

## Galatians Two

Fred R. Coulter

Open *The Holy Bible in its Original Order, A Faithful Version* and the *King James Version* to Galatians 2, because we're going to do some alternate reading. Galatians is the most difficult, the hardest to understand, and the *most misunderstood* book of the whole Bible. Unfortunately, most people go to Galatians first, rather than later.

Let me give you the writings of the Apostle Paul; the order of difficulty of these three technical books:

1. Hebrews  
—the easiest to understand, although there are some technical points there
2. Romans
3. Galatians

In order to understand Galatians you should understand Hebrews first, then Romans, then Galatians.

Why do I say that? *Because almost all Protestant doctrine is based upon misinterpretations and misunderstandings of Hebrews, Romans and Galatians!* Not only do the Protestants misunderstand it, they go to it and they use certain verses to *do away with the requirement* to keep the commandments of God. Plus, the translation of the *King James Version* of the Bible gives credence to their interpretations of it. We'll compare that when we get to Romans and Galatians in just a moment.

In translating Galatians, I found one explosion and two bombshells! Let's look at the first explosion. First we'll read in the *King James (KJV)* then in the *Faithful Version* translation (*FV*).

Galatians 2:11 (*KJV*): "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them who were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation" (vs 11-13). What does dissimulation mean to you? *Pretend, hypocrisy!*

Now, let's read the *FV* translation, because the Greek does show *hypocrisy*. Then we will ask why was he hypocritical?

Verse 11: "But when Peter came to Antioch, I withstood him to *his* face because he was to be condemned"—not just blamed. The *KJV* translators softened the meaning of it. This is pretty sharp language: *condemned!*

Verse 12: "For before certain *ones* came from James..." Who was James? *The brother of the Lord, the apostle at Jerusalem!*

"...he was eating with the Gentiles. However, when they came, he drew back and separated himself *from the Gentiles*, being afraid of those of *the* circumcision party. And the rest of *the* Jews joined him in *this* hypocritical act, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy" (vs 12-13).

Why was this to be a condemnation? *Peter of all people should have known better!* Now you know why Acts 10 is in the Scriptures. It tells the account of a Gentile—an Italian—whose name was Cornelius. He sent three men, on the instructions of an angel, to go and find Simon Peter (the Apostle Peter). He came and found him and brought him to Cornelius.

Acts 10:24: "And on the next day, they came to Caesarea. Now Cornelius was expecting them *and* had called together his kinsmen and *his* intimate friends. And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him *and* fell at *his* feet, worshiping *him*" (vs 24-25). Peter was not the first pope! He didn't say, 'Cornelius, glad to see you're on your knees; kiss my ring.'

Verse 26: "But Peter raised him up, saying, 'Stand up, for I myself am also a man.' And as he was talking with him, he went in and found many gathered together. And he said to them... [read this very carefully and understand something very important]: ...'**You know that it is unlawful for a man who is a Jew** to associate with or come near to anyone of another race....'" (vs 26-28).

Which law in the Bible says that it's unlawful? Read that statement again; this will be good instruction.. What does it say? What does it not say? "...'**You know that it is unlawful for a man who is a Jew...**'" He did not say 'the Scriptures say' that an Israelite cannot keep company with one of another nation.

What does the Old Testament tell us about the inner relationship of the children of Israel and Gentiles? *One law, one standard for the Gentiles who live within Israel!* They followed the same law. They had the same judgment. They had the same standard.

What law is this talking about? *Tradition! A law of the Jews!* A Jew is one who practices *Judaism!* Judaism is not the religion of Moses—did

you know that? *Most people don't!* Judaism, while it claims to follow the religion of Moses, does not. The rabbis in Judaism proclaim that *their* sayings and *their* laws are greater than the laws in the Bible. If anyone transgresses *their* laws, they are subject to hell!

What God was doing with this particular instance with Peter was that He was showing that that law of Judaism *had no standing before God*; had no standing with the Church of God. God was now going to deal with all nations, all people, and He was going to deal with them *without* the laws of the Judaism. I want to show you what Jesus said concerning the *traditions of men!* The traditions of men were codified into law.

I will show you a *work of law* from Scripture, a *work of law* from every one of these. But here's what Jesus said concerning *their* traditions. It's very important that we understand this concept. Remember: ***Jewish law is not Scriptural law!*** Please understand that!

