

# Galatians 2

## Introduction

1. Paul used this chapter to continue a timeline defense of his apostleship and to introduce justification.
2. He is defending his apostleship as not being inferior to the apostles in Jerusalem, or especially Peter.
3. He is defending his gospel to be pure and true, having received it from Jesus Christ, not Jerusalem.

### ***1 Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also.***

- A. By *again*, we understand the fourteen years to be after his first visit to Jerusalem (1:16-18), for it is his relationship to the apostles and Jerusalem that is the contextual theme of his history.
- B. The fourteen years were spent at Tarsus, at Antioch, on his first preaching trip with Barnabas, and back at Antioch, his home church (Acts 9:30; 11:25-30; 12:25; 13:1-4; 14:25-28).
- C. This visit to Jerusalem is recorded by Luke in Acts as the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-2).
  1. We pick this trip due to the circumcision controversy and plea for financial aid (2:3-10).
  2. We reject the financial trip to Jerusalem recorded in Acts 11:27-30 for the above two reasons and for the fact Paul had not yet preached his gospel among the Gentiles (2:2).
  3. Since this trip was primarily as a financial messenger, Paul left it out of his short history.
- D. The church sent Barnabas and Paul as their messengers, but Paul took Titus as well (2:3)!

### ***2 And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain.***

- A. When Paul went up to Jerusalem to the council, he went by divine direction, as was common with Paul, rather than by any request by the apostles there (Acts 15:1-2; 16:9; 22:18; 23:11).
- B. Though Luke described being sent by the church, Paul went by revelation (Cp Acts 10:9-23).
- C. He did not go there because his gospel was incorrect and the apostles were questioning him!
- D. He did not go there because he was unsure of the truth of his gospel and needed reassurance.
- E. When Paul went up to Jerusalem to the council, he fully admitted and disclosed the gospel that he had taught and still taught among the Gentiles regarding Moses' Law (Acts 15:3-4).
  1. He would have told them about his conversion, visions, and instruction by Jesus Christ.
  2. He would have told them of the doctrine of justification and Christian liberty he taught.
  3. He would have told them about the mighty signs and wonders God had wrought by him.
  4. He would have told them of the great success he had had in many different Gentile cities.
- F. But in order to avoid a public scandal with the Jews, he reviewed his doctrine to some of the greater lights, select apostles and elders, in a private meeting, in order to be wise and prudent.
  1. Paul was not afraid of anyone at any time; so do not interpret the verse as indicating fear.
  2. The controversy was not preaching to Gentiles, for that had been settled with Peter and Cornelius (Acts 11:1-18), but it was rather Gentiles and their duty to the Law of Moses.
  3. He did not want the Jerusalem Church and its many Jewish converts to reject his gospel, thus creating enormous conflict and doubts for his Gentile converts and future preaching, and endorsing the conflict false teachers claimed he had with the apostles in Jerusalem.
  4. This was the time of reformation, when two covenants ran side by side (Heb 9:10), and a public discourse against circumcision and Moses could have caused a riot (Acts 15:5-7).

5. Paul was not well liked by converted Jews in general, for his ministry was among Gentiles and without Jewish traditions (Acts 21:17-26). See the anonymity of Hebrews!
  6. These reformation Christian Jews were obsessed with Jewish tradition, even for Gentiles.
  7. So, Paul discreetly chose to first get with the influential leaders of this church in private.
  8. Paul had been taught by Jesus Christ and inspired by the Spirit, but there is still a place for wisdom in teaching difficult truth to a large and hostile crowd (Compare I Cor 14:32).
  9. And it was these influential leaders who supported him in the public debate, where there was great excitement created by some converted Pharisees (Galatians 2:9; Acts 15:6-19).
  10. Peter and James took the doctrinal controversy and settled it authoritatively, while Paul spoke of God's endorsement of his ministry through miracles (Acts 15:12; I Cor 1:22)!
  11. Here is the discretion of an inspired and very wise apostle – to do things in such a manner as to avoid offending prejudices unnecessarily, and to help win the day by a very discreet maneuver in private, which we ought to follow (Matt 10:16; I Cor 9:19-23; 10:31-33).
  12. To blast off foolishly in public about religion, even with the truth, indicates a fool, for, "Discretion is the better part of valor" (Pr 29:11). More good will occur by private labor.
- G. Paul did not fear he was in error, but that opposition from Jerusalem would hinder the gospel.
1. Paul knew God had called, Jesus Christ had taught him, and the Holy Spirit inspired him!
  2. Opposition from Jerusalem would support the false teachers and confuse his converts.
  3. Compare identical language where he appealed for steadfastness (Phil 2:16; I Thess 3:5)!
  4. If the apostles in Jerusalem were to endorse the false brethren, the Pharisees in the church, in their zeal for the Law of Moses, it would wreck havoc on his Gentile converts.

