicially concerning that sinner who becomes convinced of his guilt and helplessness, and believes that God's Word concerning Christ's expiatory sacrifice applies to himself; and thus becomes "of faith in Jesus" (Romans 3:26,): God's judicial pronouncement now is, that such a believing one stands righteous in His sight.
4. Justification, or declaring-righteous, therefore, is the reckoning by God to a believing sinner of the whole value of the infinite work of Christ on the cross; and, further, His connecting this believing sinner with the Risen Christ in glory, giving him the same acceptance before Himself as has Christ: so that the believer is now "the righteousness of God in Him" (Christ).

Ten Aspects of Justification

1. **The Need of Justification-** Isaiah 64:6; Romans 3:10; 1 Corinthians 6:9,10
2. **The Meaning of Justification.** "To Justify" means "to declare or to pronounce righteous." It is a judicial term (see Deuteronomy 25:1). The opposite of justification is condemnation (Deuteronomy 25:1; Romans 5:16-19).
3. **The Problem of Justification-** Romans 3:26; 4:5- How can God be just and still justify a sinner? Apart from Christ's work on Calvary, there can be no solution.
4. **The Basis of Justification**
 1. The blood of Christ- Romans 5:9
 2. The substitutionary death of Christ- Isaiah 53:6; 2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 Peter 3:18. All the demands of Divine justice have been fully satisfied by the finished work of Christ on the cross. God judged His Son (Romans 8:3; 2 Corinthians 5:21) so that He might justify the believing sinner (Romans 4:5).
5. **The Source of Justification-** the grace of God- Romans 3:24
6. **The Channel of Justification-** "Justified by faith" (Romans 3:28; 5:1). How does a sinner get this perfect righteousness? It is received by faith. The sinner is justified by the death of Christ as to the basis and through faith as to its appropriation. The free gift of God's righteousness must be personally received (Romans 5:17).
7. **The Example of Justification-** Abraham is the prime example used by both Paul and James (Genesis 15:6; Romans 4; James 2).
8. **The Result of Justification.** God's perfect righteousness is put to my account (Romans 4:3-5) and thus I am perfectly righteous, not in myself as I am still a sinner), but "in Christ Jesus" (2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 Corinthians 1:30). God now sees me just as righteous as Jesus Christ (1 John 3:7). Being justified I now have peace with God (Romans 5:1) and no condemnation (Romans 8:1)

Galatians

9. Is Christ the Minister of Sin? 2:17,18

2:17 But if, while we seek^{present active participle} to be justified^{aorist passive infinitive} by Christ,^a we ourselves also are found^{aorist passive} sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin?^b God forbid.^{c-aorist middle optative}

2:18 For if I build^{present} again the things which I destroyed,^{aorist} I make^{present} myself a transgressor.^{a-b}

9. **The Evidence of Justification.** James says that Abraham was "justified by works" (James 2:14-22). This is how we "show our faith" and this is how we prove to others the reality of our justification.

10. **The Hope of Justification-** Romans 8:30 "whom He justified, them He also Glorified." Glorification is guaranteed and in the mind of God it is already done!

16h **"The Life I Now Live"** (2:16-21):

1. A life justified without the deeds of the law- 2:16
2. A life imparted through faith in Christ 2:16
3. A life lived unto God 2:19
4. A life crucified with Christ 2:20
5. A life indwelt by Christ 2:20
6. A life continued by faith in the Son of God 2:20

17a Christ justifies the sinner by faith. When Christ justifies a sinner, does that mean he must also justify the sin and the nature of that sinner? God forbid.

17b After I am justified, I still sin. Does that make Christ the Justifier the minister of sin since He knew that justification does not eradicate the sin nature? God forbid. Away with that thought! Don't even let it enter your mind!

17c **"God forbid"** is a loose translation of μη γενοιτο, "let it not be!" But all the KJV-type translations use it. Yet the NJKV and ESV use "certainly not!" (which is much weaker), thus discarding the reading of the traditional translations.

18a In order to improve on our salvation, what if we went back to the law to try to justify ourselves? After we are justified, we realize that we still sin. We are not at a point of maturity or "sinless perfection" yet. We might reason that justification is the first step in salvation but that we need to follow up on it and complete the job. So we run back to the law and try to keep it to improve on our justification and somehow make an atonement-by-works for our continuing sin. But this is building up the thing which we destroyed at salvation. We destroyed any and all attempts at self-justification when we accepted salvation by faith. The law had no place in saving us and it has no place in keeping us saved. We transgress when we run back to the law to try to improve that good work that Christ did for us in justification. Christ's justification by faith was complete and total on our behalf and we have no need for the law. To run back to the law after justification is to question the extent of justification and to question Christ's work on the cross. This is what the Judaizers were guilty of and what Peter was falling into.

18b The pre-King James translations all use "trespasser". Both the King James and ESV use "transgressor".

Galatians

10. Dead to the Law, Alive to Christ 2:19,20

2:19 For I^a through the law am dead^{aorist} to the law,^a that I might live^{aorist active} subjunctive unto God.^{b-c-d}

2:20 I am crucified^{perfect passive} with Christ:^{a-b} nevertheless I live;^{c-d-present} yet not I,^e but Christ liveth^{present} in me: and the life which I now live^{present} in the flesh I live^{present} by the faith of the Son of God,^f who loved^{aorist active participle} me, and gave^{aorist active participle} himself for me.^g

19a The law killed the Christian (Romans 7:8,9) and was officially declared to be dead (Ephesians 2:1-4). When we were born again (hence the need for a new birth, because you were dead!), his spirit revived but not the body. His spirit is alive unto God but his body is still dead. Christians are then living dead men. Soul and spirit are quite alive through the new birth but the old body of flesh (as well as the accompanying human nature) are still dead. And since you are dead, the law has no claim over you. The unsaved man is just the opposite- a dead spirit in a living body.

19b If the believer is to have nothing to do with the law, what is his relationship to it then? One of death. In order to live unto God, we must die to the law (Romans 6,7). Dead men are attracted by or affected by nothing. So should we be to the law. In terms of justification, it has no effect on us and has no influence over us. This is not to say that the law has absolutely no influence to a Christian because it clearly does. The law is there still to show us the absolute standard of God's holiness and to define sin for us. But it has absolutely no place in our salvation or security in Christ.

19c "that I might live unto God" One cannot live "for" the flesh and the spirit at the same time, nor can one live in the world and "in Christ" at the same time. Nor can you seek to claim divine justification while at the same time trying to justify yourself through works. You are either alive or dead to the law, and, conversely, either dead or alive to God at any given moment.

"This nineteenth verse is loaded with consolation. It fortifies a person against every danger. It allows you to argue like this:

"I confess I have sinned."

"Then God will punish you."

"No, He will not do that."

"Why not? Does not the Law say so?"

"I have nothing to do with the Law."

"How so?"

"I have another law, the law of liberty."

"What do you mean--'liberty'?"

"The liberty of Christ, for Christ has made me free from the Law that held me down. That Law is now in prison itself, held captive by grace and liberty."

"By faith in Christ a person may gain such sure and sound comfort, that he need not fear the devil, sin, death, or any evil. "Sir Devil," he may say, "I am not afraid of you. I have a Friend whose name is Jesus Christ, in whom I believe. He has abolished the Law, condemned sin, vanquished death, and destroyed hell for me. He is bigger than you, Satan. He has licked you, and holds you down. You cannot hurt me." This is the faith that overcomes the devil. (Martin Luther, *Commentary on Galatians*)"

19d The Bishops Bible includes the first part of verse 20 in verse 19.

20a This is a deep verse that has no bottom. Paul considered himself crucified with Christ. This is when he died to the law- when Christ fulfilled it. This is a state of living death. I am alive but dead to the law.

Galatians

The problem with death by crucifixion is that it is a slow death. A man could hang on a cross for days before he died. Our death to the law is equally as slow. It is painful, agonizing and shameful, but the longer we stay on that cross, the deader we should become to the law.

This is why immature Christians need Roman Catholic penance to be forgiven of their sins- they are not on the cross and dying to the law/justification by works as they should be. This is why unstable Christians fall out to the Seventh Day Adventists to keep the law in order to stay saved- they haven't gotten on their cross yet and started the dying process to the law.

My old man of sin which was in subject to the law is dead. It died when I was saved. I am alive but not to myself, my old sin nature or to the law. Those things have no attraction to me as a justified Christian. I am alive only to Christ now. Only Christ has any influence on me.

"I am crucified" The phrase is in the perfect in the Greek, denoting a final, irreversible state. There was no coming down from that cross once you were crucified! And Paul certainly did not wish to come down or be taken down from his cross! While the NKJV is technically correct in rendering the phrase as an English past tense, the KJV still maintains the force of the perfect (ongoing present tense that will continue into the future).

20b Five aspects of crucifixion in Galatians:

1. I am crucified with Christ 2:20
2. Christ crucified 3:1
3. The flesh crucified in me 5:24
4. The world crucified to me 6:14
5. I crucified unto the world 6:14

20c Before I was saved, I lived- if you want to call that living- by the law. As a sinner, I thought I could somehow justify myself according to the law. But I know better now. I died to that law when I was saved and gave up my attempts at self-justification. Now I live by the faith of the Son of God and not by myself or my works. Again, I am not living by my faith in Christ but by the faith of Christ which He imparted to me at my salvation. I live by His faith and my life is thus dependent upon Him.

20d This is the "living sacrifice" of Romans 12:1,2. We are on the cross but are not totally dead yet. The old man won't die easy. He kicks, squirms and tries to get off the cross. The more you try to kill him the harder he resists. It is our duty to keep him on the cross and hasten his final dead so that we may be free of him. Here is a Biblical paradox- the Spirit of the Living God comes to dwell in the dead bodies of Christians!

20e Emphatic.

20f **"faith of the Son of God"**, again showing the important truth that we do not live by our own faith but rather by the faith of Christ imparted to us through the Spirit.

The ESV errs again by rendering this as "faith in the Son of God". We live not by our own faith but by the faith that Christ gives us and imputes to us.

20g For whom did Christ die?

1. For all (1 Timothy 2:6; Isaiah 53:6).
2. For every man (Hebrews 2:9).
3. For the world (John 3:16).
4. For the sins of the whole world (1 John 2:2).
5. For the ungodly (Romans 5:6).
6. For false teachers (2 Peter 2:1).
7. For many (Matthew 20:28).
8. For Israel (John 11:50-51).
9. For the Church (Ephesians 5:25).
10. For "me" (Galatians 2:20).

Galatians

11. Frustrating the Grace of God 2:21

2:21 I do not frustrate^{a-present} the grace of God:^b for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead^{aorist} in vain.^c

It is obvious that these verses would undermine the Calvinistic doctrine that Christ only died for the “elect” and not for the world or for so-called “reprobates”. The Scripture is clear that Christ died for all men, and that all man may be saved as salvation is made available to all.

21a “**frustrate**” is rendered differently by every translation. Tyndale uses “despise”. Coverdale has “cast not away”. Geneva uses “not abrogate”. Bishops has “reject not”. The ESV has “nullify”, so there is no agreement here.

21b Trying to justify ourselves by the works of the law before or after salvation frustrates the grace of God. Grace and law cannot co-exist. They are like oil and water. You will either be justified by works without grace or by grace without works, but not both.

21c Here is the one question that sums it all up. If justification and righteousness could be earned by keeping the law, then why on earth did Christ have to die? If I could earn it, then His death was a waste and was unnecessary. He died in vain. Those who work for justification not only frustrate the grace of God but also make the death of Christ vain.

"Do this and live", the law commands
But gives me neither feet nor hands
A better word the gospel brings
It bids me fly and gives me wings (Kenneth Wuest, *Galatians in the Greek New Testament*, page 80)

Galatians Chapter 3

12. The Vanity of Returning to the Law 3:1-4

3:1 O foolish Galatians,^a who hath bewitched^{940-b-aorist} you, that ye should not obey^{3982-present passive infinitive} the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth,^{c-aorist passive} crucified^{perfect passive participle} among you?^{d-e}

3:2 This only would^{present} I learn^{aorist} infinitive of you, Received^{aorist} ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?^{a-b-c}

1a Paul calls the Galatians "foolish" for allowing themselves to become bewitched by the Judaizers. They let themselves get theologically suckered. They were foolish for allowing the Judaizers to lead them astray so easily and so quickly, without even putting up a protest. It is like Paul is saying "You are acting like a bunch of fools! Who on earth came through there and put the hex on you to turn you from the truth you heard from me? You heard about the crucifixion of Christ and understood it so perfectly! Now, why did you drop that and start with all this works stuff?"

1b "**Bewitched**", the Judaizers had come in behind Paul and had used every trick in the book to turn the Galatians away from Paul. They used flattery, smooth words, anything they could to win their affections. They also heaped tons of abuse on Paul in the meantime ("We think very highly of Brother Paul, but you know how he is..." or "...but I bet you didn't know this about Paul..."). Plain dealing and speaking were not the forte of the Judaizers.

Strong's #940 βασκαίνω baskainô; to malign, to fascinate (by false representations), to bewitch, cast an evil eye upon, one who kills or destroys with his eyes in Classical Greek. Also used for envy in Classical Greek.

1c "**evidently set forth...**" In the plainest way possible so that even an unsaved person could see and understand.

1d Paul had clearly presented Christ and Him crucified to the Galatians but they turned their eyes away to some other Christ represented by some other gospel preached by the Galatians.

1e Paul asks 7 questions in Galatians 3. Some were asked in amazement and rebuke. Others were asked as Paul still maintained the old rabbinical habit of teaching by asking and then answering questions.:

1. O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? (3:1)
2. Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? (3:2)
3. Are ye so foolish? (3:3a)
4. Having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? (3:3b)
5. Have ye suffered so many things in vain? (3:4)
6. He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? (3:5)
7. Wherefore then serveth the law? (3:19)

2a Paul now turns sarcastic, a sanctified but righteous sarcasm. Why is it some people think preachers should never be sarcastic or negative in dealing with church problems like this? He asks them "Remember when you received the Holy Spirit? How did you receive Him, by faith or by the works of the law?" The answer was obviously by faith and the Galatians knew it. So what kind of reason could they

Galatians

3:3 Are^{present} ye so foolish?^a having begun^{aorist middle participle} in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect^{present middle/passive} by the flesh?^{b-c-d}

3:4 Have ye suffered^{aorist} so many things in vain?^a if it be yet in vain.

possibly have for forsaking that faith that imparted them the Spirit to run after a works-gospel that never did anything for them? The answer to this question is an obvious “no” as the Galatians, being Gentiles, had never been under the law and thus never had any obligation to it or blessings from it.

2b Galatians 3:2 destroys every works-based religious set up on earth. Those who work for the Spirit cannot receive Him, although such people deceive themselves into thinking they have Him.

2c “hearing of faith” This is what does the job spiritually- hearing the Word of God, for that is where faith comes (Romans 10:17). They heard on the Day of Pentecost (Acts 2) and in the house of Cornelius in Acts 10. God still does His best work during a sermon when someone is listening to a preacher. Christianity is an ear-oriented/hearing-oriented religion, not an eye-oriented one (and there go the Charismatics with their “signs and wonders” right there). The works of the law do not lead to the giving of the Spirit.

3a **“Are ye so foolish?”** Obviously, they were, spiritually, at least.

3b They had started in the spirit by accepting and holding to faith. So now they were going to abandon the faith that saved them and run on works? What did works ever do for them? Paul can't believe how foolish they are! It is sheer folly to hold that we begin in the Spirit but we must be perfected by the flesh, which played no role in our salvation. Yet this is a common pit that many young believers fall into, thinking they must live the Christian life in their own power. We begin in the Spirit and not by the flesh. Thus no man ever starts the new birth himself. There are two reasons for this:

1. He cannot because he is spiritually dead. He does not have the power to do so. It would be like rescuing yourself from a pit of quicksand by pulling yourself out by your own hair.
2. He will not. He has no desire to be saved naturally, unless awakened by the Holy Ghost.

Go back to the flesh for spiritual perfection? Go back to that which God has cursed and condemned? Go back to that which would have sent you to hell if you hadn't gotten saved? The flesh profits nothing, especially in spiritual things.

3c Three things inferred from 3:3-5 that the Law could not do:

1. Impart the Holy Spirit
2. Bring spiritual perfection
3. Work miracles

3d Not sinlessly perfect but entire, complete and mature. This is a spiritual state that the law cannot help the Christian attain to.

4a They suffered because of their acceptance of the gospel of grace they had been persecuted, perhaps by the Judaizers. Now that they had forsaken that faith, their sufferings were now voided. They had suffered for nothing and gained nothing from those sufferings and persecutions.

Galatians

13. Receiving the Spirit by Faith 3:5

3:5^a He therefore that ministereth^{2023-b-present active participle} to you the Spirit,^c and worketh^{present active participle} miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?^d

14. The Faith of Abraham 3:6-9

3:6^a Even as Abraham believed^{aorist} God,^b and it was accounted^{aorist passive} to him for righteousness.^c

5a What about this man- Paul- who had come among them, worked miracles and made it possible for them to receive the gospel. How did he do it? Did Paul do his miracles by faith or by the gospel of works? Did the Galatians receive the Spirit through the gospel of faith or works? What about God, Who sent and ministered the Spirit unto them- how did He do it, by faith or works? Again, what on earth had the gospel of works done for them that they should embrace it? What fault did they find in Paul's gospel of grace that they should reject it so soon?

5b “ministereth” Strong’s #2023 επιχορηγεω epichoregeo; from επι epi (Strong’s #1909) upon; and χορηγεω chorêgeô (Strong’s #5524) to furnish, give; to furnish besides, fully supply, aid or contribute, add, minister. It denotes everything that was necessary to give completeness and perfection to a public entertainment; the leading idea is, to afford that which is needed. “In ancient days in Greece at the great festivals the great dramatists like Euripides and Sophocles presented their plays. Greek plays all had a chorus and to equip and train them was expensive. The public-spirited Greeks would also give to defray these expenses. In war time, patriotic citizens would also give to pay for war expenses. In later Greek marriage contracts, the word is used to describe the support that a husband, out of love, gives to his wife. “Choregia” underlies the generosity of God, a generosity born of love (William Barclay, “The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians” in *The Daily Study Bible Series*, page 25).”

5c “ministereth to you the Spirit” The NKJV and ESV use an odd translation “supplies the Spirit to you” and the capitalized “Spirit” refers to the Holy Spirit. Yet how can a false teacher supply the Holy Spirit? They don’t even have the Spirit! How can they “supply” the Spirit to the saints? The Tyndale, Cramner and Geneva all use “ministereth” as does the KJV. Yet the Roman Catholic Rheims Douay of 1582 uses “giveth you the Spirit”. The NKJV rejects the traditional readings in favor of a Roman Catholic one!

5d So let’s boil it all down to “modern English”: You Galatians are acting like a bunch of idiots! Who on earth came through there and lured you away from my gospel that you received? You accepted by teaching on the work of Christ on the cross and you understood it so well that you could see it with your own eyes! My miracles verified my message. So in light of all that, why on earth are you fooling around with works? What is wrong with you people? And what about that idiot up there who is feeding you all that works tripe? Can he do miracles like I did? Can he minister the Spirit unto you like God did? What does that bird have that I don’t? What can he do for you that I couldn’t do?

6a Paul proves his point by pointing to Abraham, taking us back to Genesis 15:6. How did Abraham get his righteousness, by works or by faith? Genesis 15:6 clearly says it was by belief, not works.

6b **Abraham believed God...** see Romans 4:1-5.

6c The ESV has “counted to him as righteousness”.

Galatians

3:7 Know^{present} ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are^{present} the children of Abraham.^{a-b}

3:8 And the Scripture, foreseeing^{a-present active participle} that God would justify^{present} the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel^{aorist middle} unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.^{b-future passive}

7a Paul could apply it like this:

1. Abraham got his righteousness by faith, so what makes you think you can get yours by works?
2. If works didn't work for Abraham, what makes you think it will work for you?
3. If a man wants to lay a claim to be a child of Abraham, let him follow the example of his spiritual "father"- quit working for it and believe like Father Abraham did.

The man promoting works disqualifies himself as a son of Abraham in a spiritual sense since Abraham's righteousness had nothing to do with works. This disqualifies all unregenerate Jews, Judaizers and stupid Christians who work instead of believe.

7b We are obviously not speaking of literal, physical descendants of Abraham, as the Jews. An unbelieving Jew may be a literal, physical descendent of Abraham but he is not a spiritual one. Our concern here is the spiritual heritage of Abraham, extended to Jew and Gentile alike who receive their righteousness by faith. I am a Gentile, Italian/ Scots/ Cornish/ German/Lithuanian and a bit of Cherokee Indian. The New Birth cannot and does not change that. I am not a racial Jew and can never be. So when Paul says that I am now of the seed of Abraham as a believer, it must be a spiritual reference, not a physical one.

8a The Living Scripture. Most of the commentators miss the verse, being reluctant to give human-type attributes, or even divine attributes, to a "mere book". But Paul had no such qualms. He literally believed that Book was more alive than he was! Remember Hebrews 4:12- the Word of God is quick. It is alive. That Bible is not a dead book like *The Communist Manifesto* or the *Book of Mormon* or *Science and Health With Key to the Scriptures*- it is more alive than you are. And you can also check Romans 9:17 for a cross-reference.