Jewish law, Catholic law, Hindu law, Muslim law, Buddhist law ***are all against the commandments of God!*** If you don't believe that then you watch Deepak Chopra, a wizard of the Hindu religion. Listen to him and pick up all the *works of law* that they have: meditation, breathing, reading, thinking—all *works of law!* ***Declared by Christ null and void!*** Chopra wrote the book: *Seven Laws of Spiritual Success.*

Mark 7:1: "Then the Pharisees and some of the scribes from Jerusalem came together to Him. And when they saw some of His disciples eating with defiled hands (that is, unwashed *hands*), they found fault. For the Pharisees and all the Jews, holding fast to the tradition of the elders, do not eat unless they wash their hands thoroughly.... [with the fist] ...Even *when coming* from the market, they do not eat unless they *first* wash themselves. And there are **many** other things... [including it all, not just hand-washing, but everything that they do] ...that they have received to observe, *such as the* washing of cups and pots and brass utensils and tables" (vs 1-4).

I'll just tell you one of the Sabbath commandments that they have, which is a little hilarious: If on the Sabbath a bushel basket is turned over and they spill on the ground, if they are not spread too far, you may push them back in the bushel basket and set the basket upright. If they are spread abroad too far, you may not pick them up and put them back in the bushel basket, because that is harvesting. However, you may eat them one at a time. Many such things like that!

Verse 5: "For this reason, the Pharisees and

the scribes questioned Him, *saying*, 'Why don't Your disciples walk according to the tradition of the elders, but eat bread with unwashed hands?' And He answered *and* said to them, 'Well did Isaiah prophesy concerning **you hypocrites**... [same word referring to Peter in the book of Galatians—'hupokrites'] ...as it is written, "This people honors Me with their lips, but their hearts are far away from Me"' (vs 5-6). I want you to understand that.

God is interested in the heart—is He not? Can you do something outside of your body with your hands and feet, rules and regulations, but it does not affect your heart? ***Certainly!*** God is saying that He wants the heart made right.

Verse 6: "And He answered *and* said to them, 'Well did Isaiah prophesy concerning **you hypocrites**...'" Those are not very nice words. Christ was not an ecumenist! He didn't come along and say, 'Well now, you scribes and Pharisees, I know you have your ways, but I have My way and what we need to do is we'll just get along and love each other until the crucifixion, then you can hate Me and kill Me—how's that? Does that sound like a good game-plan?' ***No way!***

"...as it is written, "This people honors Me with their lips, but their hearts are far away from Me. But in vain... [emptiness, purposeless, no account, no good, nothing to God] ...do they worship Me, teaching *for* doctrine the commandments of men." For leaving the commandment of God..." (vs 6-8).

That's what happens when you have all of these traditions, all of these works of law. Remember when I showed you the difference between *works of law* and *the work of the law*? {see Romans Series #13}. I'm building on that, from this.

Verse 8: "For leaving the commandment of God..." What happens when you lay aside the commandment of God? Let's see if we can apply some principles: If you look at a commandment of God and you say, 'We'll change that; we don't need that.' What are you doing?

- taking away from the Word of God
- deciding for yourself what is right and wrong
- out and out judging God, because you're judging what God has spoken as unworthy of your attention and obedience

Very basic and profound! Very necessary to understand!

"...you hold fast the tradition of men, *such as* the washing of pots and cups; and you practice many other things like *this*.' Then He said to them, 'Full well do you reject the commandment of God... [not only do they lay it aside] ...so that you may

observe your *own* tradition” (vs 8-9)—which is saying, ‘We are better than God! Think about that!’

Think about that in relationship to Sabbath-keeping and Sunday-keeping. Jesus said that the Sabbath was ‘made for man and not man for the Sabbath, therefore, the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath Day.’ He’s not Lord of Sunday! Men come along and what do they do?

- They *judge* God!
- They *want to keep their tradition* of Sunday-keeping!
- They *set aside and reject* the commandment of God

—that they may keep *their own tradition*, which is a *work* of Protestant and Catholic law. It doesn’t come from God! The 14<sup>th</sup>/15<sup>th</sup> Passover is similar!