### ***3 But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised:***

- A. Did Paul know in Antioch that Titus was not circumcised? Why did he take him? Or was this another act of wisdom to get the apostles committed in private for his public defense? Glory!
- B. Even though Paul was discreet, he would not circumcise Titus and compromise his doctrine, and the apostles agreed and did not enforce circumcision on this Gentile preacher. Glory!
- C. The Lord and Paul were building a good case for any future controversy about circumcision.
- D. He circumcised Timothy to assist the gospel (Acts 16:1-3; I Cor 9:19-23), but he would not circumcise Titus to flatter false brethren – partially converted Pharisees – there in Jerusalem.
- E. Every action should be deliberately weighed as to its effect on the testimony of the gospel.
- F. Wise men prudently foresee evil in all directions, and they cheerfully adjust accordingly.

### ***4 And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:***

- A. There were members and teachers in Jerusalem, some of them strange children, who loved Jewish tradition more than the religion of Jesus Christ, and their intent was to restore Moses.
- B. These false brethren claimed to believe on Jesus Christ, but they still served Jewish tradition and required circumcision and the Law of Moses in order to be saved (Acts 15:1-2,5).
- C. False brethren get into churches (Acts 20:26-31; Rom 16:17-18; I Cor 15:12; II Cor 11:13-15; II Thes 3:6; I Tim 6:3-5; II Tim 3:1-5; II Pet 2:1-2; I John 2:18-19; Rev 2:6,14-15,19).
- D. Like the Pharisees before them, they were aggressive for proselytes (Ac 15:1-2; Matt 23:15).
- E. Freedom and liberty in Christ's gospel are wonderful, where no man can impose his ideas from the O.T. or human reasoning upon the saints of God (Rom 14:1-13; Col 2:16-23; etc.).

- F. But Judaizers and Roman Catholics and Seventh Day Adventists and others seek to create manmade laws and rules, whether from the O.T. or pagan tradition, to enslave God's people.
- G. Paul's private conference agreed that they would not give Titus as a sacrificial lamb, so that the gospel taught by Paul could continue with the full endorsement of Jerusalem!

***5 To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.***

- A. Barnabas and Paul, and the elders in conference, did not submit to the false teachers at all.
- B. He did not care about their status, claims, education, or reputation. He did not give at all.
- C. Paul did not give on a single point, nor did he learn a single thing, from these Judaizers.
- D. Should we take *hour* as literal time, allowing for 55 minutes of subjection, or as a figure of speech for a very short period of time? We use *minute* similarly, not accounting for seconds.
- E. Titus was a test case to prove to everyone that the true gospel did not require circumcision!
- F. God's true servants oppose anyone, anywhere to defend the gospel against false teachers.
- G. False teachers must have their mouths shut to protect souls from their lies (Titus 1:9-11).

***6 But of these who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me:***

- A. Paul here refers to the esteemed men of reputation again, likely the apostles and elders (2:2).
- B. These leading men did not make any corrections or additions to Paul's doctrine whatsoever.
- C. Paul was not disrespectful of these church leaders, but he wisely described them in such a way to remove any thought that he was inferior to them or beholden to them for the gospel.
- D. Paul would boldly say in another place, "Let God be true, but every man a liar," (Rom 3:4).
- E. The fear of man brings a snare (Pr 29:25), as we are about to read here, but Paul had none!
- F. Elihu would say that God is able to inspire even young men to know the truth (Job 32:6-14).
- G. David would say God's words are better than enemies, teachers, or ancients (Ps 119:98-100).
- H. Everything must be taken back to the words of God; opinions of any man or all men are vain.