Living attributes of the Scripture

1. It can foresee. It foresaw even in Abraham's day that God would justify the heathen through faith and not works.
2. It can preach. It preached to Abraham. What was the text of this sermon preached by the unwritten Scripture? That in Abraham, all nations would be blessed. This matches Genesis 18:18, an extension of the Abrahamic Covenant. All nations are blessed in Abraham because from him came the nation of Israel, God's covenant people to whom were entrusted the early revelations and oracles of God. From Israel sprang the Messiah, the Savior of the world. Abraham also has a claim to the New Testament Church which has blessed countless millions with salvation over the past 2000 years. It also obviously preached to Pharaoh as recorded in Romans 9:17 (referencing Exodus 9:16). Again, this is a similar situation as with Abraham, as there was no written Scripture in the days of Moses to preach to Pharaoh, yet it was done.
3. The Scripture did both before it came to us in a written form. The Scriptures are therefore eternal and would still exist even if every Bible in the world were destroyed.
4. The Scriptures can also draw conclusions, as in Galatians 3:22.
5. 2 Timothy 3:15 is also loaded, as it tells us that the Scriptures are able to make you wise unto salvation.

8b "In thee shall all nations be blessed" Quoted from Genesis 12:3 and 18:18.

Galatians

3:9 So then they which be of faith^a are blessed^{present passive} with faithful^b Abraham.^c

15. The Curse of the Law 3:10

3:10 For as many as are^{present} of the works of the law are^{present} under the curse:^a for it is written,^{b-perfect passive} Cursed is every one that continueth^{present} not^c in all things which are written^{b-perfect passive participle} in the book of the law to do^{aorist infinitive} them.^{d-e-f}

9a To be a child of Abraham and to share in the associated blessings, you must enter by faith, not by works, the same way he did.

9b faithful The NKJV uses “believing”. We think “faithful” is a better rendering. All the traditional versions use “faithful” so we see no good reason to change it. The ESV has “a man of faith” instead of Abraham being “faithful”.

9c “faithful Abraham” Despite the occasional lapse of faith, Abraham is still given this adjective and title of “faithful” because his heart condition was a faithful one and it was his pattern of life.

10a Those who are under the law, either by remaining unsaved or who voluntarily go back under the law after salvation (as the Galatians) are under the curse of the law. The curse of the law is this- the man who does not continue in all the things contained in the law come under its curse- judgment, condemnation and hell. The law demands to be fulfilled- do all the things contained therein and break no part of the law, else you come under its curse.

10b **“It is written”** Perfect tense- it has been written and remains written, not to be changed or altered. It is a completed action with continuous results or the continuance of an act completed in the past. The components are always a past action and continuous results. References to the Scriptures like this are often presented in the perfect tense. “The just shall live by faith” is one of those unalterable truths of Christianity. This perfect tense in reference to New Testament references to Old Testament texts is used 62 times in the New Testament, 16 times in Romans (1:17; 2:24; 3:4,10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13,33; 10:15; 11:8,26; 12:19; 14:11; 15:3,9,21). This usage of the perfect is a strong argument for the verbal and plenary preservation of the Scripture, as the written Old Testament word stands forever and continues to.

10c **“continueth not”** Not only does the curse extend to those who do not do the works of the law as a start, but even more to those who do not continue in this perfect obedience. They started keeping the law but did not or could not continue. This is the problem with a works-based salvation/keeping theological system- how long do you have to maintain this perfect obedience? For the rest of your lives, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, without let-up or respite. Who among the sons of Adam has that kind of stamina? You may pull it off for a day, maybe even a week, but not for the rest of your life! And the point remains- how will your current obedience to the law erase or pay for your past sins? It’s like a bank robber who has knocked off a hundred banks telling the judge “I won’t do it any more.” Well, that’s nice, but what about the hundred times you did it in the past? Promises of future obedience do not nullify past sins.

10d James 2:10 states that the man who breaks any point of the law becomes guilty of breaking all of the law. If a man is going to live by the law and seek his justification by the law, then he must keep the whole law, perfectly and entirely, with no lapses and no mistakes (James 2:10). But you lose even before you begin. A Judaizer will say “I will, starting today, keep the entire law and the Ten Commandments perfectly.” Well, you’ll last about 15 minutes before you break your first commandment, but the question remains “What about all your sins and violations of the law before today? How will you account for them? They must be reckoned somehow. How will you pay that debt?”

16. The Just Shall Live By Faith 3:11,12

3:11 But that no man is justified^{present passive} by the law in the sight of God,^a it is evident:^b for, The just^c shall live^{future middle} by faith.^{d-e}

10e The man who decides that he will reject the free gift of salvation and work for it instead by putting himself under the law (to get saved or to stay saved) must do the following (for starters).

1. Worship on Sabbath and be willing to be put to death if he breaks any Sabbath requirement. No Seventh-Day Adventists advocates such a thing! Yet why not? If the Sabbath is still to be enforced upon Christians, then why not the penalty for breaking the Sabbath, which is death? If it was good enough for a Jew, then why not for a ceremonial-law-observing Christian?
2. Abstain from pork, oysters, lobsters, crabs and other unclean foods.
3. Go up to Jerusalem 3 times a year for the feasts. Who does this today? Not even the Jews in Israel do! Some may observe the feasts at home but no one goes to Israel three times a year to do it.
4. Offer animal sacrifices. Yes, that's in the law, the ceremonial section! Since this person rejects the final solution for the sin problem as offered by the Lamb of God, he must revert back to the Old Testament "band aid" method of temporarily covering sins with the blood of animals without the question ever being resolved.

The problem is the law cannot be kept. We violate it regularly. A man, in order to escape the curse, must keep all the law for his entire life, without breaking it once. Even if you break the law accidentally or through ignorance, you still come under the curse because even "accidental" sins or sins of ignorance must be paid for by the guilty sinner.

Here is the foolishness of the Galatians. They were freed from this curse when they accepted salvation by grace. The law had no claim upon them for it had been fulfilled on their behalf by Christ. Now they went from that freedom from that curse and voluntarily placed themselves back under it! Why would anyone want to voluntarily curse themselves?

10f The last half of verse 10 is quoted from Deuteronomy 27:26.

11a No man can be justified by the law. It cannot be done and God never intended it to be so.

11b **"it is evident"** "This is just plain, old, common sense that I am surprised that you Galatians are having a hard time understanding."

11c The ESV makes an unnecessary change by using "the righteousness" instead of "the just" which the other translations use.

11d **"The just shall live by faith,"** This is similar to Habakkuk 2:4 except the "his" is omitted by Paul, for a reason, and the "Septuagint" has nothing to do with it, as Paul never would have quoted from such a piece of trash, even if it had existed in his day. The Old Testament saint had to live by his own faith, whatever he could muster up. He had no real help from God in that respect. The measure of his faith is largely dependent upon his observance of the law and the sacrifices as well as his acceptance of the available revelation he had. There is an element of works in a ceremonial sense in the Old Testament which affects a man's faith. The New Testament saint, on the other side of Calvary, need not depend on his own faith (which is feeble at best) but lives by the faith of Christ, imputed unto him at salvation. Also see Romans 1:17 and Hebrews 10:38, where this is repeated. Charles Spurgeon (*Sermon Notes*, 156) lists all 4 verses and puts them into the following context:

1. Habakkuk 2:4- exhibits faith as enabling a man to live on in peace and humility, while as yet the promise has not come to its maturity.
2. Romans 1:17- exhibits faith as working salvation from the evil which is in the world through lust.

Galatians

3:12 And the law is^{present} not of faith:^a but, The man that doeth^{aorist active participle} them shall live^{future middle} in them.^{b-c}

17. Redemption by Faith 3:13

3:13 Christ hath redeemed^{1805-a-b-c-aorist} us from the curse of the law, being made^{aorist middle participle} a curse for us:^d for it is written,^{1125-10b-perfect passive} Cursed is every one that hangeth^{present middle participle} on a tree:^{3586-e}

3. Galatians 3:11- exhibits faith as bringing to us that justification which saves us from the sentence of death.

4. Hebrews 10:38- exhibits faith as the life of final perseverance.

11e Three epistles in the New Testament quote Habakkuk 2:4, "The just shall live by his faith."

Romans 1:17 emphasizes *the just*;

Hebrews 10:38 emphasizes *shall live*;

Galatians 3:11 emphasizes *by faith*.

In Romans, the emphasis is upon the fact that man apart from the Law is justified before God. In Galatians, Paul is defending the gospel from those who would add law to justification by faith.

Faith plus law was the thrust of Judaism;

Faith plus nothing was the answer of Paul. (J. Vernon McGee, *Notes on Galatians*)

12a **The law is not of faith** because faith and works of the law are mutually exclusive and cannot co-exist, no matter what the Seventh-Day Adventists try to teach.

12b The keeping of the law does not require faith. It promises no forgiveness to believing, but requires obedience. It is not, "What do you believe?" but, "What have you done?" Any reprobate who put his mind to it could probably do a decent job (humanly speaking) of keeping the law. There are sinners who would never cheat on their spouses or steal or curse. They do have a sense of morality and conscience that keeps them from certain sins. But they are not saved. There is no faith required to be a moral person. I knew a Seventh Day Adventist girl once who was a worldly as any unsaved girl, yet she was very diligent in keeping the Sabbath and "obeying the law". Such observances did nothing for her to make her a better Christian (if she was saved at all). All these observances did was to give her a sense of legalistic assurance of "salvation" or "justification" (so called).

The law requires works, not faith. It doesn't care how much faith you have or don't have, as long as you keep the law. The only way to live in the law is to keep the law, which is impossible, so this man winds up dying in the law.

12c "**the man that doeth them shall live in them**" Quoted from Leviticus 18:5. The ESV makes yet another error by rendering this as "live by them".

13a Gentiles were never under the law as the Jews were but all men were under the curse of the law due to their sin against the law. Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law on the cross so that we could be freed from it. To revert back to law after having been saved by grace trods under foot the redemptive work of Christ on our behalf. In His redemptive work, Christ took our curse required for breaking the law. Since Christ was sinless and had no sinful nature, it was possible for Him to fulfill the law, which He did. He then was able to take our punishment which the law demanded of us since He had no sin of His own to pay for. Christ became the curse for us, in our stead, and suffered the consequences that we deserved. Christ became a curse (Deuteronomy 21:23) to redeem us from the curse. He actually became that curse (sin) personified as He hung on the cross. His mode of death even brought a curse. Christ died a curse on a cursed tree. When we go back under law, we make void Christ's suffering which He endured for us.

Galatians

Christ redeemed us from the slave market of sin with His own literal blood that He literally shed on Calvary. When we go back under the bondage of the Law through legalism, we then do despite to this blood and His death. It is the ultimate slap in the face to the redemptive work of Christ and His blood shed on our behalf. The sin that Seventh Day Adventists are guilty of! Why would anyone ever want to willingly become one?

13b Strong's #1805 εξαγοραζω exagorazô, from εκ ek (Strong's #1537) out of, from; and αγοραζω agorazô (Strong's #59) to buy; to buy up, ransom, to rescue from loss, to redeem from slavery

13c "**Redemption**"- to buy back, to purchase a slave with a view to granting him his freedom, to ransom. Christ did this for us with His blood shed on Calvary, to purchase fallen man back from the power and dominion of Satan, by virtue of Adam's fall. Only the blood of Christ can be the payment for this redemption (Romans 3:25; Hebrews 9:12; 1 Peter 1:18,19; Revelation 5:9).

A survey of Redemption:

1. Defined

- a. 1 Corinthians 6:20 For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's
- b. 1 Corinthians 7:23 Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.

2. By the blood of Christ

- a. Acts 20:28 Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.
- b. Romans 3:25 Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God;
- c. Ephesians 1:7 In Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace
- d. Colossians 1:14 In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins
- e. Hebrews 9:12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.
- f. 1 Peter 1:18,19 Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot:
- g. Revelation 5:9 And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation;

3. Redemption is from:

- a. The bondage of the law
 1. Galatians 4:5 To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.
- b. The curse of the law
 1. Galatians 3:13 Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree:
- c. The power of sin
 1. Romans 6:18 Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.
 2. Romans 6:22 But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life
- d. All iniquity
 1. Titus 2:14 Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.
- e. This evil world

18. The Blessings of the Abrahamic Covenant Through Faith 3:14-18

3:14^a That the blessing of Abraham might come^{aorist middle deponent subjunctive} on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ;^b that we might receive^{aorist active subjunctive} the promise of the Spirit through faith.^{c-d}

- 1. Galatians 1:4 Who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father:
- 4. Redemption gives us:
 - a. Justification
 - 1. Romans 3:24 Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus:
 - b. Forgiveness of sins
 - 1. Ephesians 1:7 In Him we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins according to the riches of His grace
 - 2. Colossians 1:14 In whom we have redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins
 - c. Adoption
 - 1. Galatians 4:4,5 To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons
- 5. Redemption is eternal
 - a. Hebrews 9:12 Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

Simply put, Christ had to become a curse under the Law (while on the cross when He was made sin) in order to redeem guilty sinners from that very same curse.

13d **“Redeemed us...made a curse for us...”** The “us” here is the entirety of mankind, not just the elect as the Calvinists would limit it, but every son and daughter of Adam, to whom salvation is offered. Naturally, all will not be saved, but all may be saved as this redemption is universal in its extent and offer.

13e Crucifixion was the more painful and shameful mode of execution in the Roman world. It was borrowed from the Persians. It was such a horrific mode of execution that no Roman citizen could be crucified. It was reserved for political criminals and the lowest of criminals. It was this form of death that was imposed upon Christ. Christ died to fulfill the law but He was not given the “honor” of being put to death by the law, which would have involved stoning. But the Jewish leaders wanted to humiliate Christ as much as possible in His death, so they insisted on crucifixion. But through the crucifixion, Christ became a literal curse in order to remove the curse of sin that was on us.

14a Paul is using rabbinical-style reasoning here, since he was once a rabbi and he is reasoning with Judaizers in a Jewish mindset. “The rabbis were very fond of using arguments which depended on the interpretations of single words: they would erect a whole theology on one word. Paul takes one word on the Abraham story and erects an argument on it (William Barclay, “The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians” in *The Daily Study Bible Series*, page 28)”

14b **“Jesus Christ”** The Greek order is “Christ Jesus” yet the KJV keeps the Tyndale and Cramner rendering while the Geneva and the ESV and NKJV have the literal rendering.

14c All this was done so that this blessing of Abraham may come upon those who accept the promise of the Spirit by faith, shunning works and the law for their righteousness.

Galatians

3:15 Brethren,^a I speak^{present} after the manner of men;^{a-b} Though it be but a man's covenant, yet *if it be confirmed*, no man disannulleth,^{present} or addeth thereto.^{c-}
present middle passive

3:16 Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made.^{orist passive} He saith^{present} not, And to seeds,^a as of many; but as of one,^b And to thy seed,^a which is^{present} Christ.

14d Summary-

1. The Old Testament saint under the law must perform works as an evidence of his faith (James 2:21 Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?).
2. These works cannot justify him unto salvation (Galatians 3:11 But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith.) unless faith accompanies them (Hebrews 11:39 And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise:).
3. The Old Testament saint lives by doing (Ezekiel 18:5-9), unlike the New Testament saint, who already has the work done for him by Christ.
4. When the Old Testament saint "quits doing" (as David, Psalm 51:11 Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me.), he finds himself in a very difficult spiritual condition before God (like Samson in Judges 16:20). God can take the Holy Spirit from the Old Testament saint permanently (Saul) or temporarily (Samson) or not at all (David), but even under the law exceptions are made. For example, grace is everywhere manifest in the life of Samson who never repents, confesses, or restores anything one time in a lifetime of continued transgression. But "Eternal Security" (as presented in the New Testament) is unknown in the Old Testament apart from the Psalms, where David was given "sure mercies" (Acts 13:34) that other men were not given, but it is "his faith" (Habakkuk 2:4); whereas the New Testament believer is living by "the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me" (Galatians 2:20).

15a Despite their defection from grace and treatment of him, the Galatians were still "brethren". Paul was treating them better than they had treated him.

15b "**I speak after the manner of men**" Paul is going to give a human illustration from common, ordinary life that the Galatians could relate to and understand.

In 3:15-18 Paul now gives a human illustration to add to his discussion in using the idea of covenants. If a covenant is agreed to by both parties and duly ratified, it cannot be legally disannulled (3:15). God made a covenant with Abraham on the basis of faith, not law (3:16). All covenants and promises God made with Abraham were made centuries (430 years) before the law was given to Moses. It was an unconditional covenant. God agreed to it and did not need Abraham's approval, although he certainly gave it. This covenant was therefore agreed upon (3:18). The point is God worked with Abraham not on basis of law but faith. Abraham knew nothing of any Mosaic Law to keep. How could he keep a law that he knew nothing of? The law could not disannul those promises that were made by faith (3:18).

15c This is because God made the covenant with Abraham and it was unconditional. God would fulfill it regardless of what Abraham would do. Since man was no party in ratifying or fulfilling this covenant, man could end it, reject it or annul it. Only God could but He would not and never has and never will.

16a The ESV uses "offspring" for "seed".

16b There is only one "seed of Abraham" and it is not the physical seed of Abraham, but rather, those who believe in the same God Abraham believed in and served. The Bible does not honor "racial Judaism" or "cultural Judaism" or "Zionism" but rather, Jews who accept Christ and believe the prophets.

Galatians

3:17 And this I say, ^{present} *that the covenant, that was confirmed before* ^{perfect passive participle} **of God in Christ, the law, which was** ^{perfect active participle} **four hundred and thirty years after,** ^a **cannot disannul,** ^{present} **that it should make the promise of none effect.** ^{aorist infinitive}

3:18 For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave ^{perfect middle/passive deponent} **it to Abraham by promise.** ^{a-b}

19. The Purpose of the Law 3:19,20

3:19 Wherefore then serveth the law? ^{a-b-c} **It was added** ^{aorist passive} **because of transgressions, till the seed** ^{16a-19d} **should come** ^{d-aorist active subjunctive} **to whom the promise was made,** ^{perfect middle/passive deponent} **and it was ordained** ^{aorist passive participle} **by angels** ^e **in the hand of a mediator.** ^f

17a The giving of the law came 430 years after the giving of the covenant promises to Abraham in the Abrahamic Covenant. The Tyndale gives the figure of 430 as Roman numerals.

18a If any inheritance, including the one associated with the Abrahamic Covenant, is by law or works, then it cannot be by grace, because works would cancel out grace and a works-based covenant could not be based on a promise, since it would be based on debt instead.

18b The ESV has “by a promise” while the other translations omit the indefinite article. The ESV rendering is too restrictive. The Abrahamic Covenant covered a lot of ground and it is certainly larger than just “a promise”. God gave many promises to Abraham so it is a better rendering to use “promise” to cover all of the promises that God made to him instead of just trying to pick out one promise.

19a So then why was the Law given? What is its purpose? If it cannot justify or save, then why was it given? What use is it?

1. It was added because of transgressions (3:19). The Law was not given until Exodus 20. Why not in Genesis 3? God gave the Law because of the increasing sin and wickedness of mankind. It was designed to be in effect until the seed (which is Christ) should come. Christ would then fulfill that Law by His perfect life and death on the cross. If there had been no sin or if man was not a sinner, there would be no need for a law to define sin and to give penalties. But man sinned after Adam’s fall, so a law was necessary condemn man in that sin. You cannot condemn a man if there is no law by which to condemn him. In order to convince man that he is a sinner who is under condemnation, God gave a law. Man broke it and God could show man the basis for his condemnation.

2. It was given to condemn all men of being under sin (3:22). It shut us up, painted us into a corner (3:23). Men tend to proclaim their own righteousness and think themselves as really being pretty good or not being so bad. But whenever the Law comes along, that self-righteous man is condemned as being a sinner without any out. This is what the Law does- it does not justify us- it condemns us and puts us, as it were, into hell. Here is its main purpose- to condemn us of sin. It defines sin and explains to us what it is. The Law is designed to convince us of our sin and to take away our excuses and self-righteousness.

The Law cannot save, sanctify, redeem. or make a sinner a better person. All it does is show man his sinful condition and reveals the helplessness of the sinner to save himself by promised future obedience to the law.

Galatians

3:20 Now a mediator^a is^{present} not a mediator of one, but God is^{present} one.^b

20. All Under Sin 3:21-23

**3:21 Is the law then against the promises of God?^a God forbid:^{b-aorist middle optative}
for if there had been a law given^{aorist passive} which could^{present middle/passive participle} have
given life,^{aorist infinitive} verily righteousness should have been^{imperfect} by the law.^c**

19b Charles Spurgeon lists the uses of the Law ("The Uses of the Law" in *The New Park Street Pulpit* 3:170-175, sermon 128):

1. It manifests to man his guilt.
2. It slays all hope of salvation by a reformed life. Can you wipe away your transgression by promises of future obedience? What of your transgressions of the past? They must be dealt with.
3. It is intended to show man the misery which will fall upon him through his sin. Spurgeon calls the law a "ten -thronged whip" with which God lashes the sinner daily.
4. It was sent to show the value of a Savior.
5. It keeps Christian men from self-righteousness.

