

God's Grace and Commandment-Keeping XII

Fred R. Coulter—August 7, 2010

Greetings, everyone! As I promised, we would get into Galatians 2 & 3. Now let me draw a little analogy for you. A child comes to the point of consciousness in speaking and understanding and he or she learns that there's the sun, and at night there's the moon. Now how much do they know about it? They know enough when they're in first grade art or kindergarten art, they draw a big circle and then they color it yellow and they put kind of like the rays of the sun; same way with the moon. Then they learn more as they go through school and then they take various science courses at school. They come to find out the sun is a big ball of fire and the sun is 93-million miles from the earth. Then someone is inspired to go and take, say, astrophysics and they study more about it and they learn an awful lot about it—that there is helium and hydrogen boiling and burning all the time. It's sending off heat waves, heat winds, magnetic particles to the earth.

So they know a lot about it, but they still don't know what really makes the sun go. We've even sent men to the moon and brought back moon rocks, but they really don't understand how the moon was made. But they know it's there and held there by magnetics, the earth is, too. So they learn more and more about it, but what do they really, really know? Well, not very much!

I would like to use that as an analogy concerning what we know concerning the Word of God. When we first begin to understand the Word of God, we're like the little child who draws the sun, draws the moon. Then we get into it a little more deeply and we understand more, and we understand considerably more on the different teachings and the different doctrines. Then you might study Greek or Hebrew, and then you learn a whole lot more. Many things open up to you because you understand the original language it was written in.

Well likewise with studying the Bible. The same exact principles apply. That's why we have the *Fourteen Rules of Bible Study*. That is begin with what you know; go to the Scriptures which are easy to understand. Then begin to prove all things and to do it a little here, a little there, and put the whole picture together. The Scriptures, and especially the difficult ones, are very much like that.

So just like when you start school, you do not start a PhD program. You start in kindergarten or the first grade and you progress. So likewise, that means that you should study the Bible beginning with the Law, then the Prophets, then the Writings, then the Gospels, and Acts, then the General Epistles, then the Epistles of Paul, then the book of

Revelation. That gives you the orderly sequence of how things were put together by God and how God developed His Word as He inspired and gave to Moses and then to the prophets, and then all the writings and then into the Gospels, and Acts and then into the General Epistles, and the Epistles of Paul.

Now the Epistles of Paul are perhaps the most complicated to understand. Most people, unfortunately, like to begin with Galatians and the Epistles of Paul, rather than go back and begin with Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, etc. and work your way through the Bible. Galatians is built upon many things that happened back in Genesis. And Galatians is also revealing a contemporary problem that the early New Testament Church had.

We're not as versed in this problem that we have here as we are with law *vs* grace and Sunday *vs* Sabbath and Holy Days *vs* holidays, etc. So we're well versed with that. Because of the problems that we have had with those various things, and especially in the Protestant churches, they do not understand especially the first two chapters of Galatians. They don't realize what it's really telling us.

Since you just received this new book, *Judaism—A Revelation of Moses or a Religion of Men?*, I'm going to ask you to please read it through, because this will help you understand Galatians even more. We sent along with it the CD, *Scripturalism vs Judaism*, because that's very important to understand for the background of Galatians. Without a doubt, Galatians is the most difficult Epistle of Paul to understand. So we'll review a little bit in chapter one and chapter two and then we'll get into chapter three, and go through chapter three in great detail.

Added to the difficulties in trying to understand Galatians is the *King James* translation. Now a lot of people say, 'Well, these were learned men and they knew the Greek and they knew the Hebrew.' Well, the truth is

1. They did not know the koine Greek

What they studied was *classical* Greek and *attic* Greek. So you have classical, attic, and then koine.

In the late 1880s they discovered many, many, many business papers, scrolls and actually codexes. Now codex is another name for a book like this that is bound on the spine. They were all written in koine Greek. Now koine Greek means *common*

language. So it was the language of business, it was the language of the people, it was not a super-inspired language, like some people said. 'Oh, God had to give a special Greek for the New Testament because it's so special.' And then they found all of these records with all business deals and letters and transactions and contracts and essays and books, and things like that. And it gave a broader understanding to the New Testament koine Greek.