Another one: The survey that was sent out (from WCG): Dear brethren, we’ll keep this anonymous, all you have to do is put in the first three numbers of your zip code: Do you want to keep the Holy Days? (yes or no) If you want to keep the Holy Days, should we keep them in August or September (yes or no) and the answer was already completed when they got it back: ‘We’re not going to keep them at all.’

- They have judged God!
- They have set aside the commandments of God with *their own reasoning*!
- Also they’re breaking the third commandment, taking God’s name in vain!

***How dare you say ‘God said’ something, when He didn’t say it!*** (Deut. 18) Think on that! Can a man speak for God when God hasn’t spoken something? *No!*

Comment: A lot of people think that the Jews kept the Laws [of God], but they didn’t, they kept *their own*.

Question about The Friends of the Sabbath and their ecumenical thing: That is a huge trap, as big as the Grand Canyon. It’s like flying around in a helicopter observing the Grand Canyon and it’s all wonderful until you crash to the bottom. It’s going to happen!

Verse 10: “For Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother’; and, “The one who speaks evil of father or mother, let him be put to death.’ But you say, ‘If a man shall say to *his* father or mother, “Whatever benefit you might receive from me *is* corban”... [merchandized for money; same old thing it’s always been] ...(that is, *set aside as* a gift to God), he is not obligated to help his parents.’ And you excuse him from doing anything for his father or his mother, nullifying the authority of the Word of

God by your tradition...” (vs 10-13).

Let’s review:

- v 9—they set aside—“you reject the commandment of God”
- v 13—“Nullifying the authority of the Word of God by your tradition which you have passed down; and you practice many *traditions* such as this.”

Those are pretty strong words—aren’t they? There are some people today who are following Judaism. They are rejecting Jesus Christ. They are rejecting the New Testament as pagan.

Carl Franklin is bringing us a detailed study on that. The first thing I’m going to do is bring a sermon on the preservation and the canonization of the New Testament—*very important!* There is an active move to do away with Christ, any form of it; every church, everywhere—regardless of whether they are Sunday or Sabbath-keepers—*that name*, the name of Christ. We need to be fully aware that is the program that is going on.

They have eliminated Christ from the government, from radio, television, schools, public affairs, and they’re going to eliminate Him from the churches. If you don’t believe that, watch that 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary for the U.N.—the interfaith service from San Francisco. Brethren, this is exactly what’s happening in the world today: They are setting aside, rejecting and making the Word of God ‘of none effect’ in those people’s lives.

***The keeping of the commandments of God is required and is a reflection of our love toward God!*** Let’s see that summarized in:

John 14:23: “Jesus answered and said to him, ‘If anyone loves Me, he will keep My Word; and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our abode with him. **The one who does not love Me does not keep My words...** [That’s strong! These two verses contrast one with the other!] **...and the Word that you hear is not Mine, but the Father’s, Who sent Me**” (vs 23-24). Again, I call to your remembrance Deut. 18:18-20. Very important!

This tells you *you* can do this concerning any commandment. If you keep Sunday, you have set aside the commandment of God, you have rejected the Word of God, and though you profess you love God, *you don’t love God!* It’s an impossibility! Do you comprehend that? They may feel good! They may behave decently! But always remember, good behavior can also come from the *tree of the knowledge of good and evil*.

- ***All ‘goodness’ of men is NOT Godliness from God!***

That is profound to understand.

- **All righteousness of men is NOT the righteousness of God!**

That also is profound to understand. These two verses (John 14:23-24) encapsulate the whole thing—don't they?

Let's see this again concerning Peter. What was God inspiring Peter to understand? *He was inspiring Peter to set aside the unlawful laws of Jews!*

Acts 10:28: "And he said to them, 'You know that it is unlawful for a man who is a Jew to associate with or come near to anyone of another race. But God has shown me...'"

- By what?
- How did He show him? *By Divine revelation!*
- Did Peter not have a vision? *Yes, he did!*
- Divine revelation is pretty profound—isn't it?
- That's direct from God—isn't it! *Yes!*
- Can there be any greater instruction? *No!*

"...*that no man should be called common or unclean*" (v 28)—big time understanding necessary here.