19c There was a movement that made a lot of noise in the 1980s and 1990s called Christian Reconstruction, or Theonomy. You don't hear much from them today (2010). They would answer Paul's question as something like "God gave the Mosaic Law to provide a framework for the operation of every nation's government." They believe God wants America and all the other nations to operate like the Old Testament Mosaic theocracy. Reconstructionists anticipate a day when Christians will govern using the Old Testament as the law book". They were looking for the collapse of Western Civilization and its "reconstruction" based on Old Testament Law. With that presupposition, it was obvious to see that they were not dispensationalist or premillennial. They were supporters of Covenant Theology and were Calvinistic. Their "high water mark" came in 2000 with the anticipation of the "Y2K" bug where all computers were supposed to crash on January 1, 2000. When that didn't happen, the movement lost a lot of steam.

19d "**till the seed should come**" Christ, who would be the "end" or fulfillment of the law (Romans 10:4). Again, the ESV uses "offspring" as it did in 3:16.

19e "**ordained by angels**" See Acts 7:53, although this is not mentioned in Exodus. But angels were involved in the delivery of the law.

19f "**by the hand of a mediator**" which would be Moses as he stood between the nation of Israel and God in the deliverance of the Law. The ESV uses "intermediary".

20a A mediator is needed because there are two disputing parties- God and Man. And Christ, who is the God-Man is that Mediator and He is the only mediator between God and man. The ESV uses "intermediary".

20b "**God is one**" God does not need a mediator or an outside agency to make His promises and covenants valid. God, being Who He is, can validate His own Word without anyone's help. God dealt with Abraham directly, without a mediator. The law is thus inferior to promise because both angels and Moses were needed for the giving of the law to Israel yet God dealt directly with Abraham without a mediator.

21a The question then comes: Is the Law against the promises of God? Of course not- away with the thought! Having just discussed the disjunction of the Mosaic law from the Abrahamic Covenant in 3:15-18 and then the inferiority of the law to God's direct redemptive activity in 3:19,20, Paul now deals with

Galatians

3:22 But the Scripture hath concluded^{a-aorist-} all under sin,^b that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given^{aorist passive subjunctive} to them that believe.

3:23 But before faith came,^{a-aorist infinitive} we were kept^{imperfect passive} under the law, shut up^{b-perfect passive participle} unto the faith which should afterwards^{present active participle} be revealed.^{aorist passive infinitive}

21. The Law Our Schoolmaster 3:24,25

3:24 Wherefore the law was^{perfect} our schoolmaster^{a-b} to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified^{aorist passive subjunctive} by faith.

the question as to whether the logical conclusion of this is that the law was somehow in contradiction and opposition to the promises of God, a notion Paul quickly squelches.

21b **“God forbid!”** The NKJV and ESV use the weaker “certainly not!” despite the fact that all the traditional versions (not just the King James) use “God forbid!”

21c What the Law could not do:

1. It could not give life. If it could, then why was the Law seen to be ineffective in giving righteousness? Righteousness could not come by the Law.
2. It could not give the promise of faith- that came by Christ to all who believe (not do, as in doing the Law) (3:22).
3. It could not justify us (3:24).
4. Could not make us children of God (3:26). It could not save us or assist us in our salvation. It could not assist us in our adoption into the family of God.

22a The Scripture foresees in 3:8 and draws conclusions here.

22b **“But the scripture hath concluded all under sin”** The grand conclusion of Scripture regarding the state and condition of man. The NJKV is much weaker, with “confined all under sin” although all the traditional versions read “concluded all under sin”, so again, there is no good reason for the NKJV to change the reading. The ESV has a very odd reading “But the Scripture imprisoned everything under sin”. How is that an improvement on the traditional readings? The Coverdale reading is closer to the ESV reading but even the Coverdale is better here.

23a **“before faith came...”** The time of the Mosaic dispensation of the law.

23b The law had us **shut up**, painted into a corner without any way out at all (as seen by use of the perfect tense). We were in an absolutely hopeless condition. The allusion may be an Eastern one, to the custom of eastern nations in the usage of their slaves and captives, who in the daytime used to grind at a mill in a prison house, and in the nighttime were put down into a pit and shut up, and a millstone put to the mouth of the pit (John Gill, *Commentary on the Entire Bible*, 9:22-23). This is why the Geneva uses military language of being “shut up as under a garrison”.

24a **“schoolmaster”** The NKJV uses “tutor” but “schoolmaster” is a stronger and better rendering than “tutor” as a tutor would not have all the authority of a slave/schoolmaster. The traditional versions will all read “schoolmaster” while the Rheims Douay of 1582 will simply transliterate “pedagogue”. The same observation holds true in 3:25. The ESV has a very inferior “guardian”, yet another unnecessary change that really clarifies nothing.

Galatians

3:25 But after that faith is come, ^{a-aorist active participle} we are ^{present} no longer under a schoolmaster.^b

The schoolmaster was not a teacher as we think of one. In Greek and Roman society, a wealthy man with a son would not raise that son himself but would place a trusted, or superior slave to be the teacher (or valet) to that son. It would be the responsibility of that slave to teach the man's son his academic and social lessons to make that son worthy to bear his father's name in public. The slave would raise the son in the stead of the father. If the son had matured properly, learned all his lessons and learned how to conduct himself in a responsible way in society, the slave would then inform his master that his son was ready to assume his place as his son. The man would then throw a huge feast where he would publicly acknowledge the boy as his son. The youth, hitherto subject to domestic rule of the schoolmaster was now admitted to the rights and responsibilities of a citizen. He now took his place beside his father in the councils of the family. The son would exchange the "toga praetexta" for the "toga virilis" and pass into the rank of citizens. Compare this to the "putting on of Christ" in 3:27. This is closely associated with adoption, which we will discuss later. Under the old Roman law, a man was not of full age until he was 25.

The Law had a similar ministry to us. The Law was to teach us the lessons about faith and grace. When we had learned those lessons that the Father required us to learn, then we would be adopted into grace. When a man moves from the legalism of the Law into the faith of grace, then he has "graduated". What does this say about the Christian (or even the non-Christian) who still clings to the Law for his justification in this age of grace? He hasn't learned his lessons from the schoolmaster- the Law! He has flunked! This shows us that the Seventh-Day Adventists (modern Judaizers) are the most spiritually immature people around today for they have failed in the School of the Law. Once they look to Christ for their justification rather than the Law, then they may advance with the rest of us.

24b What exactly does the schoolmaster teach us? (Charles Spurgeon, "The Stern Pedagogue" in *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, 20:554ff, sermon 1196).

1. Our obligations to God.
2. Our own sinfulness.
3. It also sweeps away all our excuses.
4. It chides us and chastens us for our failures to keep the Law. "The Law will serve us as the pedagogue did the boy- it will accompany and follow us up everywhere. The old pedagogue went with the boy to the playground: he did not let him play in peace. He went upstairs to bed with him: he did not sing some old song to get rid of his feelings, but the more he tries to drown his misery, the more the dark forebodings come before his mind. He cannot rest...Perhaps...a man goes to the house of God. The law follows him there. If the preacher preaches a comforting sermon, the law says "This is not or you. You have nothing to do with that. You are under my government, not under Christ..." "Hard lines" say you. You do not like this pedagogue. Nor did I when I was under him. Glad was I when the day came that I was of age."

25a Salvation by faith in this New Testament dispensation.

25b Being under law requires the schoolmaster. But mature believers who are under grace need no pedagogue.

The ESV continues to use the inferior "guardian" for a "schoolmaster". A "guardian" does not necessarily teach anything, as the schoolmaster/pedagogue does.

Galatians

22. Children of God by Faith 3:26

3:26 For ye are^{present} all the children of God by faith^{a-b} in Christ Jesus.^c

23. Baptized into Christ 3:27

3:27 For as many of you as have been baptized^{aorist passive} into Christ^a have put on^{aorist middle} Christ.^b

24. No Nationality in Christ 3:28

3:28 There is^{present} neither Jew nor Greek,^a there is^{present} neither bond^b nor free, there is^{present} neither male nor female:^c for ye are^{present} all one in Christ Jesus.^d

26a We are the children of God by faith in Christ, not by the Law. The Law could not make us sons nor did it have any role to play in our divine sonship. No man is a child of God through circumcision or by obedience to the law.

26b This verse is not a proof-text for the heresy of Universalism, which teaches that "God is the Father of All Men", but only those who are "of faith." We are creations of God but only believers who have experienced the New Birth can be called "sons of God".

26c "**Christ Jesus**" Paul is emphasizing the deity of Christ over His humanity by use of this word order.

27a We have put on Christ not by the Law but through our baptism. When we were water baptized, we identified with the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. We also put on Christ through that act of obedience in Spirit baptism at our salvation. Again, the law had no place in it.

This verse is not a proof-text for baptismal regeneration, although it is certainly abused for that purpose to prop up this heresy.

27b From the comments under 3:24,25, the immature son would exchange the "toga praetexta" for the "toga virilis" and pass into the rank of citizens at his adoption. We also change clothes at salvation, from the filthy rags of our own righteousness (Isaiah 64:6) to literally putting on Christ. He becomes our garment and clothing.

"In antiquity, men wore the garb of their rank, i.e., their clothing was a badge indicating who they were, and what their status was. Sumptuary laws required the same kind of identification well into the modern era and made it illegal for a man or a woman to dress above his rank. Paul has an amazing reference to this practice in this verse. This means we wear the marks of membership, citizenship, in the royal household of the King of kings and Lord of lords! The parable of the wedding feast tells us the same thing (Matthew 22:1-14). No man has any place in the royal court unless he is one who puts on the raiment of the king, i.e., is a member of the family of the king in word, thought and deed (R.J. Rushdoony, "Baptism and Citizenship" *Chalcedon Position Paper* 37, February, 1983)."

28a Here we are told that faith in Christ eliminates all racial, national and gender distinctions. We are one in Christ. We are not Jewish Christians or Female Christians or Slave Christians, we are Christians. This is only in Christ. We still retain these human distinctions as we move about in our earthly sphere, but they do not affect our spiritual standing in Christ.

25. Abraham's Seed 3:29

3:29 And if ye^a be Christ's, then are^{present} ye Abraham's seed,^b and heirs according to the promise.^c

28b The ESV continues to insist on using "slave" in cases like this, but "bond" is to be preferred because you can be "bond" (like being an indentured servant or simply an employee) without being a slave. All the other translations also use "bond".

28c "**neither male nor female**" This does not disannul any sexual or racial prohibitions in the Christian life. For example, women still cannot assume leadership roles in the church. This oneness in Christ is our standing in Christ and our spiritual life in Christ. It does not deal with earthly service or ministry. You can use this as a proof text (incorrectly and dishonestly) in support of women preachers.

It is also poor exposition to use this verse as a proof text for the mistaken idea that we are all going to be males in heaven, and will all be carbon copies of Jesus Christ in our glorified bodies. This teaching also has the idea that there will be no women in heaven. Peter Ruckman is the main proponent of this doctrine.

28d We are all equal in the eyes of Christ. He does not favor the rich over the poor or the master over the slave in the Kingdom of God. We all have equal spiritual privileges and access to and in Christ. But again, this does supersede or eliminate earthly station. If a master and his slave are saved, the the slave is still under his master unless he is released (see the book of Philemon, where Paul never orders the Christian Philemon to release Onesimus. Instead, he sends Onesimus back to slavery! Nor does Paul waste 5 seconds in trying to make Philemon feel guilty about owning slaves. Also, a saved rich man is under no Gospel obligation to become a Socialist and give the poor man all of his money. And a woman remains a woman with the privileges and prohibitions which accompany that after salvation.

29a Emphatic.

29b If we are saved, we are of the seed of Abraham. This is obviously not the physical seed but the spiritual seed. Thus Abraham has two seeds: a physical one (Israel) and a spiritual one (all believers). Gentiles are even more "Abraham's seed" than a non-believing Jew would be. Again, this was something that the Law could not do.

The ESV uses "offspring".

29c This is not a proof text for Covenant Theology, although they certainly try to make it such. This theological system teaches that the Church is Israel now, that God is finished with Israel and that the Kingdom promises made to Israel have been transferred to the church. When Israel rejected Christ, both on the cross and during the "second offers" from Acts 2-7, God then forsook Israel and turned to the Church in its place. Thus God transferred all the kingdom promises from Israel to the Church. THIS IS HERESY! 1 Corinthians 10:32 clearly makes the New Testament distinction between Israel and the Church of God, showing that Israel still exists in this dispensation. God has NOT forsaken Israel. Romans 11:1,2 makes this perfectly clear. Israel is "on the shelf" during the Church Age but after the Rapture, they will be pressed back into active service in the Tribulation. The Millennium will also show Israel in its proper place and relation to God. The only way Covenant Theology can possibly work is to reject the plain, literal teaching of Scripture and spiritualize everything until it fits your theological system.

You can spot a Covenant Theologian as a man who reads the Church into Isaiah 40-66. The New Testament Church is not the subject of Isaiah 40-66, but Israel in the Millennium. For example, look at the page headings in the *Thompson Chain Reference Bible* in Isaiah 40-66 and you will see headings like "God's Promise to the Church" (page 779) or "God's Great Mercies to the Church" (page 777). This is Covenant Theology and it is wrong.

Galatians

Covenant Theology/postmillennialism is spiritual vampirism because it steals the very life-blood of Israel (the Kingdom Promises) and gives them to the Church. This is theft which God never authorized and will never bless. Vampirism? Strong words, but what would you call sucking the life-blood from a nation? If you steal the Kingdom promises and covenants from Israel, what do they have left?

Galatians 3:25-29 is used for proof-texts for the following heresies:

1. Antinomianism, that we are no longer under the law as a schoolmaster (3:25).
2. Universalism, that everyone is saved or will be saved (3:26).
3. Baptismal Regeneration, that water baptism is necessary for salvation, thus adding works to grace (3:27).
4. Homosexuality (3:28).
5. Covenant Theology and Postmillennialism (3:29).

Galatians Chapter 4

26. Spiritual Childhood 4:1-3

4:1 Now I say,^{present} That the heir, as long as he is^{present} a child, differeth^{present} nothing from a servant,^a though he be^{present participle} lord of all,^b

4:2 But is^{present} under tutors and governors^a until the time appointed of the father.^{b-c}

4:3 Even so we,^a when we were^{mperfect} children, were^{mperfect} in bondage^{b-perfect passive participle} under the elements of the world:^{c-d}

1a The New King James and ESV use “slave”, which is not as good as the King James “servant”. This is an unnecessary change. There is a difference between a servant and a slave. A slave serves because he must and receives little, if any, wages. A servant serves because he wants to and he receives wages for his service. 1 Corinthians 9:17 explains the difference.

1b This goes back to the schoolmaster of Galatians 3:24,25. The child, as long as he is under the schoolmaster, has no rights and no authority in the house. He differs little from a servant. Now this child may be a prince and a future king. He may be a millionaire. But as long as he is under the schoolmasters that his father placed over him, he is nothing more than a servant. He comes into his privileges when he has learned his lessons and demonstrated his maturity. As long as he is a minor, the child cannot come into his full status. He is not his own man, nor at his own disposal. He can't do what he pleases. He is under restraint. He is kept to school or to business and is liable to correction and chastisement according as he behaves. Nor can he have the free use of his father's estate, though he be Lord of all. Adults and men don't need tutors, but children do.

The ESV has “owner of everything”. What is wrong with “lord of all” that it had to be “updated”? The other translations all use “lord”.

2a The New King James uses “guardians and stewards” instead of “tutors and governors”, which is another unnecessary change. The ESV tries its hand with “guardians and managers”. It seems that the critical text translations like to make changes in the text for the sake of making changes (and to demonstrate their independence from the traditional manuscripts) and no other reason.

2b This is explained under the discussion regarding “adoption” under 3:24,25 and 4:4,5.

2c The schoolmaster is a temporary office, reserved for the education and training of children. But full-grown men have no need of a schoolmaster. In this context, legalizers would be the spiritual children who would require the training and the discipline of the law, but those who have graduated to grace are full-grown men who have outgrown their need for the schoolmaster.

3a Emphatic.

3b The ESV uses “enslaved”.

3c Paul makes the application to the time when we were under the Law, which he calls "bondage". We were either still unsaved or had deliberately gone back to the Law. The Law still had its demands on us and we were still under its tutelage. We were not yet sons. This is a miserable position to be in when we could be freed from it if we would simply learn our lesson that the Law has been fulfilled for us by Christ

27. The Time and Purpose of the Virgin Birth 4:4,5

4:4^a But when the fullness of the time was come,^{aorist} God sent forth^{aorist} his Son, made^{aorist middle participle} of a woman,^{b-c-d} made^{aorist middle participle} under the law,^e

and that we are no longer bound to it. Unsaved people and Seventh Day Adventists fall into this position- still in bondage under the elements of the world while we who live by faith under grace are full sons.

3d The ESV has “elementary principles of the world” which is much inferior to the “elements of the world” used by the King James. The other translations are also better than the longer and wordier ESV rendering. Tyndale uses “ordinances of the world”. Coverdale is not as good with “outward traditions”. Both the Geneva and Bishops use “rudiments of the world”. Also see the ESV make the same mistake in 4:9.

4a It has been well said that Galatians 4:4-7 form the marrow of Christian divinity. In this passage we see:

1. The determination of God to redeem the world (not merely the Calvinistic "elect") by the incarnation of his Son.
2. The manifestation of the Son in the fullness of time.
3. The circumstances in which the Son appeared: sent forth; made of a woman; made under the law; to be a sufferer; and to die as a sacrifice.
4. The redemption of the world, by the death of Christ, as He came to redeem them that were under the law, who were condemned and cursed by it.
5. By the redemption price He secures sonship or adoption for mankind.
6. God the Father sends the Holy Ghost into the hearts of believers, by which they, through the full confidence of their adoption, call him their Father.
7. Being made children, they become heirs, and God is their portion throughout eternity.

4b The time of our liberation from the Law came at the birth of Christ. He freed us from the demands and the penalty of the Law by being born of a virgin, according to the Scriptures, living a perfect life that fulfilled the Law, and died under the Law in our place so that by His fulfillment and death under the Law, we could be freed from it to come into our full position as sons.

4c The circumstances around the virgin birth of Christ.

1. **It occurred at the determined time.** Daniel, in his prophecy of the 70 Weeks, pinpointed down to the day of the cutting off of the Messiah. If we backtracked 33 years and a few months, we would get the date of the virgin birth. If He died in April, AD 30, He would have been born around September or October 3 B.C. I choose A.D. 30 for the date of the death of Christ because Israel entered into a 40-year probation period when they rejected Christ. The judgment fell in 70 at the destruction of the temple, so backtrack 40 years to 30, rather than 33.
2. **It occurred in the fullness of time.** The circumstances for the birth of Christ had to be in place. The Roman Empire, the apostasy of the nation of Israel and all other political, social and religious had to be in place. The world had to come to a mature age in order for it to be liberated by the Messiah. The Law had to have sufficient time to complete its educational ministry to man. Christ did not come in the days of Manasseh or Ahab or Sodom or the Assyrian Empire or in the days of the popes or Hitler or Stalin, but in the days of Herod. How much worse were these days than the other bad periods of human history?
3. **God sent forth His Son.** God has a Son- He is Christ. This is contrary to United Pentecostals and other heretics and cultists who deny the Biblical revelation of the Trinity. This denies the teaching that attacks the sonship of Christ.

Galatians

4:5 To redeem^{aorist active subjunctive} them that were under the law, that we might receive^{aorist active subjunctive} the adoption of sons.^{a-b}

4. **He was made of a woman.** Not of a man, since man had no part in it. This confirms the virgin birth, the supernaturalness of that birth. But it also stresses His human birth, even if it was supernatural. This ties in with Genesis 3:15 and the phrase "seed of the woman". The woman has no seed, but the man. Yet such a phrase demonstrates that there was something very unusual in the birth of this "seed".

5. **Made under the Law.** Christ was an observant Jew born into the Old Testament dispensation, under the Law. He could not have fulfilled the Law unless He had been subject to it.

4d The New King James weakens the doctrine of the virgin birth here by using "born of a woman" instead of "made of a woman". The ESV does the same thing. Every man is "born of a woman". There is nothing special or unusual about that. But use of "made" suggests something that is more unusual and unique. There is no good reason for this change from the traditional rendering.

4e Why did Christ come?

1. **To redeem us who were under the Law.** To purchase us from that slave market of sin with His own blood.

2. **That we might receive the adoption of sons.** This was discussed under 3:24,25. After that boy had learned all his lessons and had matured sufficiently, he was recognized by his father and he thus entered into his full position of sonship. We would assume that some sons never got to this point. Yes they were still sons of their father but only in a biological sense. They failed or refused to complete the education and training that the schoolmaster tried to impart to them. This boy is a failure and a shame to his father's name. Now he is still a son but he does not receive the adoption. He does not enter into the same rights and privileges that the adopted son receives. A son but with no inheritance! No privileges! No family name! No recognition from the father! Multitudes of Christians will no doubt suffer such a fate as a result of how they fare at the Judgment Seat of Christ. The education is on earth. The Law tries to teach them the lessons of grace and living by the faith of Christ. They fail in some manner. They never leave the Law but continue to live in legalism. That son will not be a blessing to the family name. He failed or refused to learn his lessons as a Christian. The Father, at the Bema, will not recognize that Christian as a legal son. He is a son through the new birth but not a legal son with the inheritance and authority as the adoptive son enjoys! Saved yes, but with little to show for it in heaven! The Christian who is not publicly adopted at the Bema, they are still saved but would probably not participate in helping Christ to rule in the Millennium. I believe this public recognition occurs at the Bema Seat. This is where our Christian life and ministry is evaluated. What better place to have our sonship-education evaluated by our Father? If we "pass" are have obeyed the schoolmaster and learned his lessons, we are adopted. But that Christian who is "saved, as though by fire" will not enjoy the benefits of spiritual adoption.