***7 But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter;***

- A. So far from altering his gospel, Paul is about to explain that these leaders fully approved it.
- B. Here we see the Holy Spirit's assignments – Peter to the Jews, and Paul to the Gentiles.
- C. The apostles and elders at Jerusalem perceived Paul was on the ministerial level with Peter!

***8 (For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:)***

- A. Both Peter and Paul had matching credentials for their ministries – the Holy Ghost of God.
- B. Compare Peter healing with his shadow and Paul doing so with handkerchiefs and aprons!
- C. Compare Peter's success at Pentecost and with Cornelius and Paul's with many Gentiles!
- D. The miracles, inspiration, and gospel success were entirely comparable between these men.

***9 And when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision.***

- A. These three great apostles appear to be three leading members of the private conference, though the language allows them to be those of reputation from verse 2, hidden until now.
- B. The Galatians have been set up ... to discover the greatest three in Jerusalem endorsed Paul!
- C. The Spirit uses language of foundations and pillars for rulers (I Sam 2:8; Psalm 75:3; 82:5).
- D. After hearing Paul's testimony, they could perceive it was a work of God (Acts 11:17-18).
- E. The right hand of fellowship that we use for receiving new members is not necessary, but it is scriptural by its intention to show acceptance, approval, affection, and agreement.
- F. Contrast a right hand of fellowship in truth with a false right hand of others (Ps 144:7-8,11).
- G. After confirming doctrinal unity, a division of labor was approved by all conference parties.

***10 Only they would that we should remember the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.***

- A. Though not adding a thing to Paul's gospel, the apostles asked him to remember poor Jews.
- B. Though there were some different practices and even some envy between the Jews and Gentiles, they were "blood brothers," and as such Christian charity should be shown.
- C. However, Paul was already aggressive in this matter of Christian charity (Acts 11:27-30; 24:17; Romans 15:25-27; I Cor 16:1-3; II Cor 8:1-24; 9:1-15; Heb 13:16).

***11 But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.***

- A. We are not told about this meeting, so we cannot determine its timing or its circumstances.
  - 1. It occurred in Paul's home church at Antioch, where he protected Gentiles (Acts 15:1-2).
  - 2. It occurred with Barnabas, which makes it before Paul's second journey (Acts 15:36-41).
  - 3. Due to Paul's chronological approach here, we assume it after the council at Jerusalem.
- B. Paul publicly stood Peter down in his heretical hypocrisy, which magnified Paul's office.
  - 1. Remember Paul's need and purpose to defend his apostleship and doctrine of salvation.
  - 2. There was no time or liberty for a private meeting, since Peter had blown it in public.
  - 3. As the context shows, this face-to-face showdown was entirely doctrinal without malice.
  - 4. Like David before him, Paul learned to fight with God's help (Ps 144:1-2; II Cor 10:1-6).
- C. Peter, one of the greatest of the apostles, shows himself but a man in an office from God.
  - 1. He had blown it big time earlier in his ministry, when he denied the Lord with cursing.
  - 2. He blew it again here for the same reason – fear of man – by compromising for Jews.
  - 3. *Blameless* is a qualification for ordination (I Tim 3:2), which does not mean sinless perfection, but free of outstanding offences that have not been cleared by repentance.
  - 4. Though blamed here, Peter became blameless again by submitting to Paul's correction.
  - 5. Like David and Mark, failing ministers can be restored to useful ministry (II Tim 4:11).
  - 6. How can Catholics argue for Peter's supremacy or for papal infallibility based on Peter?
  - 7. Some, vainly seeking to protect Peter's infallibility, have decided this is a different Peter.

***12 For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.***

- A. Peter arrived in Antioch before some other Jews came from James in Jerusalem to join him.
- B. These appear not to be ordinary Jews from Jerusalem, but rather certain leaders from James.
- C. While in Antioch with this Gentile congregation, Peter ate Gentile fare with the Gentiles.
- D. But when Judaizing believers (or teachers) came from Jerusalem, he reversed his course and kept ceremonial differences with the Jews, creating a wall of division contrary to the gospel.
- E. Paul wrote the reason for this hypocrisy by the inspiration of God – Peter’s fear of men.
- F. Peter was a great disciple and lover of Christ, but he often showed weakness of character.
  - 1. We can admire him for his zeal on behalf of Jesus Christ in many instances of scripture.
  - 2. We can commiserate with him for his timidity and lack of resoluteness before opposition.
  - 3. We can grieve with him for failures that dulled the otherwise splendor of a great apostle.