In a Jew's view, how is a man *common*? *unclean*? Do you know? When I tell you this, you're going to understand why Paul's writing in Rom. 2 about the uncircumcision that keep the righteousness of the law shall judge the circumcision who break the law. How do they break *their* law? *By boasting in tradition and breaking the commandments of God!*

A man who is *common* is a Gentile who has been circumcised. He is *common* because he is not a genetic-born Jew, but a proselyte. That means being circumcised and following Judaism.

An *unclean* man is a Gentile who was not circumcised and has not followed anything concerning the true God. Those are commonly called 'goyim' or cattle.

Maybe this will help you understand every time a Jew speaks, he always says, 'I am a Jew.' The reason he does this is to get leverage over you, because he thinks he's superior! Anyone who is not a Jew is 'goyim.' You're either *common* or *unclean* and 'you're not worthy of us. We are worthy to use you, abuse you, lie to you, steal from you and take advantage of you, because WE are the chosen people.' That's all in the Talmud.

A man called up Rush Limbaugh and said, 'Jews send dittos.' He had to immediately say that he was a Jew. Someone is surely going to say that I, Fred, is an anti-Semite. NO! Jews are anti-other

people—period. They don't like to tell you that. They are anti-Christ. They will not admit it, but they are! What God was doing here was striking all of this down! If you think it's bad today, trust me, back then it was far worse—far, far worse!

Peter was the one who used to do this, the first one, so therefore, v 29: "For this reason, I also came without objection when I was sent for. I ask therefore, for what purpose did you send for me?" And Cornelius said, 'Four days ago I was fasting until this hour, and *at* the ninth hour I was praying in my house; and suddenly a man... [an angel] ...stood before me in bright apparel'" (vs 29-30).

Do you know why God had to do this supernaturally by a vision to Peter and by an angel to Cornelius? *The Jews would have never let Christianity get out of Judaism!* They would have cloistered it in as a little, teeny-weeny sect of Judaism and used it to their own advantage. Now God was opening it up!

Verse 31: "And said, 'Cornelius, your prayer has been heard and your alms have been remembered before God. Now then, send to Joppa and call for Simon who is surnamed Peter; he is lodging by *the* sea in *the* house of Simon, a tanner. When he comes, he will speak to you'" (vs 31-33).

Key verse. Why was Peter the hypocrite? Verse 34: "Then Peter opened *his* mouth and said, 'Of a truth I perceive that **God is not a respecter of persons, but in every nation the one who fears Him and works righteousness is acceptable to Him.** The word that He sent to the children of Israel, preaching the Gospel of peace through Jesus Christ (He is Lord of all), you have knowledge of; which declaration came throughout the whole of Judea, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism that John proclaimed'" (vs 34-37). Let's add a little fuel to Peter's fire. We won't burn him at the stake, but we'll find out why he was called *the hypocrite*.

This account in Gal. 2 happened *after* Acts 15:5—there had been much disputing: "But there stood up certain of those who believed, who were of the sect of the Pharisees, saying, 'It is obligatory to circumcise them, and to command *them* to keep the Law of Moses.'" How are we going to understand that?

The Pharisees version of the law of Moses was not *the* Law of Moses. Very much akin to the Catholic view of the Bible, they don't follow it, but they have their traditions, and from the writing of the 'father's' application of *their* religion. The Pharisees were exactly the same way. Did we not just read where they rejected the Law of Moses? Their version of the law of Moses was all of *their own* laws. They presumptuously and arrogantly

called it the law of Moses. This is what is being talked about here.

“...the Pharisees, saying, ‘It is **obligatory** to circumcise them, and to command *them* to keep the law of Moses.’” Furthermore, it was obligatory for them to do that, because unless they were physically circumcised salvation was impossible. They were even twisting and perverting the true religion of Christ very early on. That’s what it means.

Verse 6: “Then the apostles and the elders gathered together to see about this matter. And after much discussion had taken place, Peter stood up and said to them... [We have him on record here, and we have him on record in Acts 10.] ...‘Men, brethren, you know that from *the* early days, God made *the* choice among us *that* by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the Word of the Gospel, and believe. And God, Who **knows the heart**... [*the heart-knowing God*] ...bore witness to them *by* giving them the Holy Spirit, even as *He did* to us, and made no difference between us and them, *and* has purified their hearts through the faith” (vs 6-9).