5a A summary of adoption

1. Definition.

1. It is a Pauline doctrine for the word occurs only in the Pauline Epistles.

2. It means "to place on as a son". It is nothing like our modern concept or practice of adoption. In Greek and Roman society, a wealthy man with a son would not raise that son himself but would place a trusted, or superior slave to be the teacher (or valet) to that son. It would be the responsibility of that slave to teach the man's son his academic and social lessons to make that son worthy to bear his father's name in public. The slave would raise the son in the stead of the father. If the son had matured properly, learned all his lessons and learned how to conduct himself in a responsible way in society, the slave would then inform his master that his son was ready to assume his place as his son. The man would then throw a huge feast where he would publicly acknowledge the boy as his son. The youth, hitherto subject to domestic rule of the

Galatians

schoolmaster was now admitted to the rights and responsibilities of a citizen. He now took his place beside his father in the councils of the family. The son would exchange the "toga praetexta" for the "toga virilis" and pass into the rank of citizens. Compare this to the "putting on of Christ" in 3:27. Under the old Roman law, a man was not of full age until he was 25. Spiritually, our "training time" is our time on earth and the law is our schoolmaster. Our evaluation by the Father will come at the Bema Seat judgment (Revelation 4:1-3, notice the throne there). The Father will examine whether we have learned the necessary spiritual lessons that the schoolmaster sought to teach us and whether our lives and ministries on earth have brought honor or dishonor to the family name (the reputation of the Father). If the Father is pleased with us, He will adopt us at the Bema and we will enter the Millennial Kingdom with all the spiritual privileges of sonship. If we are disapproved at the Bema, we are still reckoned as sons (by virtue of the New Birth) but we are "saved, as though by fire" and enter into the Millennium with no privileges or recognition of sonship.

2. Verses

1. Romans 8:15 For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.
2. Romans 8:23 And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.
3. Romans 9:4 Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises;
4. Galatians 4:5 To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.
5. Ephesians 1:5 Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will,

3. The Nature of Adoption

1. It is a legal act.
2. It is based on the death of Christ.
4. It originated in God's sovereignty and is associated with predestination. As with predestination, adoption only deals with Christians. No sinner is predestinated to anything. Predestination deals with the sanctification of the believer, not the salvation of the sinner. The Calvinist makes this fatal mistake in his understanding of predestination. See Ephesians 1:5.

5. The Benefits of Adoption

1. Freedom from Legal Bondage.
2. Reception of the Spirit of God.
3. Boldness and Assurance.
4. An Inheritance.
5. Family privileges. When we are made sons of God, we receive full family privileges and responsibilities of sonship. The adopted son has all the privileges of the father, including business and social responsibilities, that an unadopted son would not have.

6. Differences between civil and spiritual adoption.

1. There may be some pleasing aspects of the adoptive child in the eyes of earthly parents but there are none in us.
2. Civil adoption cannot impart the nature of the parent to the child but spiritual adoption can.
3. In some cases, civil adoption can be rendered null and void but not so with spiritual adoption (linked to eternal security).

5b The New King James and ESV change the preposition of "adoption of sons" to "adoption as sons". This is another unnecessary change by the critical text versions.

Galatians

28. No Longer Servants but Sons 4:6,7

4:6 And because ye are^{present} sons,^a God hath sent forth^{aorist} the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying,^{present active participle} Abba, Father.^b

4:7 Wherefore thou art^{present} no more a servant,^{1401-1a} but a son;^b and if a son, then an heir of God through Christ.^b

29. The Folly of Returning to the Law 4:8-11

4:8 Howbeit then, when ye knew^{perfect passive participle} not God, ye did service^{a-aorist} unto them which by nature are^{present participle} no gods.^b

6a But now that Christ has come, fulfilled the demands of the Law and redeemed us from its penalty, we are now sons rather than servants. We are no longer under the Law and it is no longer our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.

6b We have the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit in our hearts now which gives us that spirit whereby we may cry "Abba Father". This is a witness of our sonship. This is because we are sons. I see two levels of sonship:

1. Common sonship which we all enjoy now. All Christians are sons and enjoy the common family privileges of that new birth sonship. This comes through the new birth, which places us within the family of God as a common son, just as physical birth would place us into a human family.
2. Adoptive sonship which spiritual Christians will enjoy, coming into full possession of at the Bema. This is sonship conferred.

7a Now we are no longer servants but are sons and we may cry "Abba Father." No slave was ever allowed to refer to his master with this term of affection. Every Christian has the privilege and position of sonship. But how many are not living up to their privileges by voluntarily going back under the Law and living a life of legalism?

The ESV uses "slave" instead of "servant".

7b Not only are we sons but we are also heirs. We have an inheritance awaiting for us in heaven, which includes many things:

1. Eternal life
2. A home/mansion in heaven
3. Eternal fellowship with the Father
4. Deliverance from sin

8a The ESV has "enslaved" instead of "did service". Again, this is a very poor translation by the ESV. It is possible to serve a false god or a false theological system (or even the law in a legalistic sense) willingly, without any idea of slavery. The other translations all use "did service".

8b This is referencing the former idolatry of these Gentile converts. They were religious and served their gods with a laudable dedication, but they served not the true God. It should be our goal to serve the One True God with more dedication and zeal than the heathens serve their non-existent gods.

Galatians

4:9 But now, after that ye have known^{aorist active participle} God, or rather are known^{aorist passive participle} of God, how turn^{present} ye again^a to the weak and beggarly^{4434-b} elements,^{c-d} whereunto ye desire^{present} again to be in bondage?^{e-}
present infinitive

4:10 Ye observe^{present middle} days, and months, and times,^a and years.^b

9a But here is something that makes absolutely no sense. We were saved. The Law has now been fulfilled in our lives by the death of Christ. It no longer has any claim on us. We now live under grace. What a glorious liberty! But why on earth would some Christians, after having tasted this liberty that is in Christ, go back under bondage? Why place oneself back under the curse of the law? The law could not save us but you are going to look to it for sanctification and justification with God? You are going to go back to something for your sanctification that was never designed for sanctification? What sense does this make?

9b “**beggarly**” Strong’s #4434 πτωχος ptochos; a beggar (as cringing), pauper, poor. The ESV has “worthless” but the other translations all use “beggarly”, which is better than “worthless”. It involves the idea of a beggar, who has nothing and nothing to offer, even if he thinks himself to be rich. But he is wretched, poor, blind and naked.

9c What is the Law referred to as?

- 1. Weak
- 2. Beggarly
- 3. Bondage

The Law is utterly impotent to do the things in the believer's life that grace does and what Christ did by coming into the world.

9d As in 4:3, the ESV uses the very clunky “elementary principles of the world” which is no improvement over the various traditional text renderings.

9e The ESV uses “slaves” for “bondage”.

10a The ESV has “seasons”. The other translations all use “times”.

10b The marks of this spiritual bondage and legalism is seen in the observing days and months and times and years. It involves binding oneself to the Sabbath (which is not binding upon Christians), feast days, holy days...

Many Christians are still in such a self-imposed bondage today. They observe Sunday as something of a Christian Sabbath and will force those under their authority to treat it as such- no shopping, no going out to eat, no fun! Some feel bound by observances of Christmas and Easter. As Christians, we are under no such obligations to these days. If you want to observe Christmas and Easter, you are free to but are not under obligation to do so. The same goes for Saturday or Sunday. If you want to keep one in a special way, you may, but you also have the liberty to observe "every day alike" (Romans 14:5). Colossians 2:16 is the key here: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink or in respect of an holyday, or of the new moon or of the sabbath days". That settles it. As sons and Christians, we have no obligations to the calendar. We have liberty to observe days as we please but no one can enforce it upon us. To do otherwise is to revert to legalism.

These Galatians then are guilty of refusing the easy yoke of genuine Christianity for the hard and burdensome yoke of legalism and works. While rejecting the easy yoke of Christ, they were painfully observing days, and months, and times and years. Most men, either from false views of religion, or through the power and prevalency of their own evil passions and habits, have ten thousand times more trouble to get to hell, than the followers of God have to get to heaven.

Galatians

4:11 I am afraid^{present middle passive} of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor^{perfect} in vain.^a

30. Paul's Ministry Among the Galatians 4:12-16

4:12 Brethren, I beseech^{present middle passive} you, be^{present middle/passive imperative} as I^a am;^b for I^a am as ye are:^c ye have not injured me at all.^{aorist-d}

4:13^a Ye know^{perfect} how through infirmity of the flesh^b I preached the gospel^{aorist} unto you at the first.^{middle}

11a Paul wonders if all his time, effort, energy and prayers on behalf of the Galatians was worth it or if it was really just a waste of time.

12a Emphatic.

12b The 1599 Geneva Bible (2006 reprint) has the impression that Paul is identifying with the Galatians by the rendering "for I am even as you" where the King James renders it in the passive that "they should be even as he is". The King James rendering is to be preferred here for Paul certainly would not have identified himself with the Galatians in their apostasy from his gospel. Even the New King James does a better job here than the Geneva.

12c Paul wasn't ashamed to be identified with the Galatians. He was a Jew, an ex-Pharisee, who was now the Apostle to the Gentiles, something that was unthinkable to a Jew. If Paul was willing to identify with the Gentiles and to practically become a Gentile, for the Gentile's sake, why couldn't the Galatians reciprocate? Could they not be willing to identify with the Gospel of Grace and with Paul's ministry? Were they not willing to stand with a man and his doctrine that were under constant and withering assault by the Judaizers? Must they seek out man's approval and positive public opinion? Paul didn't. He took on shame and reproach for their sake. Would to God the Galatians were willing to do the same thing.

12d Despite how the Galatians had forsaken Paul and stabbed him in the back, Paul says that he does not take it personally. To be a leader or a preacher, you must develop a thick skin because people will hurt you. These things are inevitable. You must learn to take a wrong without taking it personally. Charles Spurgeon called it developing one blind eye and one deaf ear, so you only hear half the criticism leveled at you and only see half the problems in your church.

13a Paul then says "Remember..."

1. Remember how I preached to you in my infirmity?
2. Remember how you weren't offended at my infirmities? The Galatians did not use Paul's physical problems as an excuse to refuse him. This is the meaning of the "temptation which was in my flesh" in 4:14
3. Remember how you received me when I came- even as an angel of God?
4. Remember how you would have been willing to pluck out your own eyes and give them to me? This hints that Paul suffered from a serious eye problem.

13b We do not exactly know what this "infirmity of the flesh" is, if it was a physical or medical situation that Paul had. We can speculate all we want but ultimately, we do not know as Scripture does not reveal the nature of this problem. It may be the same thing as the "thorn in the flesh" Paul mentioned in 2 Corinthians 12:7. Or Paul could simply be talking about his human weaknesses and frailties as he preached, something every genuine preacher could identify with. This second interpretation is probably the better one.

Galatians

4:14 And my temptation^a which was in my flesh ye despised^{aorist} not,^b nor rejected,^{aorist} but received^{aorist middle} me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus.^c

4:15 Where is^{imperfect} then the blessedness^a ye spake of?^b for I bear you record,^{present} that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out^{c-aorist active} your own eyes, and have given^{aorist} them to me.

4:16 Am I therefore become^{aorist} your enemy, because I tell you the truth?^{present}
active participle-a

31. The Ministry of the False Teachers Among the Galatians 4:17,18

4:17 They zealously affect^{present} you,^{a-b} but not well;^c yea, they would^{present} exclude^{aorist infinitive} you, that ye might affect^{present subjunctive} them.^d

The ESV has this “weakness of the flesh” as a “bodily ailment”. While it is true that Paul was not the healthiest specimen out there (being stoned and beaten with rods will do that to you), the idea is not that Paul was physically beat up, but that his flesh (his fallen human nature) was weak and that was the weakness that Paul is referencing.

14a The ESV uses “condition”.

14b “**despised**” The Geneva uses the stronger “abhorred”.

14c Despite all of Paul’s burdens and weaknesses, the Galatians were not offended by all but still initially received Paul honorable and with the respect an apostle deserved. Of course, that would change later!

15a “**blessedness**” This King James rendering is easier to understand than the Geneva’s and Bishop’s use of “felicity”.

15b “Well, where is all this blessedness now? What have I done to cause you to go from loving me to attacking me in so short a time?” Paul really wanted to know but I think the Galatians would have been unable to supply a good answer. It was not so much Paul but the influence of the Judaizers who hated Paul that had caused the Galatians to turn from him.

15c The ESV uses “gouged out” which is too strong for the King James’ “plucked out”. The ESV is too violent here. The other translations all use “plucked out”.

16a A classic question. The Galatians were treating Paul as an enemy now rather than as their spiritual father. Why? Because Paul had told them the truth? Paul tells the truth and he gets attacked. The Judaizers lie and they are patted on the back. As one cynic put it “No good deed ever goes unpunished!” Paul had not become their enemy but the Galatians (especially the Judaizers) had made Paul their enemy.

17a The Judaizers were very earnest in their ministry to capture the Galatians but Paul points out that zeal is not a virtue in itself. A man can be very zealous in what he believes but still be wrong. It is not the force of a man’s arguments that determines truth but rather how the man’s message conforms to the Bible.

Galatians

4:18 But it is good to be zealously affected^{present passive infinitive} always in a good thing,^{a-b} and not only when I am present^{infinitive} with you.

17b The Geneva Bible has these false teachers “jealous” over the Galatians while the King James has them “zealously affected” over them. The Geneva gives an interesting insight as to a motivation for their activities in spreading their false doctrines and confusing the Galatians- jealousy. They were jealous over the truth they had received and the spiritual liberty they were enjoying, so they became zealous to do what they could to destroy it.

17c Paul was very bold and upfront as he preached, even at the risk of offending the hearers. The Judaizers were just the opposite. They would go out of their way to avoid offending anyone. They would lie to avoid offense. Here is a distinguishing mark of a true man of God who really loves you- he loves you enough to tell you the truth. The Judaizers had no such love for the Galatians but despised them enough to lie to them. You will lie to those whom you do not love or respect.

Here is a good modern example of being zealously affected for a bad thing- from September through December on Saturday and Sunday at numerous football stadiums around the country for college and pro football. Those fans will pay through the nose for tickets at the 50-yard line, spend \$5.00 for a hot dog, sit in 20-degree weather in rain or snow for 4 hours and fight unholy traffic trying to get home. He will yell like Indians attacking Custer at the game. But when they go to church (if they go to church!) they complain about having to tithe, the length of the sermon and the fact that the auditorium is too cold and the seats are too hard! They are indeed zealous, but not for the Lord! These idolaters would make a Holiness tent revival look live an Episcopal funeral.

17d Cultists are very zealous. Jehovah Witnesses and Mormons are very determined in their efforts to capture the ignorant and the undiscerning in their webs but does that make their false gospel any better? Does it sanctify them at all? Zeal is only beneficial and good if it is for the truth.

18a Compare these "wildfire" ministries of the false teachers with this description of the public ministry of Christ in Isaiah 42:2/Matthew 12:19 "He shall not strive nor cry (not cry nor lift up-Isaiah); neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. (nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets-Isaiah)". Christ was not a zealot. He was not a wild-eyed fanatic. He didn't need to resort to raw outward emotion and zeal to press His point home or to get people to accept Him. His strength was in His message, not His delivery. Beware of a man who has such a weak message that he must rely on technique and personality to get it across. There are a lot of wildfire ministries today where the preacher and the congregation mistake noise for spirituality. I had a preacher from north Georgia visit my church in Maryland once and complain that he "couldn't feel the Spirit in our services" since no one did laps around the church or handsprings down the aisle. He mistook physical excitement and making a lot of noise in the services as evidence of the power of God. Charismatics are famous for their theatrics and not a few Fundamentalists of the mindset of Jack Hyles think that a lot of screaming and slobbering during the sermon is some indication of spirituality! They think outward manifestations of emotion equal spirituality when in reality, the opposite is true. The best heart work is always done in the quiet and secret places in the heart and are manifested by a transformed life and by a holy walk, not in disrupting a worship service with a lot of shouting.

18b The King James' "**zealously affected**" is better and stronger than the Geneva Bible rendering of "to love earnestly". One can "love earnestly" without necessarily being zealous. The ESV is clunky and wordy as usual with "It is always good to be made much of for a good purpose".

32. Paul's Desire For The Galatians 4:19,20

4:19 My little children,^{a-b} of whom I travail in birth^{present} again^c until Christ be formed^{aorist passive subjunctive} in you,^{d-e}

4:20 I desire^{imperfect infinitive} to be present^{present infinitive} with you now, and to change^{aorist} my voice; for I stand in doubt^{present middle} of you.^{a-b}

19a Despite their defections, Paul still had a soft spot in his heart for the Galatians. This takes grace! The Galatians had turned against Paul and attacked him, yet he still calls them "My Little Children"! Here is an acid test of Christianity- can you do the same towards those do you wrong?

19b "**My little children**" is common in John's writings but this is the only time Paul uses it. And look at the context in which he uses it! These Galatians had driven the knife in his back and Paul refers to them as "my little children!" See how a man of God takes a wrong. He does not break fellowship nor does he lash out or write nasty letters all over Asia telling everyone how badly the Galatians has treated him. Would to God that modern preachers would respond as well as Paul did when they are wrongly attacked!

19c Paul was literally going through the birth pangs of evangelism and conversion on behalf of the Galatians again. When he first was working among them, he labored as a mother with child to bring them to spiritual birth. Evangelism and discipleship is a long, hard and occasionally painful progress for both the preacher and the congregation. But something happened that first time with the Galatians for they had forsaken their profession under him. So we have to go back to square one and do it all again until the Galatians get it right.

Paul would have to travail again until Christ was formed in the Galatians. Until they began to bear the image of Christ in their lives and profession, any spirituality they professed was worthless. Legalists and Judaizers are not Christlike. That wrong attitude and false doctrine had to be destroyed from among the Galatians before Christ could be formed in them. Here then is the ultimate goal of the Christian life, being conformed to the image of Christ (Romans 8:29). The Galatians had destroyed and marred any Christlikeness they might have had when they forsook the Gospel of Grace and became Seventh Day Adventists when they went back under the Law. Men do know something of the pains of childbirth! The missionary or church planter trying to birth a local church into existence is well familiar with the pain in dealing with new converts and carnal Christians. Yet what of the joy when the baby is brought forth! We then forget the pain we went through when we see the baby!

19d This is not to imply the Galatians had lost their salvation for that is not possible in this dispensation (it may be possible in the tribulation and in the millennium). Rather, the gospel Paul had preached to them didn't "take" and he had to go back again and re-teach them as though they were still sinners because they had not truly learned and accepted Paul's gospel.

19e The Tyndale, Coverdale and Bishops all use "fashioned".

20a Paul said that he stood in doubt of the Galatians. He couldn't figure them out and had no idea how to deal with them. The Galatians had Paul perplexed as to how to reclaim them from the mire they got themselves into.

"But this made the apostle long to be with them. He was perplexed as to them, for the gospel had in reality been abandoned by them; yet when looking to the Lord, he always hoped that Christ was truly in their hearts, and that only in their heads they had accepted a doctrine, which totally perverted the gospel of Christ. He needed, so to speak, to travail in birth afresh with them till Christ should be formed in them. Nevertheless, he calls them his children: his love inspired him with confidence, and yet filled his heart with uneasiness. He would have desired to be with them that he might change his voice, suiting it to their state; not only teaching them the truth, but doing whatever their need required. Mark here, the deep love

33. The Allegory of Hagar 4:21-31

4:21^a Tell^{present imperative} me ye that desire^{present active participle} to be^{present infinitive} under the law, do ye not hear^{present} the law?^b

4:22 For it is written,^{1125-a-perfect passive} that Abraham had^{aorist} two sons,^b the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman.^c

of the apostle. Moses, faithful as he was, grew weary of the burden of the people and said: "Have I conceived all this people? have I begotten them, that thou shouldst say unto me, Carry them in thy bosom, as a nursing father beareth the sucking child, unto the land which thou swarest unto their fathers?" (Numbers 11:12): but the apostle is willing to travail in birth with them as his children a second time, in order that their souls might be saved (John Nelson Darby, "Notes on Galatians" in *Collected Works*, 34:87)."

20b Paul expresses his regret that he has to be so hard on the Galatians but he really has no other choice but to be in light of the circumstances. He wants to "change his voice" toward them, to re-establish the relationship he enjoyed previously with them, to go back to the "good old days". But before that could happen, the Galatians must needs repent of their apostasy.