***13 And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.***

- A. There were other converted Jews at Antioch who previously ate with the Gentiles, knowing Christian liberty, but who now avoided those Gentiles out of fear of Peter and the visitors.
- B. The division was so distinct and the pressure so great that Barnabas became a hypocrite, who was Paul’s ministerial companion and a messenger of the council (Acts 15:22,25,35; 16:4).
- C. Here we learn the definition for dissemble and dissimulation – hypocrisy (Romans 12:9)!

***14 But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?***

- A. Because Peter acted out his heresy in public, and because it was having such a wide effect in the church at Antioch, Paul did not deal with the matter privately as before (2:2).
- B. The truth of the gospel had been clearly confirmed in Jerusalem by the apostles and elders.
- C. Rather than deal with poor deluded sheep, Paul went right after the most authoritative leader.
  - 1. Peter had been taught by the Lord about Gentiles and had approved of Paul in Jerusalem.
  - 2. If Peter as a Jew could leave the Law when he chose, why did Gentiles need consider it?
  - 3. Paul argued from the greater (Jewish duty to the Law) to the lesser (Gentile lack of Law).
  - 4. Since Antioch was primarily a Gentile church, Paul refers to Peter’s influence upon it.
  - 5. This is a sharp rebuke of Peter’s heretical hypocrisy, and it was totally deserved by Peter.
  - 6. Peter was compelling the Gentiles in Antioch to live like Jews by his public example.

***15 We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,***

- A. Both Peter and Paul were Jews by birth, but even they were free to view the Law as liberty.
- B. The distinction here is not between sinless Jews and sinful Gentiles, but rather the Jewish view of Gentiles that they were all ignorant sinners without law or light to right worship.
- C. Why in the world would more knowledgeable and obligated Jews require sinful Gentiles to keep the Law, since, as the next verse indicates, they knew it could not justify even them?
- D. Peter was well versed on this point, for he publicly declared it in Jerusalem (Acts 15:7-11).