There are other details that are in Galatians 2:12: “For before certain *ones* came from James, he was eating with the Gentiles.... [putting no difference] ...However, when they came, he drew back and separated himself *from the Gentiles*, being afraid of those of *the* circumcision party.” A political move! A reversion to Judaism! He was afraid they would go back and tell James that he was eating with Gentiles.

Verse 13: “And the rest of *the* Jews joined him in *this* hypocritical act, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy.” This was a big deal! Think of it this way: You come to church one day and you hear there’s going to be a big meeting and Peter, Paul and certain ones from Jerusalem are going to be there—this may have been a Feast day—and you’re all excited and the deacon stands at the door and says ‘Gentiles to the right, Jews to the left; Gentiles eat over here, Jews eat over there.’ How are you going to feel?

Verse 14: “But when I saw that they did not walk uprightly according to the Truth of the Gospel, I said to Peter in the presence of them all, ‘If you, being a Jew, are living like the Gentiles... [eating with them, mingling with them and so forth] ...and not according to Judaism, why do you compel the Gentiles to Judaize?’—and separate themselves from the Jews?”

To *Judaize* has nothing to do with the Law of God! Is there any place in the Scriptures that says that you cannot eat with one of another nation? **NO!**

Verse 15: “We who are Jews by nature—and

not sinners of *the* Gentiles—knowing that a man is not justified by works of law...” (vs 15-16).

Let’s review: **Justification** means *to be made right to God the Father* in heaven above. That justification comes from the heart, in believing on Christ, repentance and baptism. There is no place in all the Scripture that says *do this law and you are right with God*. There is no law designed to do that.

- What is law designed to do? *Law is designed to show what sin is!*
- Can law give you life? *No! God can!*

Let me use a couple of examples to show the difference in justifying by *works of law*. We’ll use a *work of law* that we can relate to today and then we’ll show the difference.

If you go through a stop sign and you get a ticket, you have transgressed the law that says *thou shalt not go through a stop sign*. Suppose you ignore the ticket. You decided you don’t believe there should be a stop sign there, so ‘I am not going to pay this fine. It’s irritating to me, I don’t want a stop sign there.’ So, you ignore the fine. Then they send you a notice, ‘We’re going to increase your fine unless you pay it by such-and-such a date. You ignore it.

Payment of the fine would justify you for that transgression. You continue to ignore it. They send another notice. Finally, after a certain period of time they issue a warrant for your arrest. One day you’re driving down the street and you have another traffic infraction. The policeman pulls you over and reads your license number, pulls that number up on his onboard computer and finds out there is a warrant for your arrest.

He comes back to you and says for you to get out of the car, ‘you’re under arrest.’ He slaps the handcuffs on you, throws you in back of the police car, takes you down to the jail, and now your car is towed and put over here and you’re going to pay storage. You stay in jail overnight and you come before the judge, and the judge says, ‘Why didn’t you answer the notices for the fine?’ *Well, I don’t believe there should be a stop sign there!* ‘But you didn’t pay the fine.’ Now he slaps on a stiffer sentence. He was not justified! His *work of law* could have been to pay the fine and you’re justified.

Now then, is there any *work of law* to justify you before God in heaven above?

One more example: Suppose you murdered a man. Now you’ve transgressed the Law of God. What is going to justify you to God? Not murdering any longer? *Repentance; that’s all!* Just like the stop sign; if you go before the judge because you didn’t pay that fine, and you say, ‘Judge, I’ve stopped at every stop sign since then.’ He says that doesn’t matter, ‘you’re supposed to stop at all of them.’

(go to the next track)

If you separate from the Gentiles to eat, does that make your heart right or wrong? *Makes it wrong!* God is interested in the heart. Remember, we said *the heart-knowing God!*

Galatians 2:16: “Knowing that **a man is not justified by works of law...**”

(KJV) v 16: “Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law...” The definite articles ‘the’ are *not in the Greek*. There we see the terrible translation. It does not mean ‘by keeping the commandments of God.’ But, “...by works of law...” Both of the definite articles ‘the’ are NOT in the original Greek. This is why there’s so much confusion.

“...but through *the* faith of Jesus Christ...” (v 16). What does faith require? Is faith something external or internal? *Internal! You must believe!* That’s the only way you’re justified, because of what God did through Jesus Christ. ***God took upon Himself, when Jesus came in the flesh, all the sins of the whole world!*** You must believe on *that* justification!