21a James Lightfoot (page 179 in his commentary on Galatians) would paraphrase this passage thus: "Ye who vaunt your submission to the Law, listen while I read you a lesson out of the Law. The Scripture says that Abraham had two sons, the one the child of the bondwoman, the other the child of the free. The child of the bondwoman came into the world in the common course of nature: the child of the free was born in fulfillment of a promise. These things may be treated as an allegory. The two mothers represent two covenants. The one, Hagar, is the covenant given from Mount Sinai, whose children are born into slavery, and this covenant corresponds to the earthly Jerusalem, which is in bondage with her children. The other answers to the heavenly Jerusalem which is free- I mean the Church of Christ, our common mother. In her progeny is fulfilled the prophetic saying, which bids the barren and forsaken wife rejoice, because her offspring shall be more numerous than her rival's, who claims the husband for herself."

21b Do you not understand the law? Don't you know what you are getting yourselves into by voluntarily putting yourself back under the law? Paul then asks "You who desire to go back under the Law only do so because you are ignorant of the Law. If you really understood the Law, you would never desire to re-submit yourself to it after you have been freed from it." God said of Ishamel (the Law/flesh/carnality) "cast him out!" We have no inheritance with him!

22a "It is written" in the Scripture, in Genesis. This is in the perfect tense- it has been written and remains written, not to be changed or altered. It is a completed action with continuous results or the continuance of an act completed in the past. The components are always a past action and continuous results. References to the Scriptures like this are often presented in the perfect tense. "The just shall live by faith" is one of those unalterable truths of Christianity. This perfect tense in reference to New Testament references to Old Testament texts is used 62 times in the New Testament, 16 times in Romans. This usage of the perfect is a strong argument for the verbal and plenary preservation of the Scripture, as the written Old Testament word stands forever and continues to.

22b Isaac- the son of promise, the son of the Spirit
Ishmael- the son of the flesh and of carnality.

22c The contention between the Spirit and the Flesh is highlighted here with Isaac and Ishamel. They are at odds with each other and cannot be reconciled spiritually, as they are two totally different and contrary principles.

Galatians

4:23^a But he who was of the bondwoman was born^{b-perfect passive} after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise.^c

4:24 Which things are^{present} an allegory:^a for these are^{present} the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which engendereth^{present active participle} to bondage,^b which is^{present} Hagar.^c

4:25 For this Hagar is^{present} mount Sinai in Arabia,^a and answereth to^{present} Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage^{b-present} with her children.^c

23a What Ishmael stands for:

1. The Law, bondage. He was the son of the bondwoman. He was the son of the flesh, of carnality, the product of a lapse of faith and a disbelief in the promise of God.
2. He is identified with Mount Sinai and the Law. This old covenant of the Law can be summarized: "There is my Law, O man; if thou on thy side wilt engage to keep it, I, on my side will engage that thou shalt live by keeping it. If thou wilt promise to obey my commands perfectly, wholly, fully, without a single flaw, I will carry thee to heaven. But mark me, if thou violatest one command, if thou rebel against a single ordinance, I will destroy thee forever." (Charles Spurgeon, "The Allegories of Sarah and Hagar" in *The New Park Street Pulpit*, 2:121, sermon 69).

What Isaac stands for:

1. Freedom from the Law. He was the son of promise. He was the son of the freewoman.
2. He is identified with Jerusalem, the Holy City, the City of God, which is free.

23b "**was born**" is in the perfect tense, showing that this birth "in the flesh" was something that was fixed and could not be changed. That which is born of the flesh is flesh and cannot be bettered or transformed into spirit. That which is born of the flesh is flesh and remains flesh and must be dealt with as flesh.

23c The ESV has "through promise". All of the other translations have "by promise".

24a Paul gives the allegory of Ishmael and Isaac. Paul meets the Judaizers on their own ground by proving his position through the Old Testament. An allegory is defined as a story that can be read on two levels: the literal surface meaning and a deeper meaning. Characters and episodes are intended to represent some elements of life, ideas or principles. They were very popular in classical literature. John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress* would be the best example. This does not cast any doubt on the historicity of these events and characters from Genesis.

24b The ESV uses "slavery".

24c "Paul understood the Rabbinical method of spiritualizing and used it against his old associates, turning the Old Testament allegories into a battery in defence of New Testament principles. (Charles Spurgeon, "Salvation by Faith and the Work of the Spirit", *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* 21:205, sermon 1228)."

25a The Geneva is awkward here. It simply could have used "Mount Sinai" but went with "Sinai is a mountain in Arabia".

25b The ESV has "slavery".

Galatians

4:26 But Jerusalem which is above is^{present} free, which is^{present} the mother of us all.^a

4:27^a For it is written,^{1125-22a-perfect passive} Rejoice,^{aorist passive imperative} thou barren that bearest^{present active participle} not; break forth^{aorist imperative} and cry,^{aorist imperative} thou that travailest^{present active participle} not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath^{present active participle} a husband.

4:28 Now we,^a brethren, as Isaac was, are^{present} the children of promise.^b

4:29 But as then he that was born^{aorist passive participle} after the flesh persecuted^{imperfect} him that was born after the Spirit,^a even so it is now.

4:30 Nevertheless what saith^{present} the Scripture?^a Cast out^{aorist imperative} the bondwoman^{b-c} and her son: for the son of the bondwoman^c shall not be heir^{aorist active subjunctive} with the son of the freewoman.

25c In the allegory, Hagar is to Mount Sinai, where the law was given, and which stands for bondage under the law.

26a Jerusalem, the Holy City and the City of God, would represent spiritual freedom in Paul's allegory.

27a Verse 27 is a quote from Isaiah 54:1.

28a Emphatic.

28b We are the sons of Sarah and are joint-heirs of promise along with Isaac. Isaac was part of the promise, not Ishmael. Ishmael had no part in God's program. Our lot is cast with Isaac. Those who choose the Law along with the illegitimate son Ishmael are choosing to be "cast out" along with the bondwoman and her son! We are free-children, not bond-children. Jerusalem is our spiritual mother, not Mount Sinai, unless you are a Seventh-Day Adventist.

29a As the flesh persecutes the spirit, so does the Law persecute grace. They cannot co-exist- it must be one or the other. They are at enmity with each other. Ishmael was no friend to Isaac. See Genesis 21:9 where Ishmael mocked Isaac.

It is interesting that the flesh persecutes the spirit, although Paul does not say that the spirit persecutes the flesh, despite the fact that the two are totally irreconcilable and contrary to each other and cannot co-exist.

30a "What saith the Scripture?" The ultimate and final court of appeal. Let human opinion be ignored, for this is the ultimate question that decides all issues. The question is not "what saith the theological systems?" or "what saith the big name preacher?" or "what saith the Bible College?" or "what saith the commentaries?" but "What saith the Scriptures?" Let that question thunder forth!

30b "Cast out the bondwoman" is quoted from Genesis 21:10-12. Cast her out! And her son! She has nothing to do with us! What use do we have for the flesh? We are the children of the promise, by faith, by promise, by covenant, not by works or the flesh. We are to reject the flesh and the offspring it produces- carnality. And the Greek word here can also carry an idea of violence with it- "violently cast out the bondwomen..."

Galatians

4:31 So then, brethren, we are^{present} not children of the bondwoman,^a but of the free.

30c The ESV has "slavewoman".

31a The ESV has "slave".

We could then construct the following table of comparison and contrast between Law and Grace from this allegory:

<u>LAW</u>	<u>GRACE</u>
1. Hagar	1. Sarah
2. Ishmael	2. Isaac
3. Mt. Sinai	3. Jerusalem
4. Earthly Jerusalem	4. Heavenly Jerusalem
5. Carnal and fleshly	5. Spirit
6. Of the flesh	6. Of promise

Observations on Law and Grace:

1. Under Law there was a dividing veil (Exodus 26:33) - Grace brought a rent veil (Hebrews 10:19-22).
2. Law blots out the sinner (Exodus 32:33) - Grace blots out the sinner's sin (Colossians 2:14).
3. The Law curses the offender (Galatians 3:10) - Grace covers the offender (Romans 4:7).
4. The Law cries out, "**Do** - and **live!**" (Deuteronomy 8:1) - Grace cries out, "It is done! **It is finished!** Receive Jesus and live!" (John 19:30; John 1:12).
5. The Law cries out, "**Every mouth... stopped.**" (Romans 3:19) - Grace invites, "Every mouth opened." "**That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus**" (Romans 10:9). "**Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord**" (Romans 10:13).
6. The Law showed favor to the good (Proverbs 12:2) - The grace of GOD shows mercy and favor to the bad, the ungodly (Ephesians 2:1-6).
7. The Law was graven upon stone . . . outward (II Corinthians 3:3) - Grace is graven on the heart . . . inward . . . **CHRIST in you** (Colossians 1:27; Colossians 3:3; II Corinthians 3:3).
8. The Law says, "**He added no more**" (Deuteronomy 5:22) - Grace assures us, "**Hath... spoken... by His Son**" (Hebrews 1:2).
9. Law is inexorable in its demand (Joshua 7:25) - The grace of GOD is inspirational in its blessing (II Corinthians 5:17).
10. The Law brings judgment (Romans 5:18) - Grace brings justification (Romans 3:24).
11. Law cries out, "Keep the Commandments - all of them, in every minute detail" (James 2:10)- Grace assures us we are kept by the power of GOD (I Peter 1:5).

Galatians

12. The Law demands love (Deuteronomy 6:5) - The grace of GOD exhibits love (John 3:16).
13. The Law moves the sinner to sin (Romans 7:8) - The grace of GOD removes sin from the sinner (Matthew 1:21).
14. According to the Law, nearness to GOD is impossible (Exodus 20:21) - In Grace, nearness to GOD is guaranteed (Ephesians 2:13).
15. The Law demands obedience - or no blessing (Deuteronomy 28:1-2) - Grace brings obedience because of the blessing (I John 4:19).
16. The Law cries out, "Stone the prodigal" (Deuteronomy 21:20-21) - Grace cries out, "Put the best robe on the prodigal . . . kill the fatted calf! Let us feast and be merry!" (Luke 15:20-23).
17. Law brings death (Deuteronomy 21:22-23) - Grace gives to us the quietness and assurance of peace (Romans 5:1).
18. The Law retaliates (Exodus 21:24) - The grace of GOD redeems (Galatians 3:13).
19. The Law demands sanctification (Leviticus 11:44) - Grace bestows sanctification (I Corinthians 1:30).
20. Because of the Law, three thousand were slain (Exodus 32:28) - Because of the grace of GOD, three thousand were saved (Acts 2:41).
21. The Law is unsatisfying to the conscience (Hebrews 10:1-2) - The grace of GOD is unfailing in its forgiveness and remedy for sin (Hebrews 9:12-14; Hebrews 10:10-14).
22. The Law is the voice of consternation (Hebrews 12:18-21) - The grace of GOD is the voice of covenant, blessing, peace and assurance (Hebrews 12:22-24).
23. When the Law was given, Moses' face shown, and the people feared (Exodus 34:30) – Grace brought by JESUS CHRIST attracted the people to the face of JESUS (Mark 9:15).
24. The Law was a yoke of burdensome weight (Galatians 5:1) - Grace is to be in the yoke with JESUS, which makes the yoke easy and the burden light (Matthew 11:29-30).
25. The Law produced zeal (Romans 10:1-2), but no salvation (Philippians 3:6; Romans 10:1-8) - Grace imparts zeal, and brings joy unspeakable and full of glory because we are saved (Titus 2:14; I Peter 1:8). (Oliver B. Greene, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*).

Galatians Chapter 5

As was his custom in his epistles, Paul always dealt with the doctrine before he ended with practical applications of that doctrine.

34. Stand Fast in Liberty 5:1

5:1 Stand fast^{a-present imperative} therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free,^{ao} and be not entangled^{present passive imperative} again with the yoke of bondage.^{b-c-d}

1a In the light of the Judaizer opposition, Paul exhorts the Galatians not to forsake the gospel of grace that he had given them. Stand fast in the liberty of grace. Do not fall back to the bondage of the Law from which you were delivered.

1b Going back to the Law again after being delivered from it and into the liberties of grace is to put the yoke back on yourself and place yourself back into bondage.

1c "It may seem remarkable that Paul, who was once the strictest of Pharisees, should become the most ardent champion of the doctrines of salvation by grace and justification by faith...Did not the Lord show great wisdom in selecting as the chief advocate of this truth a man who knew the other side, who had wrought diligently under the Law, who had practiced every ceremony, who was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and had profited above many under the Jews' religion, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of the fathers? He would know right well the bondage of the old system, and having felt its iron enter into his soul, he would the more highly prize the liberty wherewith Christ makes men free...The Lord, therefore, sent this mighty man of valor, this Saul the Benjamite, head and shoulders taller than his fellows, of sound heart and decided purpose and devout spirit, to wage war with the adversaries of free grace. (Charles Spurgeon, "Salvation by Faith and the Work of the Spirit", *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit* 21:205-206, sermon 1228)"

1d We are not to enslave ourselves nor are we to let another man enslave us, especially in regards to the traditions of men. Now that you have liberated by the bondage of legalism by the atonement of Christ, it would be a sin to voluntarily bind ourselves or to allow another to so bind us to any form of slavery. This includes ecclesiastical bondage. There are many Christians who make much of grace and liberty from the demands of the law, yet they voluntarily (but unnecessarily) submit themselves to manmade rules, regulations and rites of whatever church, fellowship or denomination they belong to. They are in spiritual bondage to manmade denominations and theological systems instead of enjoying the liberty and freedom that is found in Christ.

The ESV uses "slavery". The other translations use "bondage". The ESV really bungles the verse and makes it much harder to read compared to the traditional translations.

"Many Christians shout, "Independent! Unaffiliated!" But when you dig below the surface you find they are not independent; they have a machine of their own, and the minister dictates to and commands the members. According to the New Testament, born again believers are led by the Holy Ghost, not by the preacher in the pulpit. The preacher is the overseer, the leader - but he is not to command. He is to lead, and not to be "[lord] over God's heritage." He is to be an "[ensample] to the flock." Every true minister is the under-shepherd of the Lord (Oliver B. Greene, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*).".

Galatians

35. The Problem of Circumcision 5:2,3

**5:2 Behold, I^a Paul^b say^{present} unto you, that if ye be circumcised,^{present passive}
subjunctive Christ shall profit^{future} you nothing.^{c-d-e}**

**5:3 For I testify^{present middle/passive} again to every man that is circumcised,^{present passive}
participle that he is^{present} a debtor to do^{aoist infinitive} the whole law.^{a-b-c-d}**

2a Emphatic.

2b "I, Paul..." the "I" here is emphatic, emphasizing that Paul is speaking with his full apostolic authority and that it is coming from him, not some other man.

2c A Jew who had been circumcised before he was saved is not the problem Paul deals with here. It was the Christians who underwent circumcision after they were saved in the mistaken notion that circumcision somehow completed their salvation or added to it. But circumcision is an element of the Law that has no use under grace. See Acts 15:1,5,24 where the believing Pharisees were teaching that the Gentiles had to keep the Law and be circumcised to be saved. This is what the Galatians had picked up and what Paul condemned.

2d Undergoing circumcision to improve salvation or to add to it nullifies grace. Grace, by its very definition and nature, has no need for Judaistic ritual. If we are saved by grace and kept by grace, then why circumcision? But here is the crux of Judaizer teaching- you needed to do something to stay saved or be saved- in this case, be circumcised and keep the Law. The Judaizers then taught "Saved by Grace- Kept by Works". This was in direction opposition to grace. Grace saved us and it also keeps us. Grace is operative before and after salvation.

2e Again, the ESV rendering is weak and inferior to the traditional translations, especially with the "See..." when the other translations all use "Behold...", which is yet another unnecessary change.

3a Christians who went back to the Law and placed themselves back under the yoke of bondage also obligated themselves to keep the whole Law. I think many legalizers, Judaizers and people who promote salvation by works don't realize this. If a man desired to become a naturalized citizen of a certain country, he would have to fulfill all the citizenship requirements in order to attain the rights of citizenship. But his obligations would not stop there. He would also be bound to accept and come under all the other rules and regulations of the country that his new citizenship would now obligate him to. So Paul argues that if a man accepted circumcision for salvation, he also obligated himself to fulfill the entire law as well. How illogical- to go from freedom to chains- for no good reason at all! Without faith, love and obedience to the truth, circumcision is nothing more than a physical mutilation.

3b "The Galatians were not satisfied with faith alone as a token of their salvation. They wanted something physical, tangible, like circumcision. It is no different than a heathen relying upon priest or charm or magical rite as a Christian relying on circumcision for justification. "The Galatians wanted to be more sure than faith could make them, and so they ran off to getting circumcised and observing days and weeks and months and all sort of carnal ordinances." (Charles Spurgeon, "Salvation by Faith and the Work of the Spirit", *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, 21:211, sermon 1228)

3c The Geneva renders this phrase as being "bound" to keep the whole law, which I think gives a better idea of this obligation, although there is nothing wrong with the King James rendering here. The Tyndale, Coverdale, Geneva and the ESV all have "keep the...law" while the Bishops and King James have the stronger "do the...law". It is not just to "keep" the law but to also "do" it where the obligation comes in for the legalizer.

Galatians

36. Fallen From Grace 5:4

5:4 Christ is become of no effect^a unto you,^{aorist passive} whosoever of you are justified^{present passive} by the law; ye are fallen from^{aorist} grace.^{b-c-d-e}

37. Faith Over Circumcision 5:5,6

5:5 For we through the Spirit wait for^{present passive/middle} the hope of righteousness by faith.^{a-b}

3d The main idea here is “stay out of debt!” It is always good to remain as free as possible as long as possible. Why sell yourself for nothing? Why go into bondage to the law and to legalism if there is no reason to do so? You can have salvation through the free gift of grace that does not require selling yourself into spiritual bondage and legalism, so why do it? It makes no sense! Why sell yourself into debt to obtain something that you can obtain for free?

4a The Geneva Bible renders this as “ye are abolished”, which is technically correct but the wording seems awkward compared to the King James. The New King James has “you are estranged from Christ” which isn’t bad. The ESV has “severed” which is more questionable. The Tyndale and Coverdale use an archaic “Ye are gone quyte fro Christ”. Bishops has the idea of Christ becoming “vain” to the Galatians, so the translations are all over the map with this phrase.

4b This verse has been misinterpreted (especially by Pentecostals, so-called Arminians and other groups that do not accept the doctrine of the security of the believer) as teaching that a Christian can lose his salvation but such is clearly not the case. The context clearly deals with our relationship to grace. A man who forsakes grace and goes back under the Law falls away from grace more than it does to salvation. The verse has nothing to do with a man's salvation but rather his relationship to Law and Grace. The Galatians had abandoned Grace for Law and thus had fallen from the Grace they once held to and professed. The Bible is very clear on the doctrine of the security of the believer in this dispensation. This verse deals with one’s right relationship to grace in salvation and sanctification. It does not deal with that salvation itself. The verse simply relates the spiritual truth that you cannot be saved by law and grace together.

4c “The aorist represents the consequences as instantaneous (J.B. Lightfoot, *Commentary on Galatians*, page 204).” Once grace is abandoned for works and legalism, the spiritual results are immediate and damaging. This summarizes Paul's dire warnings of the consequences of accepting the pseudo-gospel of the Judaizers:

1. Christ shall profit you nothing- 5:2
2. You are a debtor to do the whole law- 5:3
3. You are fallen from grace- 5:4

4d In 5:3 is the warning- don’t fall into debt!
In 5:4 is the warning- don’t fall from grace!

4e The ESV adds “away”, which isn’t really necessary nor does that addition add to the understanding of the verse.

5a We wait for the hope of righteousness by faith, not by Law. The Law cannot deliver this hope for it does not bring justification or righteousness, only condemnation. All of our hope comes through faith.

5b The Tyndale, Geneva and ESV have “through faith” instead of “by faith”.

Galatians

5:6 For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth^{present} any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh^{a-present middle participle} by love.^b

38. Who Did Hinder You? 5:7-10

5:7 Ye did run^{imperfect} well;^a who did hinder^{b-c-aorist} you^{d-e} that ye should not obey^{present passive infinitive} the truth?^f

6a The Tyndale and Coverdale strengthen this with the idea of this faith being “mighty in operation”.

6b Faith is a superior basis for hope (or anything other spiritual thing) than is circumcision or uncircumcision. They do not figure into our salvation, but faith does. Faith is superior to Law, ritual or circumcision for it delivers hope.

7a The Galatians were doing well for a time after Paul had left them until the Judaizers appeared and set up obstacles that the Galatians just couldn't clear. They ran well for a time and were making good progress until legalism hindered them. Legalism is always a hindrance, never a blessing. The Galatians had begun to run their spiritual race (the Christian life) only to fall down on the first turn.

7b The pre-King James translations use the Old English word “let” for “hinder”, something the King James also does occasionally, but not here.

7c This has the of “who cut you off? Who interrupted you from your Christian life?”

7d Who did hinder you?

1. Did I, Paul, do it? Pray then for your minister
2. Did your fellow members do it? Pray for them. It is possible that fellow-professors may hinder. We are obliged to accommodate our pace to that of our fellow-travelers. If they are laggards we are very likely to be so too. We are apt to sleep as others. We are stimulated or depressed, urged on or held back, by those with whom we are associated in Christian fellowship.
3. Did the world do it? Separate yourself from it.
4. Did the devil do it? Resist him.
5. Did you not do it yourself? This is highly probable as most of our problems come from within:
 1. Did you not overload yourself with worldly care?
 2. Did you not indulge carnal ease?
 3. Did you not by pride become self-satisfied?
 4. Did you not neglect prayer, Bible reading, the Lord's Table?