***16 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.***

- A. Paul here answered his question from verse 14, where he confronted Peter for his hypocrisy.
- B. Peter was guilty of gross heresy and hypocrisy by implying Gentiles needed to keep the law.
- C. Paul, Peter, and the other believing Jews, with the greatest knowledge of and obligation to the Law of Moses, knew full well it could not justify even Jews at all before God.
- D. Paul and Peter and the council of Jerusalem had laid hold of justification by faith in the finished work of Jesus Christ, knowing there was no saving power in Moses' Law at all.
- E. Justification is one of the great concerns of true theology – how can man be just before God?
  - 1. Acceptance by God is the paramount issue, not our acceptance of God (Ephesians 1:6).
  - 2. What will take away our sinful guilt and deliver us from the condemnation of a just God?
- F. What is “the faith of Jesus Christ”? For it is the means of our legal justification before God.
  - 1. Because we trust our King James Bible, we do not alter it to read “faith in Jesus Christ,” which modern translations do to reduce the Bible to their concept of faith and its role.
  - 2. Yet, the simple genitive case does not prove whether it is Christ's faith or ours in Christ.
  - 3. Consider well the example of similar language to Gal 2:16 in James 2:1. Whose faith?
  - 4. Context determines if the simple genitive is subjective or objective, which is answered by determining if the object of the preposition is the subject or object of the possession.
  - 5. See cases of subjective-genitive (Hag 2:7; Dan 11:37; I John 3:16; Jas 2:4; II Cor 5:14).
  - 6. See cases of objective-genitive (Luke 11:42; I Timothy 3:6; 6:10; Acts 13:34; Jude 1:21).
  - 7. We understand “the faith of Jesus Christ” to be His singular obedience to God for us, for the rest of the New Testament teaches justification by His work for us (Rom 5:17-19).
- G. Did Jesus Christ have faith in God, and did this faith play a major role in our justification?
  - 1. The Lord Jesus Christ was more faithful than Moses, who had great faith (Heb 3:1-6).
  - 2. Jesus is not the object of justifying knowledge, making it our knowledge; but rather He is the subject of it, for our justification is by His perfect knowledge of God's will (Is 53:11).
  - 3. What a travesty that some interject man's faith and knowledge into our legal justification.
  - 4. The knowledge Jesus Christ possessed was that faith and confidence in God that led Him all His life; which took Him through Gethsemane, His horrible trial, and His miserable crucifixion, until He finally committed His spirit to His Father at the moment of death.
  - 5. He had great in faith and trust in God, as enemies said (Ps 16:8; Heb 2:13; Matt 27:43).
  - 6. Justification is by the obedience of One, and He obeyed in life and death (Rom 5:15-19).
  - 7. Without faith, He could not have pleased God; but He did please (Heb 11:6; Matt 23:23).
  - 8. Jesus definitely did trust in God (Hebrews 2:13; 3:1-2; 5:7-8; Matt 27:43; Luke 23:46).
  - 9. It was Jesus Christ's faithful obedience to God's will that truly saved us (Heb 10:7-10).
  - 10. His perfect fulfillment and obedience to the law required more faith than any other man.
- H. Could “the faith of Jesus Christ” be subject-genitive and teach justification by Christ alone?
  - 1. Absolutely! Then the sense would be we are justified by the gospel or religion of Christ.
  - 2. The words are used in this sense in James 2:1 and Rev 14:12 and possibly other places.
- I. How does our faith of believing in Christ related to Jesus Christ's faith in God His Father?
  - 1. Faith neither regenerates us vitally, justifies us legally, or elects us eternally. It is for us.
  - 2. Our faith is the first act of a regenerated heart to lay hold of eternal life by God's grace.
  - 3. To faith we add good works of seven fruits to prove election (II Pet 1:5-15; Jas 2:14-26).
  - 4. Faith does nothing more than any other good work of the new man (I Timothy 6:17-19).

5. Faith, and the works that follow true faith, are the evidence of eternal life to our hearts.
- J. Paul and Peter gave up all hope in the Law to believe Jesus Christ alone for justification.

***17 But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.***

- A. While the reasoning here is somewhat obscure to us, consider it in light of Jewish thinking.
1. Has Paul shifted his line of thinking from Jewish legalism to mere antinomianism? No!
  2. Has Paul shifted his line of thinking from Jewish legalism to carnal Christianity? No!
  3. He followed the argument he began in verse 14 that is Jewish in nature, by which he condemned Peter's heretical example, which implied the necessity of Law obedience.
  4. The forward context of verses 18-19 is key, where Paul refers to Peter and other Judaizers as making themselves sinners by adding legal duties that cannot justify to the gospel.
- B. If we converted Jews, who seek to be justified by Christ, add to the gospel any obligation to the Law of Moses, which we know cannot justify us from our sins and only proves our sinfulness, we make ourselves sinners and Christ's religion one of sin and condemnation.
- C. If circumcision or other legalism is obligatory, we make Jesus Christ's death worthless (5:2-4), and instead of being a glorious Saviour by His death, He did not deliver men from sin.
- D. If we converted Jews, who know the Law cannot justify us, are counted sinners by those Jews retaining a Law superstition, is therefore Jesus Christ a preacher of sin? God forbid!
- E. If we converted Jews, who know the Law cannot justify, imply a reinstatement of the Law for righteousness, which we had forsaken, then we make ourselves and Christ ministers of sin.
- F. There is value in reading Paul's detailed reasoning along similar lines in Romans 6:1-23.

***18 For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.***

- A. What is under consideration in the context of 2:11-19? The Law of Moses for Christians.
- B. Paul is addressing Peter and the other believing Jews as himself, a believer in Christ who has destroyed the law for righteousness by his preaching of Jesus Christ crucified (Gal 2:15-16).
1. This is wise and prudent reasoning to address Peter by transferring the point to himself.
  2. Peter had boldly destroyed legal distinctions (Acts 10:28,34-35,43; 11:13-18; 15:5-11).
  3. Peter had destroyed the Law when he first came to Antioch, but was now rebuilding it.
- C. If Paul (really Peter) were to rebuild those things – circumcision or the Law for justification – he would make himself a sinner by applying a covenant that could not justify him.
- D. If Paul (really Peter) were to rebuild those things – circumcision or the Law for justification – which just prior he had been violating with the Gentiles, then he made himself a sinner.
- E. Therefore, by this verse we understand the “sinners” in verse 17 are those viewed as such by Judaizers measuring by the Law.