- Are we all evil by nature? *Yes! We all have human nature!*
- Can we do anything purely righteous?
- Can we do anything as righteous as God is righteous? *No!*

Since we cannot do that, there is nothing that we can do to make ourselves righteous before God, as God demands that we are righteous—unless we believe in Christ, and unless that righteousness is imputed to us. *It’s of the heart!*

“...we also have believed in Christ Jesus in order that we might be justified by *the* faith of Christ, and **not by works of law; because by works of law shall no flesh be justified**” (v 16). Isn’t going to happen! ‘Be a good boy and come to church every Sunday.’ *NO!*

- Unless you *repent!*
- Unless you *believe!*
- Unless you *obey!*
- Unless you love *God!*

I hope this makes it real clear.

Verse 17: “Now then, if we are seeking to be justified in Christ... [through faith] ...*and* we ourselves are found to be sinners, *is* Christ then *the* minister of sin?...” You still have human nature and you still sin. Did Jesus make you sin? *No!* He is there to forgive it, because He is the propitiation!

“...MAY IT NEVER BE!” (v 17). The *KJV* says, “God forbid!” but the Greek there is ‘me

genoito’ which means *don’t ever let this thought come into existence—may it never be!* An absolutely true, literal translation would be *may this never be conceived of!* ‘Gennaio’ means to impregnate. *May this never come into existence or be conceived of!*

Verse 18: “For if I build again those things that I destroyed, I am making myself a transgressor.” Peter, you’re a sinner before everybody and written in Scripture for all time. That had to be pretty tough stuff that Peter was doing.

Verse 19: “For I, through law, died to law...” What does this mean? *The wages of sin is death! Sin is the transgression of the Law!* How could Paul write this if he were literally dead? *He couldn’t!* What death did he die?

“...in order that I may live to God. I have been [jointly] crucified with Christ...” (vs 19-20). Why did I translate it that way? *That’s what the Greek means! Crucified together, jointly!*

Romans 6:1 tells us how we die: “What then shall we say? Shall we continue in sin so that grace may abound? **MAY IT NEVER BE!**... [same expression; Paul uses this over and over again—‘me genoito’] ...We who died to sin... [Was Judaism and Judaism’s law sin? *Yes!* Was Peter going back and sinning? *Yes!*] ...how shall we live any longer therein? Or are you ignorant that we, as many as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into His death? Therefore, we were buried with Him through the baptism into **the** death... [Christ’s death] ...so that, just as Christ was raised from *the* dead by the glory of the Father, in the same way, we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been conjoined [co-crucified] together in the likeness of His death, so also shall we be *in the likeness* of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man was co-crucified with *Him* in order that the body of sin might be destroyed, so that we might no longer be enslaved to sin; because the one who has died *to sin* has been justified from sin” (vs 1-7).

That’s what it means in Galatians 2:20: “I have been crucified with Christ...” What God does when you’re baptized, He literally *takes the sacrifice of Christ and places that—imputes that—to you as your death!* That’s what it means. Now you understand why baptism has to be by water immersion. You can’t sprinkle. You’re not buried with sprinkling.

“...yet, I live. *Indeed*, it is no longer I; but **Christ lives in me...**” (v 20). How? *By the power of the Holy Spirit of God!* We are to have Christ formed *in* us.

“...For *the* life that I am now living in *the* flesh, I live by faith—that *very* faith of the Son of

God, Who loved me and gave Himself for me” (v 20). That’s something! God does this on an individual basis. That’s what’s so fantastic about it.

Verse 21: “I do not nullify the grace of God; for if righteousness... [that right standing before God] ...*is* through *works of law*, then Christ died in vain.” If you can make yourself right by separating from the Gentiles, then Christ is of no effect and died in vain! Whatever law you want to have: washing of pots and cups, etc.

This was one of these big ‘bombs.’ Galatians 3:1 (KJV): “O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you, that you should not obey the Truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ has been evidently set forth, crucified among you?” What does ‘set forth’ mean to you? *Shown, portrayed, talked about, prophesied.* The Greek is even stronger.

Let me read it in the FV, v 1: “O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you *into* not obeying the Truth...”