(Charles Spurgeon, *Sermon Notes*, 4:254, with some additions)

7e Paul already knew who had hindered them but he asks the question in frustration. Were the Judaizers really so charismatic that they should be more precious in your eyes than me? Was the legalism and bondage they preached really more appealing to you than the liberty of grace I presented to you?

7f “The Christian begins to run the race (Hebrews 12:1-4); he knows the Starter and the Finisher (Hebrews 12:1-4); he must get all the weights out of his pockets before he starts; and he must run to win (1 Corinthians 9:24), not to “place” or “show”. The course must be finished (2 Timothy 4:4-8), and “the faith” must be kept while running. Obedience to the truth is clearly described in what follows (verses 13-26) (Peter Ruckman, *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians*, pages 148-149).”

Galatians

5:8 This persuasion cometh not of him that calleth^{present active participle} you.^{a-b}

5:9 A little leaven leaveneth^{present} the whole lump.^{a-b}

5:10 I have confidence^{perfect} in you through the Lord, that ye will be none otherwise minded:^{future} but he that troubleth^{present active participle} you shall bear^{future} his judgment,^a whosoever he be.^{present subjunctive}

39. The Offence of the Cross 5:11

5:11 And I,^a brethren, if I yet preach^{present} circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution?^{present passive} then is the offence^b of the cross^{c-d-e-f} ceased.^{perfect passive}

8a This new persuasion of legalism was not of the Holy Spirit. He never would have led the Galatians to abandon the gospel of grace for legalism. It is amazing how often disobedient Christians will claim that "The Lord led me" to do something that is so contrary to Scripture. The Galatians seemed to fall back to this line of defense against Paul- "The Lord led us to do it!" (How many times have you heard that?) No He did not. Paul asserted. The Lord gets blamed for a lot of things that He did not do. We do a thing, knowing God has not commanded it or approved of it, and then seek God's rubber stamp on it.

8b The Bishops has the worst rendering of the verse this time with "perfection" for "persuasion".

9a Be careful! A little leaven of false doctrine or false practice leads to greater errors later. Today it is legalism. What will that lead to? What will it be tomorrow? Full-blown apostasy always starts small- a doctrine compromised a bit here, an unscriptural practice introduced there. The Galatians had been leavened by legalism. If they did not purge out this leaven of false doctrine now, they stood in danger of greater problems in the future.

9b The Tyndale, Coverdale and Bishops expand on the "lump" by adding "of dowe", which is an old spelling for "dough".

10a God would judge the Judaizers who had caused all the problems they started in Galatia. If we were going to define legalism, it can be summed up simply as "Living the Christian life in your own strength and power without the aid of the Holy Spirit or the faith of Christ." God never leads any man to assume such a way of life.

11a Emphatic.

11b The Coverdale, Geneva and Bishops use "slander" for "offense", which is not as good.

11c Paul mentions the offence of the cross, which was an integral part of the gospel. The Judaistic gospel brought no offence because everyone likes salvation by works. It exalts man's role in his own salvation and minimizes God's work. But strip a man of all his religious works and maintain that salvation is all of grace and all of God and what the fur fly! Man's religious pride has been punctured so he will naturally attack the gospel of grace that Paul preached.

We must keep this offence of the cross before our congregations at all times. If the message is not offensive then it is not the Gospel. It must be offensive to sinners (and even saints!) because the Gospel and its claims of discipleship naturally are in opposition to the natural mind. Men may want to be saved but only on their own terms. To accommodate this desire is compromising the Gospel, the sin the Judaizers were guilty of. They preached a popular message- work for it. Men like to work for their

40. Paul's Desire For The Troublers of the Galatians 5:12

5:12 I would they were even cut off ^{a-b-future middle} **which trouble** ^{present active participle} **you.**

salvation. That message carries no offence and is thus not the Gospel. To suppose a cross without an offence is folly.

Paul is responding to the charge that he was preaching what he was (salvation without works) in order to simply please men. He was charged with preaching an easy gospel that would appeal to everyone. But if that was true, then Paul asks why he was being persecuted. Men-pleasing preachers who preach cheap and easy gospels don't suffer any persecution, since everyone would like that message. But Paul suffered great persecutions because his gospel did not appeal to the religious nature of man (and especially the Jews), thus disproving the charge that Paul was nothing more than a man-pleaser.

11d Why is the cross so offensive?

1. Its doctrine of atonement offends man's pride.
2. Its simple teaching offends man's wisdom and artificial taste.
3. Its being a remedy for man's ruin offends his fancied power to save himself.
4. Its addressing all as sinners offends the dignity of the Pharisees.
5. Its coming as a revelation offends "modern thought."
6. Its lofty holiness offends man's love of sin. (Charles Spurgeon, *Spurgeon's Sermon Notes* 4:257)
7. It is an exclusive message, not acknowledging any other remedy to the sin question but instead, claims to be the only and exclusive truth.

11e "The cross is the strength of a minister. I, for one, would not be without it for the world. I should feel like a soldier without weapons, like an artist without his pencil, like a pilot without his compass, like a laborer without his tools. Give me the cross of Christ. This is the only lever which has ever turned the world upside down hitherto, and made men forsake their sins. A man may begin preaching with a perfect knowledge of Latin, Greek and Hebrew, but he will do little or no good among his hearers unless he knows something of the cross. Never was there a minister who did much for the conversion of souls who did not dwell much upon the cross. (J.C. Ryle in *Spurgeon's Sermon Notes* 4:259)

11f "They shunned the reproach of the cross, for man is never ashamed of a religion he himself can accomplish. Neither Pagans, nor Mahommedans, nor Jews, nor those who follow a corrupt Christianity, are ashamed of their religion. Alas! we find many thus ashamed among those who confess the truth, and Christ according to the truth; a remarkable fact, and one that shews where poor human nature is! (John Nelson Darby, Notes on the Epistle to the Galatians in volume 34 of his *Complete Works*, page 86)."

12a Strong words for strong apostates! Mean! Nasty! Go back to 1:8 and see where Paul calls down curses on these Judaizers! But when souls are at stake and the Gospel is being undermined, it is no time to be nice and polite. It is time to take out the Sword of the Spirit and start swinging for blood. These Judaizers were leading men to hell by their message and were perverting the Gospel. They deserved nothing better than to be cursed by God and to be cut off.

12b The New King James has "could wish that those who trouble you would even cut themselves off!" which actually might be better than the King James rendering since the New King James acknowledges the difficult middle voice of the Greek verb. The ESV renders the verb in the same way. But this rendering does cause a significant deviation from the King James. The King James has that they would be cut off, but that someone else (presumably the Lord) would cut the false teachers off while the New

41. Liberty Not License 5:13-15

5:13 For, brethren, ye^a have been called^{aorist passive} unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh,^{b-c} but by love serve^{present imperative} one another.^d

5:14 For all the law is fulfilled^{present passive} in one word, even in this; Thou shalt love^{future} thy neighbor as thyself.^{a-b-c}

King James has Paul wishing they would cut themselves off, which seems something that would be very unlikely. Why would a false teacher "cut himself off"? The New King James might be more accurate, technically, but the King James rendering makes more sense. The literal Greek rendering does not always translate to a good English translation. The translation must be accurate but it must also make sense to the English reader. The Tyndale uses "separated". Coverdale uses "rooted out". The ESV is the most graphic.

13a Emphatic.

13b We are not under Law but under grace but that does not mean that we have no Law! The Law is still there and it is still God's absolute standard of holiness. We are delivered from its condemnations since Christ fulfilled its demands against us on the cross. But we dare not cast it aside, claim grace and Christian liberty and then live as we please. This is the heresy of antinomianism (without law) and it is just as bad as legalism.

13c Men seem to always gravitate to one extreme or the other- legalism (too much law) or antinomianism (no law). Man simply cannot stay balanced. Why can't we avoid the extremes and position ourselves between the two poles? We should still keep the Law as much as we can because it was not done away with, but not to get saved or to stay saved. We keep His commandments because we love Christ. We do these things and avoid the others because He has commanded us to and we obey out of love and a desire for personal holiness on our part. The antinomian refuses to see this

As a Christian, you may not live as you please- you do not have such a license. Where in Scripture does it say we may continue to live in sin now that we are saved? Paul condemns that attitude in Romans 6:1: "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid!" Paul asks a rhetorical question: shall we who are saved continue to live in sin and pursue sin in order to make grace abound? Such a thought ought to be revolting to the Christian. The doctrines of grace, however, are always open to such slander and misunderstandings. Seeing we have been delivered from the pollution of sin, such a thought of returning to the hogpen ought to never be seriously considered. Considering the great truths about the benefits of justification by faith and about the redemptive work of Christ in counter-acting the sin of Adam, as explained in Romans 5, could we continue in sin so that grace may abound? This heresy is of the idea that to make grace really valuable, shall we go deep into sin or continue in it to make it really valuable? After all, the more we sin, the more grace God extends to us, right? Not if we deliberately sin after we have received the knowledge of the truth. This is the grace of God designed to bring the sinner to repentance, not to give a man license to continue in his sin in the delusion that God would be too merciful to punish him.

13d Rather than wallowing in sin without liberty, we are to be using it to serve others. We have liberty to serve God and others, not liberty to selfishly live for ourselves as a heathen would. We are free only within the confines of the will of God and the law of God. To step over that boundary is to transgress (literal definition). So we have the liberty then to do right, but not the liberty used as a license to sin.

14a Paul says that the whole Law is fulfilled in one word: thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Here is a major misunderstanding of the Law. It's central thesis is not necessarily "do" but is rather "love". Love is at the center of the Law- love God and your neighbor. Yet how the Judaizers missed it! They were giving

Galatians

5:15 But if ye bite^{present} and devour^{present} one another, take heed^{present imperative} that ye be not consumed^{aorist passive subjunctive} one of another.^a

42. Walk in the Spirit 5:16-18

5:16 This I say^{present} then, Walk^{a-b-present imperative} in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil^{aorist active subjunctive} the lust^c of the flesh.^d

Paul "down the country" because he was preaching the truth. Where was the love in that? They were hurting the Galatians by sweeping them up in their false doctrines. Where is the love in that? Today, the modern Judaizers, the Seventh-Day Adventists, constantly criticize us for worshipping on Sunday, that we have the Mark of the Beast. How they bite and devour the "Sunday keeping preachers" (as they refer to us- I've heard it myself)! Since they are attacking the truth and those who preach and teach the truth, where is the love in that? Legalizers and not known for their love but rather for their harsh attitudes towards those who will not tow the line exactly as they do.

14b Paul reduces the 613 precepts the Jews claimed were in the Law down to one- love your neighbor as yourself. Now we do love ourselves. The modern Christian psychologist (really a heretic since Christianity and psychology cannot be combined or mixed without compromising the gospel) says that our biggest problem is that we do not love ourselves enough. Rubbish! We love ourselves too much. We sin because we are so enamored with ourselves that we must gratify the flesh despite the commands of God. The point is that we ought to gratify our neighbor as much as we do ourselves. Then we fulfill the whole Law!

14c **"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"** is quoted from Leviticus 19:18.

15a Like "dog eat dog", something Christians should not be doing to each other, for that is not demonstrating the love of God toward each other. "Dog eat dog" may work in the world of business or politics, but it has no place among God's people. No Christian should practice this form of cannibalism.

16a **walk** is in the imperative mood- something that Paul urges upon the Galatians as a constant and consistent mode of life. We are to maintain a manner and philosophy of like that is based upon the power of the Holy Spirit instead of walking in our own sinful nature and desires.

16b To "walk" involves several things:

1. **Deliberate action.** One does not "walk" by accident.
2. **Exertion of effort.** It takes work to walk.
3. **A clear pathway.** One would usually avoid walking over hard paths. We walk in the ways we do because they seem to be easy for us to do so. a sinner finds it easy to walk in the flesh while a saint would find it exceedingly hard. The saint delights in walking in the Spirit yet the sinner would loathe such a path.
4. **A destination.** We walk to get somewhere. Where do We wish to end up at the end of our life- a destination marked by the Spirit or the flesh?

16c The ESV waters this down as "desires" but "lust" is much better and is used by the other translations.

16d This is exactly the opposite from the teaching of the Judizers. They concentrated on the flesh (circumcision and the Law) and underplayed the importance of the Spirit. Paul gives us the right priority here- walk in the Spirit, not the flesh. But one cannot walk in the Spirit unless he is first filled with the Spirit. You will walk according to whatever Spirit is filling you, whether that Spirit be of of the flesh or of holiness.

Galatians

5:17 For the flesh lusteth^{a-present} against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary^{present middle/passive} the one to the other:^b so that ye cannot do^{present subjunctive} the things that ye would.^{c-d-present subjunctive}

5:18 But if ye be led^{present passive} of the Spirit, ye are^{present} not under the law.^a

43. The Works of the Flesh 5:19-21

5:19^{a-b-c} Now the works of the flesh are^{present} manifest, which are^{present} these; Adultery,^{3430-d} fornication,^{4202-e} uncleanness,^{167-f} lasciviousness,^{766-g}

17a The ESV waters this down as “desires” but “lust” is much better and is used by the other translations.

17b We also see how incompatible the Spirit and flesh are. They cannot be reconciled nor merged, nor will they compromise with each other. You are either walking in the Spirit or you are walking in the flesh at any given moment. There is no alternative. You cannot do both. You do not walk 50% in the Spirit and 50% in the flesh- it is 100% to nothing, one way or the other. They are completely opposite to each other and there is no common ground between them.

17c The Law nor circumcision can protect against the lust of the flesh. You cannot fight the flesh with the flesh, but the Spirit must be used. You can't fight fire with fire here.

17d **“ye cannot do the things that ye would.”** This reminds us of Paul's lament in Romans 7:15-24 of our inability to serve God as we should, live for Him as we should or live as holy as we would like.

18a You cannot walk in the flesh and in the Spirit at the same time. In other words, it is theologically impossible to be a good, practicing Seventh-Day Adventist! You cannot claim to be saved by grace and then teach that you have to keep the Law in order to stay saved! That is mixing flesh and spirit, Law and Grace. It cannot be done, any more than oil and water can be mixed. You must make up your mind- one or the other. Either follow the Law fully without grace and faith, or be a Christian without relying on the Law for your salvation or justification. But you cannot do both.

19a Notice the difference between **the works of the flesh** and the **fruit of the Spirit**. Paul does not say “fruit of the flesh” or “works of the Spirit”. The “fruit of the Spirit” involves no works. Consider an apple tree. It does not have to “work” to produce fruit. It does so because it is its nature to produce fruit. Hence a Christian who is walking in the Spirit does not have to “work” at producing fruit in his life. He will produce it naturally. And he will produce all nine parts of the fruit, although he may produce more fruit in some areas than he might in others. But the “works of the flesh” are not fruit. The sinner, by nature, produces these works but even in his sin, he is going to have to work at it. The way of sin is hard and involves much toil and effort in order for the sinner to manifest the various sins in his life.

There is nothing positive in the above list! As Paul said in Romans 7:18 (I know that in me, that is in my flesh, there dwelleth no good thing). What about these works is so attractive to those contemplating going back to the Law?

19b We have 17 works but only one fruit. The sinner will produce any or all of the 17 manifestations of the flesh in his life. He probably won't produce all 17 but he will produce some. Not every sinner is a murderer or an adulterer, but those manifestations are certainly possible in his life. Most sinners are not as bad as they could be but they are still bad nonetheless. But there is only one fruit of the Spirit. It is an all-or-nothing proposition. You will produce all nine elements of the fruit (although in varying amounts) or none at all.

Galatians

So now let us define what is meant by walking in the flesh and walking in the Spirit by observing the results of both lives. Action and reaction- walk according to the flesh and the Law and you will exhibit fruit as a result. What kind of fruit does the flesh produce? What was the spiritual fruit of legalism and of the Judaizers? What sort of fruit could the Galatians expect as a result of their legalism? Paul lists 17 of them in these verses.

19c The breakdown of these sins:

1. Sexual sins- 5:19 adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness,
2. Religious sins- 5:20 idolatry, witchcraft, variance, heresies
3. Social sins- 5:20,21 hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings

19d **“adultery”** Strong's #3430 μοιχηα moicheia; adultery, includes a sexual violation of the marriage relationship, the defilement of the marriage bed. I do not believe that the spiritualizing definition of apostasy, which is a spiritual adultery, is meant here.

This is missing from the ESV.

19e **“fornication”** Strong's #4202 πορνεια porneia; harlotry (including adultery and incest, idolatry. We get our English word "pornography" from this. Chastity was one major virtue Christianity brought into the world. Sexual immorality was commonplace in the world, and was even expected and tolerated, especially in heathen religious practices.

19f **“uncleanness”** Strong's #167 ακατηαρσια akatharsia; impurity. John Gill would include sodomy here.

19g **“lasciviousness”** Strong's #766 ασελγεια aselgeia; licentiousness, filthy, lasciviousness, wantonness, actions that excite disgust and shock public decency, lustful, lewd, sensuality, lack of personal self-restraint, brutal. A man may be “akathartos” and hide his sin: he does not become “aselgês” until he shocks public decency. In classical Greek, the word generally signifies insolence or violence towards another. In the later language the prominent idea is sensuality. To be “lascivious” is to be “lustful, licentious, wanton or lewd”. The other traditional translations render this as “wantonness”. The New King James has “lewdness”. The ESV has “sensuality”.

VERSE COMPARISON OF THE WORKS OF THE FLESH 5:19-21

King James	Tyndale	Coverdale	Geneva 1599/2006	Bishops	ESV
adultery	advoutrie	aduoutrye	adultery	adulterie	(omitted)
fornication	fornicacion	whordome	fornication	fornication	sexual immorality
uncleanness	vnclenes	vnclenes	uncleanness	vnclennesse	impurity
lasciviousness	wantannes	wantanes	wantonness	wantonnesse	sensuality
idolatry	ydolatrye	Idolatrye	Idolatry	Worshippyng of images	Idolatry
witchcraft	witchecraft	witchcraft	witchcraft	witchcrafte	sorcery
hatred	hatred	hatred	hatred	hatred	enmity
variance	variaunce	variaunce	debate	variaunce	(omitted)
emulations	zele	zele	emulations	zeale	jealousy
wrath	wrath	wrath	wrath	wrath	fits of anger
strife	stryfe	stryfe	contentions	strife	rivalries
seditions	sedicion	sedicion	seditions	seditions	dissensions
heresies	sectes	sectes	heresies	sectes	divisions

Galatians

envyings	Envyinge	Envyinge	envy	Enuyinges	envy
murders	murther	murthur	murders	murthers	(omitted)
drunkenness	dronkenes	dronkennes	drunkenness	drunkennesse	drunkenness
revellings	glottony	glotony	gluttony	gluttonies	orgies

5:20 Idolatry,^{1495-a} **witchcraft,**^{5331-b} **hatred,**^{2189-c} **variance,**^{2054-d} **emulations,**^{2205-e}
wrath,^{2372-f} **strife,**^{2052-h} **seditions,**¹³⁷⁰⁻ⁱ **heresies,**^{139-j}

20a **“idolatry”** Strong's #1495 ειδολολατρεια eidololatreia; from ειδωλον eidôlon (Strong's #1497) idol and λατερια lateria (Strong's #2999) service; image-worship, idolatry. These idolatries were so bad that they were forbidden by Roman law. This idol worship often encouraged both drunkenness and sexual vice.

20b **“witchcraft”** Strong's #5331 φαρμακεια pharmakeia; medication (pharmacy), magic, sorcery. It has a strong idea of drug use, since witches used drugs in the formulation of their potions and spells. The New King James and ESV have “sorcery”.

20c **“hatred”** Strong's #2189 εχθρα echthra; hostility, a reason for opposition, enmity, the opposite of love. The New King James has “contentions”. The ESV has the harder word “enmity.”

20d **“variance”** Strong's #2054 ερις eris; a quarrel, wrangling, contention, debate, strife. The Geneva Bible renders this as “debate” and the ESV omits the word. This is a debate in a negative sense- arguing for the sake of arguing or simply to stir up trouble.

20e **“emulations”** Strong's #2205 ζελος zelos; heat, zeal, fervent mind, indignation, jealousy. “Emulations” is from the Latin “imitari”, meaning “to imitate”. And it is the effort or ambition to equal or surpass, a jealous rivalry for honor or power. The Tyndale, Coverdale and Bishops all use “zeal”. The New King James and the ESV have “jealousies”.

20f **“wrath”** Strong's #2372 θυμος thumos; violent passion (as if breathing hard), fierceness, indignation. The ESV has “fits of anger” which is just plain wrong. “Anger” here is a general attitude, a frame of mind, something that is part and parcel of the sinner involved. “Fits of anger” gives the idea of sporadic and isolated episodes of anger instead of it being a constant and continual attitude. Jesus had “fits of anger” on occasion. Was He manifesting the works of the flesh? Of course not. But He was not a man full of wrath, controlled by wrath, which is what is being described here. The rendering of the ESV is a back-door attempt to charge the Lord with sin by manifesting one of these works of the flesh.