***19 For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.***

- A. The death of Christ according to the terms of the Law left Paul dead to any of its claims, for this is a fundamental principle of Paul's gospel (Rom 6:3-11; 7:1-4; 8:1-4).
- B. Jesus Christ perfectly fulfilled every condition, and He died as the perfect sacrificial Lamb, both of which together killed any legal claim it had against us, leaving us dead to the law, but alive unto God, Who sent Jesus Christ to redeem us by the law of the Spirit in Christ Jesus!
- C. Paul was free from condemnation of the law to live with joyful zeal to God, Who saved him!

***20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.***

- A. Here is a wonderful text that describes the Christian life from several different perspectives.
- B. Paul was crucified with Christ, meaning that He was legally executed by the Law in Christ: his sins were fully paid for by meeting the Law's demands for death through Christ's death.
  - 1. Being crucified with Christ can have other senses as well, but not here (Gal 5:24; 6:14).
  - 2. The Law was a hopeless way of living – no end of sin; but Christianity is full of hope.
- C. Though legally dead through the Law, Paul was very much alive in his life dedicated to God.
  - 1. His crucifixion with Christ is a legal death by meeting the demands of the Law for sin.
  - 2. However, Paul still had a vital and practical life that he was living in the flesh like us.
- D. The life Paul lived was based on the indwelling Spirit of Christ (John 14:19-20,23; Gal 4:6).
  - 1. Jesus Christ is in every true child of God; He is not in reprobates (II Cor 13:5; Col 1:27).
  - 2. Without the strength of the Spirit of Christ, we would not have power to do anything.
  - 3. Paul was not living a life based on any hope or merit in the Law of Moses, like Judaizers.
- E. Our lives, like Paul's, are based on the faith and obedience of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself.
  - 1. We do not alter the words to make this our faith in Christ, but His own great faith in God.
  - 2. The empowering Spirit within us is based on the faithfulness of the Lord Jesus Christ.
  - 3. We would not even have the Spirit were it not for the faithfulness of Christ (Acts 2:33).
  - 4. Paul's life was based on Christ within him – the strength of the Son of God (Phil 4:13).
  - 5. The same faith and fear that drove Jesus Christ is our source of strength (II Cor 4:10-11).

***21 I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.***

- A. Continuing to transfer the point to himself, Paul rebuked Peter for frustrating God's grace.
- B. Paul magnified God's grace in salvation and allowed nothing else to be added to it, especially the Law of Moses; for grace plus anything on our part is frustrated grace (Rom 11:6).
- C. Here is Paul's concluding statement to Peter about mixing grace and law for righteousness.
- D. There is no mixing of the Law and Christ, otherwise Christ's death accomplished nothing.
- E. The same argument applies against Arminians, who make Christ's death of no effect unless you accept, believe, call on, invite in, or otherwise save yourself by decisional regeneration!

**Conclusion:**

- 1. The gospel of Jesus Christ, which we believe, was delivered from a great controversy in this chapter.
- 2. There will be false brethren and/or teachers in every church: saints must hold doctrine tenaciously.
- 3. The apostle of the Gentiles, who had been taught directly by Jesus Christ, was not inferior to others.
- 4. The wisdom of Paul using a private conference, taking a test case, and fearing no man is very prudent.
- 5. When doctrine is threatened publicly, there is no other option but for a minister to rebuke it publicly.
- 6. Even the best of men have feet of clay, which in Peter's case showed up by hypocrisy through fear.
- 7. The ministers of Jesus Christ need to follow Paul's example to name sin and sinners in these times.
- 8. The true doctrine of Jesus Christ depends on His work alone without any Law or other additions.
- 9. Our lives in Christ are based on His finished work, His indwelling Spirit, and His powerful example.

**For Further Study:**

- 1. The sermon outline, "[True Grace](#)," defines grace and vindicates it from various false corruptions of grace.