- Is that happening today? *Yes!*
- What is the Truth?
  - ✓ *Your Word is Truth!*
  - ✓ *Your law is Truth!*
  - ✓ *Your commandments are Truth!*

“...before whose eyes Jesus Christ, crucified, was set forth in a written public proclamation?” That is much more profound than just evidently “...set forth...”

Why did I translate it that way? From the Greek Interlinear—I know this will be a little technical, but I think it’s good that we understand some of the technicalities in it so it gives us greater faith and assurance.

Galatians 3:1 (*Interlinear*): “O senseless Galatians... [without brains; you aren’t even thinking] ...who you bewitched, the truth not to obey whose before eyes Jesus Christ **was openly** set forth among you crucified?” The four Greek letters above *was openly* is ‘proe’—means *before* and ‘graphe’—means *written*. The whole word is ‘proegraphe.’ The Scriptures are called ‘graphe.’

- What are we talking about? *They had to have had the Old Testament!*
- Was not all about the prophecies of Christ as a public declaration in the Old Testament? *Yes!*
- What else could this include? *This was written in about 54<sub>A.D.</sub>!*
- What else could this include? *New Testament Scripture!*
- Could it also have included the book of Luke?
- Who was Luke? *Luke was the one who*

*traveled with Paul! The one who wrote the book of Acts!*

- What was the first coming of Jesus Christ?
- Was it not the most profound event in the history of the world? *Yes!*
- Should that not have been written about? *Yes!*
- Was God going to leave the writing of the New Testament to people who didn’t believe in Christ?
- Let them write it after the death of the apostles?
- Do you think that the new disciples were without written record of Christ?

They found and can date accurately to 54<sub>A.D.</sub> a fragment of the book of Matthew written in Greek!

Luke 1:1: “Since many have taken in hand to compile a *written* narration... [Greek: draw up a narration; that is writing a history] ...of the matters, which have been fully believed among us, as they delivered *them* to us... [they received some of these written narrations] ...those who from *the* beginning had been eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word” (vs 1-2).

What is this telling us? *Clearly that those are* “...eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word”—the apostles. This is basic! They were writing it up and delivering it to the disciples.

Verse 3: “It seemed good to me also, having accurately understood everything from the very first, to write *these things* in an orderly sequence to you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you might know the *absolute* certainty of *the* things in which you have been instructed” (vs 3-4).

Pretty powerful case—isn’t it? In Galatians 3:1, they had Jesus Christ publicly proclaimed in a written proclamation that He was crucified, which then is the whole story of the Gospel and the life of Christ.

The more I get into the Scriptures, the more excited I become. I tell you, when I was translating this and I saw ‘graphe’ I just about came unglued, just about blew out of my seat and smashed my head on the ceiling. WOW! look at that! Many people won’t get excited over that, but I sure did.

Galatians 3:2: “This only I desire to learn from you: did you receive the Spirit of God by works of law, or by *the* hearing of faith?” How are they going to hear? *They’re going to hear what was written!* That’s exactly what we’re doing today on the Sabbath Day. Are we not hearing the words of faith? *Yes!*

Verse 3: “Are you so foolish? Having begun in *the* Spirit, are you now being perfected in *the*

flesh?” That’s what most people get done. That’s what Peter was doing. The carnal means of *separating!*

Galatians 4:8 (KJV): Howbeit then, when you knew not God...” What is this telling us? *They had no connection with God!* They were Gentiles. They weren’t like the Jews who had the knowledge of God, but weren’t doing it. These had no knowledge of God.

“...you did service unto them which by nature are no gods” (v 8) Who wants to have service done to them that are not God’s by nature. Demons!

Verse 9 (KJV): But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn you again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? You observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain” (vs 9-11).

(FV) v 8: “Now on the one hand, when you did not know God, you were in bondage to those who are not gods by nature.... [What is bondage? *Sin!*] ...But on the other hand, after having known God—...”(vs 8-9). There are two words in the Greek that should be translated *on the one hand* and *on the other hand* but were not translated by the *King James* translators. It’s good to translated it because it shows the contrast.

“...rather, after having been known by God—how *is it that* you are **turning again to...**” (v 9). What does that mean? *Going back to!* They left it and were going back to. It doesn’t say how are you turning to. It’s “...turning again to...”