20h **“strife”** Strong's #2052 εριθεια eritheia; intrigue, faction, contention. Also has the idea of canvassing for public office, scheming, self-interest, mercenary intentions. The New King James has the inferior “selfish ambitions” and it clearly makes too many changes in this list.

20i **“seditions”** Strong's #1370 διχοστεις dichostsis; disunion, dissension, division. The New King James has “dissensions”.

20j **“heresies”** Strong's #139 αιρεσις haireisis; a choice, a party or disunion. A heretic accepts revealed truth but then turns around and alters it to serve his own needs. The other traditional text translations have “sects” which would have the idea of one who “makes or creates sects”. The ESV has “divisions”.

Galatians

5:21 Envyings,^{5355-a} murders,^{5408-b} drunkenness,^{3178-c} revellings,^{2970-d} and such like: of the which I tell you before,^{present} as I have also told you in time past,^{aoist} that they which do^{e-present active participle} such things shall not inherit^{future} the kingdom of God.^{f-g}

21a **“envyings”** Strong's #5355 φθονος phthonos; ill-will, jealousy, spite, pain felt, and malignity conceived, at the sight of excellence or happiness.

21b **“murders”** Strong's #5408 φονος phonos; be slain with, slaughter. This word is missing in the ESV.

21c **“drunkenness”** Strong's #3178 μεθε methe; an intoxicant. We are commanded to be filled with the Spirit and not to be drunk with wine (Ephesians 5:18,19) but the sinner reverses this command.

21d **“revellings”** Strong's #2970 κομος komos; a carousal (as if letting loose), reveling, rioting, a village merrymaking (the word is from the root "kômê", village), people going up and down the streets singing and drinking, or revels held in religious ceremonies, especially for Bacchus, wild, furious and ecstatic. In the cities such entertainments grew into carouses, in which the party of revelers paraded the streets with torches, singing, dancing and all kinds of frolics. These revels also entered into religious observances, especially in the worship of Bacchus, Demeter and the Idaean Zeus in Crete. The frantic and orgiastic rites of Egypt, Asia Minor and Thrace became engrafted on the old religion. Socrates pictures himself as having gone down to the Piraeus to see the celebration of the festival of Bendis, the Thracian Artemis (Diana); and having been told by one of his companions that, in the evening, there is to be a torch-race with horses in honor of the goddess. The rites grew furious and ecstatic. Crowds of women abandoned themselves to demonstrations of frantic excitement, with dancing and clamorous invocation of the god. There were said to tear animals limb from limb, to devour raw flesh, and to cut themselves without feeling the wound. The men yielded to a similar impulse by noisy revels in the streets, sounding the cymbals and tambourine and carrying the image of the god in procession. Peter addresses the sojourners in Galatia, where the Phrygian worship of Cybele, the great mother of the gods, prevailed, with its wild orgies and hideous mutilations. It has the idea of drunken songs and parties. How appropriate for our generation! Every weekend (especially on Sundays when everyone should be in church), sinners (and not a few saints) run off to the beach or the mountains and live it up. Americans must simply have their weekends and their vacations! And with it come the unchristian music (rock, country, jazz, rap, R&B, “oldies”...) and the booze. The Greek word also deals with festivities in honor of Bacchus, the god of wine, which festivals were marked by feasting, drunkenness and the grossest impurities and obscenities.

The ESV has “orgies”.

21e The New King James rendering of “those who practice...” which does recognize the idea of this Greek word.

21f Those who do these things have no inheritance in the Kingdom of God. If they are saved, they will have no rewards for walking in the flesh. God does not reward walking in the flesh!

21g The critical text versions, like the ESV, just can't leave these words alone but find it necessary to change most of them, mainly for the sake of change, as their changes are not improvements and do not add anything to the understanding of the text.

44. The Fruit of the Spirit 5:22,23

5:22^{a-b-c} But^d the fruit of the Spirit is^{present} love,^{26-e} joy,^{5479-f} peace,^{1515-g} longsuffering,^{3115-h} gentleness,⁵⁵⁴⁴⁻ⁱ goodness,^{19-j} faith,^{4102-k}

22a Now in contrast, we see the fruit (singular, as compared to the 17 works of the flesh) of walking in the Spirit. There is one fruit but 9 manifestations of it. This is the fruit the Lord desired His disciples to manifest in John 15:1-8. I have heard some Fundamental preachers try to limit the fruit of John 15 to merely soul winning, and that our "fruit that remains" are the souls we win. But this interpretation must be rejected for it is founded on a failed philosophy of hyper-evangelism, which is destroying Fundamentalism today (as well as doing great damage in some sectors of New Evangelicalism and the Charismatic movement). Comparing Scripture with Scripture will not allow such a hyper-evangelistic application or interpretation. We can understand why there would be such a limited interpretation as "soul winning" (in its modern definition) is much easier than actually praying, meditating, having devotions and walking with God. Plus, "soul winning" (in its modern definition) is a better tool to use to build your own ecclesiastical empire and to gain the praise of men than is a devotional life. Consider Barnabas. We have no record that he ever led anyone to Christ. Yet he:

1. Gave a lot of money to the church- Acts 4:36,37
2. Got Paul into the church when others didn't want him- Acts 9:26-28
3. Helped the church at Antioch- Acts 11:22-24
4. He taught Paul, who later wrote 13 books of the New Testament and who took the gospel to Europe
5. He helped John Mark get back into the ministry after Acts 13

Now- did Barnabas bear fruit? How many souls is he recorded to have won in Acts?

There are 9 manifestations of the fruit of the Spirit as compared to 17 works of the flesh, almost a 2:1 ratio, showing that it is twice as easy to walk the flesh than to walk in the Spirit! The way of legalism may sound hard but is really very easy, for it requires no spirituality. It is much harder to walk in the grace, liberty and faith of the Spirit than in the legalism of the flesh. Anyone can be a legalist for that requires no spirituality- only a lot of spiritual pride. But only a genuine, Spirit-filled Christian who loves God can walk in the Spirit.

Fruit then is a natural manifestation of a nature (John 15). You do not practice fruit, you bear it. An apple tree bears apples because it is its nature to. An apple tree cannot produce tomatoes. A legalist cannot produce the fruit of the Spirit and a Spirit-filled Christian will not manifest the works of the flesh.

This fruit can be divided into three categories according to whom it is manifested toward:

1. Upward toward God- love, joy, peace
2. Outward toward others- longsuffering, gentleness, goodness
3. Inward toward ourselves- faith, meekness, temperance

22b If a man is walking in the Spirit, he will manifest all (not some) of the following virtues.

22c Breakdown of the fruit of the Spirit:

1. Godward qualities- love, joy, peace,
2. Outward qualities- longsuffering, gentleness, goodness
3. Inward qualities- faith meekness, temperance:

22d **"But"**. The contrast! The contrast between the flesh and the spirit! They are always presented side-by-side in contrast, never together. They are always presented as a choice, as in "choose one", and we must indeed must choose one. We must live either in the flesh or we must live in the spirit at any given time and both means of life and the fruits they produce are presented side-by-side for our comparison.

Galatians

5:23 Meekness,^{4236-a} temperance:^{1466-b} against such there is^{present} no law.^{c-d}

22e “**love**” Strong's #26 αγαπη agapê; love, affection or benevolence; a love-feast, love without human emotion as a basis. This is the love that God loves with, as it is His nature to love and His love is not based on any human emotion.

22f “**joy**” Strong's #5479 χαρα chara; cheerfulness, calm delight.

22g “**peace**” Strong's #1515 ειρηνη ειρênhê; peace, prosperity, quietness, rest. It is the calm, quiet, and order, which take place in the justified soul, instead of the doubts, fears, alarms, and dreadful forebodings, which every true penitent less or more feels, and must feel till the assurance of pardon brings peace and satisfaction to the mind. Peace is the first sensible fruit of the pardon of sin, as seen in Romans 5:1.

22h “**longsuffering**” Strong's #3115 μακροθυμια makrothumia; to be long-suffering, forbearance, self-restraint before proceeding to action, the quality of a person who is able to avenge himself yet refrains from doing so. This is the attitude that God has towards man. God could have wiped us out long ago, especially after Adam's Fall, during the events leading up to the Flood, at the Tower of Babel, at the crucifixion of Christ, at any time, but He withheld Himself out of mercy, love and grace.
The ESV uses “patience”.

22i “**gentleness**” Strong's #5544 χρειστοτες chrestotes; usefulness, moral excellence, kindness, self-control and even-temperness, self-discipline of the emotion and of the temperament.
The ESV has “kindness”.

22j “**goodness**” Strong's #19 αγαθοσυνη agathosunê; goodness, virtue or beneficence

22k “**faith**” Strong's #4102 πιστις pistis; persuasion, credence; moral conviction, assurance, belief, believe, fidelity. The Tyndale, Coverdale, ESV and New King James use “faithfulness”.

VERSE COMPARISON OF THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT IN 5:22-23

King James	Tyndale	Coverdale	Geneva 1599/2006	Bishops	ESV
love	loue	loue	love	loue	love
joy	ioye	ioye,	joy	ioye	joy
peace	peace	peace	peace	peace	peace
longsuffering	longesufferinge	longe sufferinge	long suffering	long suffer yng	patience
gentleness	getlenes	getlenes	gentleness	gentlesse	kindness
goodness	goodness	goodnesse	goodness	goodnesse	goodness
faith	faythfulnes	faithfulnes	faith	fayth	faithfulness
meekness	meknes	mekenesse	meekness	mekenesse	gentleness
temperance	temperancye	teperauce	temperancy	temperauncie	self-control

23a “**meekness**” Strong's #4236 πραιοτες praiotes; gentleness, humility, meekness, forbearance, calmness toward God, acceptance of God's dealings with us. According to Aristotle, praotês is that virtue that stands between two extremes, the "orgilotês", uncontrolled and unjustified anger and "aorgisia", not becoming angry at all no matter what takes place around you.

The ESV has “gentleness”.

Galatians

45. Live in the Spirit 5:24-26

5:24 And they that are Christ's^a have crucified^{aorist} the flesh with the affections and lusts.^{b-c}

5:25 If we live^{present} in the Spirit,^a let us also walk,^{present active subjunctive} in the Spirit.^{a-b}

5:26 Let us not be^{present middle/passive subjunctive} desirous of vain glory,^{a-2755} provoking^{4292-present middle participle} one another, envying^{present active participle} one another.^b

23b “**temperance**” Strong's #1466 εγκρατεία egkrateia; self-control, temperance, freedom from excess in the gratification of the appetites. It is opposed to all epicurism, gluttony, drunkenness and incontinence.

The ESV uses “self-control”.

23c Now if all these things be in us, then Peter tells us in 2 Peter 1:8 that we will not be unfruitful. If a man is walking in the Spirit, then he will produce fruit. It will be automatic and he will not help but bear spiritual fruit.

23d It is interesting that “hope” is not mentioned as a fruit of the Spirit, although “faith” and “love” (charity) are. See 1 Corinthians 13:13 for this triad.

24a The ESV adds “Jesus”.

24b The only way to walk in the flesh is to crucify that flesh and everything associated with it- put it to death and become insensible to it (Galatians 2:20). The exhortation is then clear- kill the flesh, turn away from the legalism of the flesh and walk in the Spirit.

24c The ESV uses “desires” for “lusts”. The Coverdale reverses the “lusts and desires”.

25a The ESV has “by the Spirit”. The traditional translations all agree with the King James.

25b How could we live in the Spirit and walk in the flesh? Such a practice would nullify living in the Spirit, for to walk in the flesh would be to live in the flesh. A man who is living in the Spirit must walk in the Spirit, as he would be unable to walk in the flesh in such a spiritual state.

26a The ESV has “conceited” but there is a difference between being “conceited” and being “desirous of vain glory” as the other translations have it.

26b Three things for the Spirit-living man to avoid:

1. **Vain glory.** Stop worrying about the praise of man (the “vain glory”). “Vain glory” is temporary and fickle. A man who is right with God will seldom be praised by man and even most Christians will shun him. Beware of any man who has minions who do nothing else but sing his praises. This means that we are not to be seeking great things for ourselves (Jeremiah 45:5). Preachers are not to waste any time in building their own empires, putting out brag sheets that advertise their ministry all over the country or in trying to establish their own personality cults. Unfortunately, far, far too many preachers do exactly this because they desire “vain glory” and the praise of men as they boast of all the “souls that they have won” and the sizes of their Sunday Schools and their Sunday morning attendance figures.

Galatians

Strong's #2755 κενοδοξος kenodoxos, from κενος kenos (Strong's #2756) empty or vain; and δοξα doxa (Strong's #1391) glory or praise; vainly glorifying, self-conceited

2. **Provoking one another.** This would have the idea of trying to start trouble. We can provoke one another in a good way, urging, yea, goading, each other onto higher levels of holiness, but a lot of this provoking is understood in a negative way, mainly seen as attempts to aggravate each other.

Strong's #4292 προκαλεομαι prokaleomai; to call forth, to call forth to one's self, to challenge to a combat or contest with one, to provoke, to irritate. Used only here.

3. **Envy one another.** Envy is a sin that is associated with covetousness and hatred that can lead to no good. We are not to envy another man's church, ministry, attendance or influence, but rather, we are to be concentrating upon our own lives and ministries.

Galatians Chapter 6

46. Spiritual Restoration 6:1

6:1^a Brethren,^b if a man be overtaken^{aorist passive subjunctive} in a fault,^c ye which are spiritual,^d restore^{present imperative} such an one^e in the spirit of meekness;^f considering^{present active participle} thyself, lest thou also be tempted.^{g-aorist passive subjunctive}

1a This deals with the issue of church restoration, which is needed when a Christian falls into a sin that is serious enough to warrant the attention of the church. Restoration is a Biblical mandate and must be practiced by local churches in order to insure purity and doctrinal orthodoxy. The ministry of restoration is exerted to be a testimony to other Christians and sinners that the church is serious in its opposition to sin. Failure of a church to attempt to restore members neuters its preaching against sin. Restoration is also used as a means of reclaiming a wayward saint, to reclaim him from the sin he has fallen into and to reclaim him back into full fellowship of the church.

1b If the light of all that the Galatians have done to Paul and the general tone of the letter, Paul still has the grace to refer to them as “Brethren”!

1c The Geneva has the idea of a “stumbling” into a sin unexpectedly, by accident, suddenly. This is the idea of “overtaken” as the King James has it but the Geneva may be a bit clearer. The Tyndale has “by chance” which is also good. This would give the idea that church restoration is not designed for those who practice sin or who are involved in a lifelong, habitual practice of sin. The Geneva and Coverdale have the idea that this ministry of restoration is for those who are “overtaken” (as the King James has it), those who find themselves suddenly in a sinful situation, one they stumbled into, not one they deliberately walked into. Restoration is for those who are “ambushed” by sin. Discipline is for those who commit deliberate and willful sin in a habitual manner.

The ESV uses “transgression” for “fault” here but it is not a good rendering if Paul is discussing an “accidental-type” sin. “Transgression” is more of a willful violation, which would be contrary to this idea.

1d Not anyone or everyone in the local church is spiritually qualified to oversee church restoration. Unspiritual, carnal church members should not be involved in church restoration due to their lack of knowledge and experience. Pride and a condemnatory attitude on the part of inexperienced Christians may do more harm than good. A man involved in this delicate ministry must be

- 1. Experienced
- 2. Biblical
- 3. Knowledgeable
- 4. Spiritual

The pastor, deacons and elders of the church oversee this restoration.

1e It is the duty of the Christian to restore such a one in this case, who slips and falls, not to sit in judgment and condemn him in the spirit of an egotistical Pharisee. We are to pick him up, dust him off, assist him in a ministry of restoration, and to get him back on his feet again and get him back in the race and to help him to resume his pilgrimage. We are not to dance on his grave and revel in the fact that we are somehow better than he is spiritually since we did not fall into that sin.

1f The goal of this is the restoration of the affected party to a position of spiritual usefulness once again. We are seeking to bring the person to a point of repentance and to make him spiritually useful again. He must submit to church discipline and be willing to abide by the decision of the church in order to be spiritually restored.

Galatians

47. Fulfilling the Law of Christ 6:2-5

6:2 Bear ye^{present imperative} one another's burdens,^{922-a-b-c} and so fulfil^{aorist imperative} the law of Christ.

6:3 For if a man think himself^{present participle} to be^{present infinitive} something, when he is^{present} nothing, he deceiveth^{present} himself.^{a-b-c-d-e}

The ones doing the restoring are to do so in a spirit of meekness, not of hate, arrogance or pride. This is why spiritual maturity and experience are necessary because a novice could not properly do it. These seasons are prime opportunities for Satan to get into the church and wreck all sorts of havoc. Restoring here has the idea of repairing damaged nets. The Greek rendering suggests patience and continued effort. Even after confession and restoration, there may be a long period of work ahead for the brother as well as the church to completely bring the offending man back to the place where he was before he fell.

The ESV has "gentleness" but "meekness" is better because the meek man will always consider his own spiritual state as he is involved in this ministry of restoration. You can be "gentle" and not necessarily consider yourself at the same time.

1g This shows us why we are to be meek as we restore such a one, remembering that "there but for the grace of God go I. I just might be brought before the church one day for the same sin I condemned this brother for harshly. I should treat him as I would desire to be treated."

2a What is the text of this law? Bear each other's burdens. It is bound up in loving your neighbor. Love him properly and you will bear his burdens! We ought to be burden-bearers than burden-binders, as the Pharisees were, who loved to bind burdens on the backs of their unfortunate followers (Matthew 23:4). We have too many such modern Pharisees in the church who wallow in legalism and who seek to impose it upon others by insisting other believers conform to their own personal convictions. If they do not, the Pharisee denounces them as unspiritual. They tell you "do this, don't do that, wear this, don't wear that, drink this, don't eat that" as if your salvation depended upon it. Instead, they are simply trying to get you to obey their manmade rules because they enjoy the sense of power and authority that gives them over the lives and consciences of other believers. That is a privilege that belongs to the Holy Spirit alone, and to no man. The spiritual man is always looking for ways to lessen such loads, not add to them.

2b The Galatians were so desirous to load themselves down with the burdens of the Law, legalism and all of its ritualism, let them add one more burden that actually has some value- bearing the burdens of another. If they desire to follow a law, then let them follow the Law of Christ.

2c There are two different Greek words are used for "burden" in 6:2 and 6:5:

1. 6:2 "**burdens**" Strong's #922 βαρος baros; weight, a load, abundance, authority. We are to bear each other's loads, weights and troubles. We are to weep with those who weep.

2. 6:5 "**burden**" Strong's #5413 φορτιον phortion; an invoice (as part of freight), a task or service. But we must bear the burdens of our own service. God has called us to service and we must bear that burden alone. No one else can do our ministries for us and no one else will be held accountable for our ministries except us.

The first part of "bearing the loads of others" is covered in verses 2 and 3. The second part about individual burden bearing is dealt with in verses 4 and 5.

3a Humility is also enjoined here. We are not to think highly of ourselves, especially in a spiritual sense, lest we end up deceiving ourselves. Thus, a (spiritually) proud man is a self-deceived man. He has convinced himself that he is something when he is in reality nothing. The Jews have a similar saying

Galatians

6:4 But let every man prove^{present imperative} his own work,^a and then shall he have^{future} rejoicing^b in himself alone, and not in another.

6:5 For every man shall bear^{future} his own burden.^{5413-a-b-2c}

"Whoever he is that is something, or thinks in himself that he is something, it would be better if he had never been created." (John Gill 9:53)

3b Would that some preachers would take this to heart! How many preachers carve out their own empires and personality cults and promote themselves to the hilt. They really think they are "God's man for this vital hour" simply because they pastor "America's largest Sunday School" or had 5000 baptisms last year. Yet this sort of preacher sickens God and irritates the saints because in reality, he is really a big, fat spiritual nothing, a zero, despite all his claims to the contrary.

3c "**He deceiveth himself**" And there is no worse form of deception than self-deception.

3d "**He deceiveth himself**":

1. When he thinks he is good enough
2. When he thinks he can save himself
3. When he thinks no one can know if he is saved or not
4. When he thinks he must wait until he is better before he can be saved
5. When he thinks that if he is lost, it's not his fault
6. When he thinks there is something more he has to do to be saved than believe
7. When he thinks that he will escape if he neglects so great salvation (Hebrews 2:3).

3e The Tyndale and Geneva add "in his imagination" which is more of a commentary than a straight interpretation,. A man may be self-deceived in many other areas in his life and not just in his imagination. The Bishops has "in his own fantasy" which is interesting but again, is an unnecessary expansion.

4a Every man must prove his own work spiritually and in terms of his own individual ministry and walk with God.. When we stand at the bema judgment, we will answer for our works and ministries, not that of another. Some people are professional Pharisees who gad about from pew to pew in their churches to supervise the lives and services of others. It is all you have to do to worry about yourself! Any rewards we earn will be ours alone but any loss we sustain will be suffered by us alone. In this sense, we bear our own burden, so 6:2 does not contradict with 6:5. We may bear each other's burden down here socially but we must bear our own burden at the bema in terms of our own personal duties and responsibility. There, no one can help us!

4b The ESV has "boast". The ESV usually puts in some form of "boasting" in verses that have to deal with rejoicing, which is an error. Rejoicing and boasting are not the same things. When we rejoice, we can do so in regards to something either God or man has done. But "boasting" is excluded as it usually deals with promoting self and human pride, often at the expense of the glory of God. But the ESV seems to want to give fallen man any and every excuse it can to boast and promote self and flesh.

5a Negative injunctions of burden bearing:

1. We are not to burden others. The text does not say "Let others bear your burdens."
2. We are not to spy out other's burdens and report thereon.
3. We are not to despise them for having such loads to bear.
4. We are not to go through the world oblivious to the sorrows of others (Charles Spurgeon, *Spurgeon's Sermon Notes*, 4:260).

48. Exhortation to Teachers 6:6

6:6 Let him that is taught^{present passive participle} **in the word communicate**^{present imperative} **unto him that teacheth**^{present active participle} **in all good things.**^a

49. Sowing and Reaping 6:7-9

6:7 Be not deceived;^{a-present passive participle} **God is not mocked;**^{b-c-present passive} **for** **whatsoever a man soweth,**^{present subjunctive} **that shall he also reap.**^{d-future}

6:8 For he that soweth^{present active participle} **to his flesh shall of the flesh reap**^{future} **corruption;**^{a-b} **but he that soweth**^{present active participle} **to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap**^{future} **life everlasting.**^{c-d}

5b Each must bear his own sin if he persists in it. Each must bear his own shame, which results from his sin. Each must bear his own responsibility in his own sphere. Each must bear his own judgment at the last. (Charles Spurgeon, *Spurgeon's Sermon Notes*, 4:261)

6a The preacher/teacher is to continue in his ministry of communicating the gospel and all related subjects to those who sit under him.

7a **Be not deceived** or “do not allow yourselves to be led astray. Do not deceive yourselves nor let anyone else (namely false teachers like the Judaizers) deceive you.

7b He will not be deceived, assumed, taken for granted or ridiculed by man. The Greek word has the idea of “turning your nose up at some”, which is usually done in contempt. You may mock God in such an irreverent fashion, but not so with God. You cannot expect to flaunt the laws of God and escape unscathed. Sooner or later, you will receive your just and righteous punishment.

7c Charles Spurgeon lists a few areas in which God will not be mocked:

1. Of the idea that there are no rewards or punishments.
2. By the fancy that we will escape in the crowd.
3. By the superstition that certain rites will set all right at the last, whatever our lives might be.
4. By a reliance upon an orthodox creed, a supposed conversion, a presumptuous faith and a little almsgiving (Charles Spurgeon, *Spurgeon's Sermon Notes* 4:263).

7d Sowing and Reaping 6:7,8

1. A Common Mistake- “Be not deceived”
2. A Solemn Reminder- “God is not mocked”
3. An Unfailing Law- “Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap” (James Smith, *Handfuls on Purpose*, 10:273).

8a So it is with all temptations and lusts. They are ever scattering seeds- as weeds do. What a power there is in seeds! How long-lived they are! as we see in the mummies of Egypt, where they may have lain for thousands of years in darkness, but now come forth to grow...They have wings and they fly for miles. They may float over wide oceans and rest themselves in foreign countries. Often they are taken up by birds which transport them to distant places. It propagates itself and spreads over the whole soul, and goes down from generation to generation (James McCosh in *Spurgeon's Sermon Notes* 4:264-5).

Galatians

6:9 And let us not be weary^{present subjunctive} in well doing^{present active participle} for in due season we shall reap,^{future} if we faint^{present passive participle} not.^{a-b-c}

50. Ministering to the Household of Faith 6:10

6:10 As we have^{present} therefore opportunity, let us do^{present middle/passive subjunctive} good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.^a

8b "In like manner, he that sows to the flesh - who indulges his sensual and animal appetites, shall have corruption as the crop: you cannot expect to lead a bad life and go to heaven at last. According as your present life is, so will be your eternal life whether your sowing be to the flesh or to the Spirit, so will your eternal reaping be (Adam Clarke, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*)."

8c For every action there is a reaction is the old physics maxim and it applies to men as well. The picture is to a farmer. He goes into the field with seeds of corn. He sows that corn and expects corn to grow and expects to reap corn. He will not reap apples.

8d Now the spiritual principle is this: in your life, if you sow fleshly actions, sins, rebellions, pride, self-will and rebellion, then that is what you will reap at the bema. You will reap at the bema what you sowed in life. Sow obedience, prayer, service and holiness and you will get it back with interest at the bema. You will receive at the judgment exactly what you have invested into it. Every act and deed as a Christian is being applied to our bema accounts and we will reap the results of those actions, whether they be good or bad. While you will not meet with your sins again since they have been dealt with at the cross, we may certainly have to deal with the results of those sins in this life and at the bema. God will not be trifled with. He will recompense every man according to his deeds. This law is more sure than the law of the sun rising in the east every morning. The Laws of divine government cannot be set aside or ignored.

9a Other applications:

1. Sow smoking and reap lung cancer and an early grave.
2. Sow drunkenness and reap a ruined liver and a liquor-soaked brain. A destroyed family, wealth and reputation will also follow.
3. Sow sexual immorality or sodomy and reap AIDS or any number of venereal diseases, and very possibly an angry husband with a shotgun, looking for the man who slept with his wife, or an angry father looking for the boy who violated his daughter.
4. Sow sin and a lifetime of rebellion and reap the lake of fire!

9b But it also works in a positive way. Sow Bible study, church attendance, service, a devotional life and divine obedience and reap life eternal. There is a reward for good service and life. It may seem that there is no benefit in holy living and service down here. Work for God and live right and what does it get you? Scorn, ridicule, opposition, persecution, poverty among other things. But there is a reward coming! There is a harvest day coming for such divine sowing! We do not receive our full rewards down here but rather we are to expect them at the bema. That is why we are not to have our eyes fixed on any temporal reward, but rather are to be looking beyond this life for our reimbursement. Just as your employer pays you on the day appointed (and not before), God's "payday" is set at the bema judgment and not before.

9c The Coverdale does not really do a very good job with this verse in missing the "if we faint not" thought.

10a Christian service is to be rendered to all men but our first priority is to the brethren. The pastor's primary responsibility is to his people as is the church. The church is a sort of welfare agency, helping those who need it, but the Christian, who is a member of that church, has first claim on Christian help.

Galatians

51. Paul's Large Letter 6:11

6:11 Ye see^{aorist imperative} how large a letter^{a-b} I have written^{aorist} unto you with mine own hand.

52. A Fair Show in the Flesh 6:12,13

6:12^a As many as desire^{present} to make a fair shew^{aorist infinitive} in the flesh,^b they^c constrain^{present} you to be circumcised;^{present passive infinitive} only lest they should suffer persecution^{present passive subjunctive} for the cross of Christ.

It always seemed odd to me that sinners who have no use for the church or the gospel always call churches when they can't make the rent! Our church gets calls like this regularly. They wasted their money on booze and cigarettes and other sins but then want the church to bail them out! No man has any right to expect anything out of the church unless he has put something into it first. Let the sinners go to other sinners for their help. They scorn the church but will bless it when they get hungry enough. What hypocrisy! They only see the church as a bank or a welfare office instead of a place dedicated to the worship of God and the teaching and preaching of His Word.

11a This does not deal with the length of Galatians, since Galatians is not that long of a letter, but rather with the large letters Paul used in writing. Paul penned Galatians himself, without the help of a secretary. His poor eyesight forced him to use these very large letters so that he could see what he was writing. In this rare instance, the ESV has a better rendering, but it does so with a non-theological verse.

11b Some suggest that Paul used very large letters here to call attention to the importance of the next upcoming verses. He says in 6:12 that he wrote this letter himself, without the help, aid or editing of a secretary. Galatians is pure, 100% Paul, with no outside influences or help. Everything that has been said has been totally apostolic and thus worthy of attention by the Galatians.

12a Paul returns his attention to the Juadizers. Paul has to take one more shot at them before concluding this letter. Paul discusses their real motivations:

1. **To avoid persecution for the cross of Christ.** To them, a fate worse than death would be to receive any criticism, opposition or attacks for their doctrines and practices. False teachers are usually most unwilling to suffer for what they believe, unlike genuine believers and true teachers
2. **To glory in your flesh.** They gloried in their large number of converts. They were counting heads and racking up numbers. The more flesh they could rack up (more converts) the more they gloried. How we are plagued with this today! There are countless men running around the country to boast and brag concerning how large their churches are and how many "souls they have led to Christ". They are glorying in the flesh of their followers, not in their followers themselves. Their converts are just so much meat to them. They didn't care about their converts personally. As long as a profession could be wrangled out of them, they were happy. How this condemns the hyper-evangelism of Jack Hyles (and his myriad of followers), Charles Finney, John R. Rice, *The Sword of the Lord*, *Revival Fires*, and nearly every Charismatic/Pentecostal evangelist today! And it seems that we all have been conditioned and programmed to believe that if our church is not growing (numerically, as if there was no other way for a church to grow) or if we do not have a large church, then we are a spiritual failure somehow, as it mere numbers can measure the spirituality and success of a ministry!

12b This involves the "fair show in the flesh" for legalizers love the outward show. They need the ritualism, the processionals and recessionals and all the outward trappings of religion. Their religion is built on the outward in all things- there is nothing spiritual about it. But those who walk in the Spirit need

Galatians

6:13 For neither they themselves who are circumcised^{present passive participle} keep^{present} the law; but desire^{present} to have you circumcised,^{present passive infinitive} that they may glory^{aorist middle subjunctive} in your flesh.^{a-b-c}

53. Glorifying in the Cross 6:14

6:14 But God forbid^{a-aorist middle optative} that I should glory,^{b-c-present middle/passive infinitive} save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ,^{d-e-f} by whom the world is crucified^{g-h-perfect passive} unto me, and Iⁱ unto the world.

none of the outward trappings of religion for we worship in spirit and in truth. But they glory in the flesh, that thing the Lord has condemned.

12c Emphatic.

13a The Galatians were just numbers to the Judaizers, tokens of their conquest. The Judaizers cared nothing for the Galatians personally, just as long as they could put their notches in their pistol. Now compare this to Paul, who really cared for the Galatians and prayed for them with an intense burden. Who was closer to God?

13b In summary, the Judaizers who insisted on the Gentile converts being circumcised did so for two motivations:

1. So that they (the Judaizers) might escape persecution that they would have otherwise endured had they preached the same gospel of grace that Paul preached.
2. They wanted to put on a public religious performance that would make them look spiritual and successful and gain more converts and adherents to themselves (that would increase the attendance to their church!) while at the same time, harming Paul's ministry.

13c As we have noted before, the ESV likes to substitute "boast" where the traditional manuscripts would use "glory". But here, such a change would be justified, but only because we are talking about false teachers. To make the change with reference to the things of God, God Himself or Christians is not justified but it is justified in dealing with the motivations of these false teachers, for their motivations are carnal and fleshly.

14a "But God forbid...", Or "far be it from me" or "may I never do it"...a very strong negative desire on Paul's part.

14b The Judaizers would glory in their converts and in their circumcision and in their ritual and religion but there was only one thing Paul dared glory in and that was in the cross of Christ. Glorifying in anything else would be idolatry. And it would be foolish to glory in anything else except the cross. If Paul had gloried in the Galatians, he would have wound up with egg on his face after the Galatians' defection. But there is no such danger in the cross for it never changes nor varies. He who glories in Christ and His cross need never fear about being ashamed. Paul could have gloried in his progress as a Pharisee, his education, his past service, his spirituality, his visions and revelations, but he knew better. To have done so would have resulted in idolatry and foolishness. "God forbid that I should glory in my birth, my education, my proficiency in Scripture, or my regard to orthodox ritual." (Charles Spurgeon, "The Cross Our Glory", *12 Sermons on the Passion and Death of Christ*, page 142)

14c "Some glory in their physical strength, in which an ox excels them; or in their gold, which is but thick clay; or in their gifts, which are but talents with which they are entrusted. (Charles Spurgeon, "The Cross Our Glory", *12 Sermons on the Passion and Death of Christ*, page 141)"

Galatians

14d Paul no doubt gloried in that cross that was so shameful but more importantly, Paul gloried, yea, even boasted, in the doctrine of the cross. This includes the doctrines of the atonement and propitiation. Paul will take the shame, tribulation, suffering, curses and even death associated with genuine, Biblical Christianity than the comforts of compromise any day.

Paul gloried in the cross by continually bringing it up in his preaching. No matter his text, Paul would somehow work in the atoning blood of Christ, how He was made sin on that cross for us. What you major on is what you glory in.

14e In these days, neo-fundamentalists, evangelicals and Charismatics like to glory in a lot of fleshly things rather than the cross, like:

1. Attendance
2. Busses
3. Sunday schools
4. Doctorates (honorary or earned- makes no difference)
5. How high up the latter in the fellowship or denomination a preacher is
6. Books published
7. How many Bible conferences or meetings he is invited to preach in
8. Baptisms
9. Converts
10. Facilities
11. The fact that some big-name preacher is promoting him

Anything but that which is truly important- glorying not in ourselves but only in the cross of Christ- what He has done in us, through us and for us. A Christian has no business glorying in anything else. We glory in Christ or we glory not at all.

But this desire for preachers to glory in the flesh is quite sickening to both God and man. A man who can only talk about himself and how great he is and how great his church is knows nothing of the power of Christ. He is an egoist who worships at the altar of self. He is powerless and graceless and is to be avoided at all costs. The acid test of such a man is- who does he talk about more- himself or Christ?

Of course, most churches do this by emphasizing their ritual, their fancy church buildings, their lavish interiors, their robed preacher and choirs. They put all the emphasis on the external ritual than you can see instead of on the inward workings of the Spirit that you cannot see nor tally on a board in public view.

14f "The Christian glories in the cross for the following reasons: (Albert Barnes, in *Spurgeon Sermon Notes*, 4:267).

1. Because of the love of Him who suffered there.
2. Because of the purity and innocence of Christ as He died there for the guilty.
3. Because of the honor there put on the Law of God by His dying to maintain it unsullied.
4. Because of the reconciliation there made for sin.
5. Because of the pardon there procured for the guilty.
6. Because of the fact that through it we become dead to the world and are made alive unto God.
7. Because of the support and consolation which go from that cross to sustain us in trial.
8. Because of the fact that it procured for us admission into heaven, a title to a world of glory.

14g Charles Spurgeon lists 3 crucifixions in 6:14:

1. Christ crucified
2. The world crucified
3. The Believer crucified (*Spurgeon's Sermon Notes*, 4:266-267)

14h The perfect tense here shows the final, "once-for-all" not to be undone historical finality of this crucifixion.

Galatians

54. A New Creature 6:15

6:15 For in Christ Jesus^a neither circumcision availeth^{present} any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.^{b-c}

55. Benediction to Those Walking by Faith 6:16

6:16 And as many as walk^{a-future} according to this rule,^b peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.^c

56. Paul's Marks 6:17

6:17 From henceforth let no man trouble^{3930-present imperative} me:^a for I^b bear^{941-present} in my body the marks^c of the Lord Jesus.^{d-e-f-g}

14i Emphatic.

15a The Critical texts omit "in Christ Jesus". The ESV makes this omission.

15b Run this cross-reference to 2 Corinthians 5:17. Here is the acid test of any gospel or theological system- does it change the heart? This is the failure of legalism- it may change the outside but it has no effect on the heart. Law and legalism cannot change the heart, nor can any works-based theological system. The only thing that can change the heart of man is the grace of God, not the Law or any legalistic theological system. If it can't change the heart then it cannot be a gospel of God and you should steer clear of it!

15c The most important thing spiritually is not how you conform to rites or rituals, but whether your heart and life have been transformed and changed by the indwelling Holy Spirit. If there has been no such change, then you have not been born again and you are on your way to hell and all the circumcision and religious rituals in the world will do you no good. You can be circumcised and go to hell, but a changed life through acceptance of the gospel is the sign of having been born again.

16a This "walk" is a military term. To those who keep in step and time with their Captain, Jesus Christ, they receive the blessing of obedience and of faith.

16b This rule is not legalism but rather the law of Christ in 6:2. The man who walks according to the rules of grace and faith has this apostolic blessing upon him. The Judaizer/legalist who walks by the works of the flesh and faithless observance to the Law has no such benediction.

16c An interesting phrase here. Israel is "a prince with God" and they were God's covenant and chosen people (and still are). The use of this phrase then stands for the chosen and elect of God, God's special people in this New Testament dispensation, which would be the Church. But we make that observation while still maintaining the sharp distinction between Israel and the Church. The phrase "Israel of God" is not a dispensational term in this context, but merely a title for those who have been born again, both Jew and Gentile.

17a Paul would now accept no more criticism from the Judaizers or legalizers. After all, he had the marks of Christ on him from his stonings and whippings that he had endured for the gospel sake. That's it! No more! The debate is closed! If the Judaizers wanted to carry on this debate, Paul would simply keep his mouth shut, take off his shirt and show them his scars. He would then ask "Here are the marks of my

Galatians

57. Conclusion 6:18

6:18 Brethren, the grace^a of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit.^b Amen.²⁸¹

dedication to the gospel of grace. Where are your marks to show your willingness to suffer for your legalism?" Answer- they had none! The Judaizers were most unwilling to suffer for their gospel. It was that dear to them. They would be willing to give it up in a minute if it meant persecution or loss of income or prestige. Here is another good way to measure the message a man may bring- has he suffered for it? Has he been abused, slandered, lied about, persecuted, imprisoned? If not, then his message isn't worth a hill of beans. A gospel is not worth anything if it is not worth suffering and dying for.

“trouble” is Strong’s #3930 παρεχω παρεχō; from παρα para (Strong’s #3844) of, with, from; and εχω echō (Strong’s #2192) have; to reach forth, offer, to show, afford, supply. to be the authors of, or to cause one to have. to give, bring, cause one something either favorable or unfavorable, to occasion, to offer, show or present one’s self, to exhibit or offer on one’s own part, to render or afford from one’s own resources or by one’s own power.

17b Emphatic.

17c The **marks** are "stigma" in the Greek. In English, a stigma is something we bear that has a detrimental effect upon us or is looked down upon by society. Under normal circumstances, the marks that Paul bore would have been considered a shameful thing for it would have identified him as a criminal, but Paul was proud of them, for it showed that he had suffered for Christ. It also has the idea of a brand. Cattle are branded to show ownership. When Christ desire to brand one of His own to leave a visible mark of His ownership of that man, He will usually send Him into deep persecution and suffering! But this is only to confirm divine ownership of that man! Woe to the "Christian" who has never been so branded!

The Catholics try to imitate these marks with their "stigmata" but no Bible-believer would waste two seconds taking those sorts of claims seriously

17d Critical texts omit **the Lord** is deleted (just "the marks of Jesus"). The ESV also makes this omission.

17e A man who has suffered something for the cause of Christ is a man who is impossible to “deal” or “reason” with. If he was going to compromise at all, he would have done it long ago, before he chose to suffer affliction for the cause of Christ. After he has been through the crucible and bears the marks of such suffering, he will have no reason to compromise, for then, his sufferings would have been for naught.

17f “**I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus**” referring to Paul’s physical sufferings detailed in 2 Corinthians 11:23-28- and then some, no doubt. A man who has suffered something for Christ always has our attention more than an armchair theologian with perfectly manicured fingernails. Richard Wurmbrand carries more weight and demands more respect than anything Billy Graham might have to say.

17g The law of sowing and reaping (6:7,8) could be invoked here in Paul's case. Before Paul's conversion, he hauled Christians off to prison and had them beaten. So when he was saved, the Lord revealed what great things he must suffer (Acts 9). And Paul did suffer! He beat Christians so he is beat and stoned. He put Christians in jail, so Paul must do a long stretch of jail time. As a Jew, he persecuted Christians, so now the Jews persecute him as a Christian. There is just no escaping this law, even for the Apostle to the Gentiles!

18a This **grace** is clearly defined in 2 Corinthians 8:9.

18b “**your spirit**” Your human spirit.

Bibliography

- Barclay, William, "The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians" in *The Daily Study Bible Series*
- Clarke, Adam, *Commentary on the Whole Bible*
- Darby, John Nelson, *Complete Works*
- Gill, John, *Commentary on the Entire Bible*
- Greene, Oliver B., *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians*
- Lightfoot, J. B., *Commentary on Galatians*
- Luther, Martin, *Commentary on Galatians*
- McClintock, John and James Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological and Ecclesiastical Literature*
- McGee, J. Vernon, *Notes on Galatians*
- Perkins, William, *Commentary or Exposition Upon the First Five Chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians,*
- Phillips, John, *Exploring Galatians*
- Ruckman, Peter, *The Bible Believer's Commentary on the Books of Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians*
- Rushdoony, R. J., "Baptism and Citizenship" *Chalcedon Position Paper 37*, February, 1983
- Smith, James, *Handfuls on Purpose,*
- Spurgeon, Charles, *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*
- Spurgeon, Charles, *The New Park Street Pulpit*
- Spurgeon, Charles, *Spurgeon's Sermon Notes*
- Spurgeon, Charles, *12 Sermons on the Passion and Death of Christ*
- Vance, Laurence, *Galatians Chapter 1 and 2*
- Wuest, Kenneth, *Galatians in the New Testament*