“...the weak and impotent elements... [without power, nothing to it] ...to which you again desire to be in bondage? You are *of* your own selves... [not of God] ...observing days, and months, and times and years” (vs 9-10).

Why did I translate that “You are of your own selves observing...”? This is another one that blew me right away! In the Greek there is a special form of voice called *the middle voice*. Let me tell you what that means and I’ll try and explain it so you can understand it. Middle voice means *you are the subject and you are the recipient of your action*. You receive your action. It’s all contained in one form of the verb.

Let me use a couple of English examples: Standard simple sentence in English: I (subject) see (verb) the car (object). Your action of seeing the car. How could we express something similar in English where then you receive that action. Best you could do is this: you stand in front of a mirror and you say, ‘I see myself.’ You are doing the action and you are

receiving the benefit of seeing yourself.

In this, this means, v 10: “You are *of* your own selves... [you’re the subject and the recipient of the action] ...observing days, and months, and times and years.” In other words, they’re not doing it to God. They are not doing it from the Scriptures to God, they are observing it on their own initiative. Notice what they are observing: “...days, and months, and times and years.”

- Did the Apostle Paul know how to write ‘Sabbath’? *Yes!*
- Did the Apostle Paul know how to write ‘moon’? *Yes!*
- Did the Apostle Paul know how to write ‘Holy Day’? *Yes!*

Colossians 2:16<sub>[transcriber’s correction]</sub>: “Therefore, do not allow anyone to judge you in eating or in drinking, or with regard to a festival, or new moon, or *the Sabbaths.*”

- If he were talking about the Sabbath, would he not have said *Sabbath* instead of *days*?
- If he were talking about the New Moon, would he not have said *New Moon* rather than *months*?
- If he were talking about Holy Days, would he not have said *Holy Days* instead of *times*?
- *Yes!*

What were they doing? *They were going back to something they had been doing before!* They were ‘returning again.’

‘...days, and months, and times and years’ has **nothing** to do with Sabbath and Holy Days—period! All of the Protestant theologians say that it does, *and it doesn’t!* What you’re really dealing with is this: *something that many of the theologians always do; they go to a verse to prove their position, but it proves the opposite!* That’s what we’re dealing with here. They were doing it for themselves!

How many have seen the calendar presentation of the Therapute and the Essenes? The Essenes were a Jewish sect. They were pagan sun-worshippers. They were Levites. They believed in circumcision. They believed in keeping law and works of law. But on their calendar—which was a 364-day calendar—their Sabbath was on a Wednesday.

- Is that **a** day? *Yes!*
- Is Sunday **a** day? *Yes!*
- *So is Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday.*
- **Sabbath is God’s day!**

**The Sabbath**, the seventh day, which God—by creation—made for us to observe and fellowship with Him.

- Does any man have the right to do away with what God has created and say, ‘I am serving God’? *No!*

Likewise, the Holy Days:

- Does any man have the right to say, ‘You don’t keep these’ when God says ‘You shall keep them’? *No!*

Those were the profound things in Galatians. Trust me, brethren, please understand this series in Galatians: If you understand this you understand the most difficult parts of the New Testament bar none! They are technical. They are difficult. But they are also understandable. That’s something that I am amazed that people have been writing me and telling me they have never, never heard anything like what they’re getting in this.

They need to know! The doctrinal onslaught is coming and unless you know and rooted and grounded in the Word of God you’re going to get swept away!

All Scriptures from *The Holy Bible in its Original Order, A Faithful Version* (except where noted)

#### Scriptural References:

- 1) Galatians 2:11-13
- 2) Acts 10:24-28
- 3) Mark 7:1-13, 9, 13
- 4) John 14:23-24
- 5) Acts 10:28-37
- 6) Acts 15:5-9
- 7) Galatians 2:12-20
- 8) Romans 6:1-7
- 9) Galatians 2:20-21
- 10) Galatians 3:1
- 11) Luke 1:1-4
- 12) Galatians 3:2-3
- 13) Galatians 4:8-10
- 14) Colossians 2:16

#### Scriptures referenced, not quoted:

- Deuteronomy 18:18-20
- Romans 2

Also referenced: Romans Series #13  
(*Works of Law*)

FRC:bo  
Transcribed: 10-14-12  
Corrected: September/2016