Because the *King James'* scholars who did it at that time, did not really understand the significance of many things in Greek, they made mistakes in translating and the biggest mistakes are made in Romans and in Galatians. Those mistakes are fatal to Protestantism.

2. They did not understand Judaism

They knew nothing about it, they knew nothing of the laws of Judaism. To them, Judaism was the Old Testament, the laws and commandments that God gave, and the New Testament is for Christians. And that's how they came up with the doctrine: We don't need to read the Old Testament, because that's Judaism, and Judaism is condemned in the book of Galatians. Then they made the mistake of twisting the Scriptures so that it turned out with the absolute antithesis of an interpretation that *the law is a curse*. So all of these things reinforce what Protestantism developed.

So we'll cover certain things here in Gal. 1, and then we'll go to the heart of the problem in Gal. 2 & 3. And it's ironic, it is absolutely ironic, ninety-five percent-plus of the times when a doctrine is established by misinterpreting a Scripture, that very Scripture gives the answer.

Galatians 1:6: "I am astonished that you are so quickly being turned away from Him Who called you into *the* grace of Christ, to a different gospel." As we've been seeing, the grace of God is the umbrella of our relationship with God the Father and Jesus Christ, so that we can become the very sons and daughters of God. That's the whole substance of the New Covenant.

Verse 7: "Which *in reality* is not another gospel; but there are some who are troubling you and are desiring to pervert the Gospel of Christ." We have the same thing today with Judaism, Messianic Jews, Hebrews Roots, Your Hebrew Calling, and I only know of one man from the tribe of Judah who in this day and age has forsaken all traditions of the Jews. So the Jews were trying to pervert the Gospel.

A lot of the Jews also intertwined paganism with it, just like today. Jews keep Christmas and Easter and all of those, as well as Hanukah and the Sabbath and Shavuot, and Trumpets and Atonement,

Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. They keep all of them. So we see, as a forewarning to us, those things in the book of Galatians.

Now notice how Paul sets the record straight. "But if we... [So he's including himself and the brethren and *we* also includes the apostles, because there was a problem with Peter later on and he also mentions Peter, James and John.] ...But if we, or even an angel from heaven, should preach a gospel to you, that is contrary to what we have preached, LET HIM BE ACCURSED!.... [Totally cut off from God.] ...As we have said before, I also now say again. If anyone is preaching a gospel contrary to what you have received, LET HIM BE ACCURSED!.... [Now here is what all ministers need to realize, right here]: ...Now then, am I striving to please men, or God?...." (vs 8-10).

- What do we do when we preach?
- What do we do when we counsel people?
- What do we do when we have to tackle some very head-on problems that are very difficult?

That's called *politics!*

"...Or am I motivated to please men?.... ['Let's have some favor with one, you see.' We'll see how that comes in Gal. 2 with what Peter did.] ...For if I am yet pleasing men, I would not a servant of Christ" (vs 8-10).

So this verse tells us an awful lot, what every minister and teacher needs to keep in mind. We are to teach the Word of God as He has given it, so that the brethren can be fed, *so that each one can have a personal, individual relationship with God*. To give you an example: suppose a Protestant minister finds out about, 'Oh, I need to keep the Sabbath now. Boy, if I preach that, I'd lose my flock. I wouldn't have any salary. So we'll just kind of hopscotch over that, but I'll give some good sermons out of the Word of God.' You're preaching a different gospel.

"But I certify to you, brethren, that the Gospel that was preached by me is not according to man... [So he doesn't have to please any man.] ...because neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught *it by man*; rather, *it was by the* revelation of Jesus Christ.... [And we know that to be three and a half years in the desert in Arabia where Christ taught him personally through dreams and revelations.] ...For you heard of my former conduct when I was in Judaism..." (vs 11-13). The *King James* says 'in the Jew's religion'—Judaism. And as this book that we've just published will show you, Judaism has nothing whatsoever to do with the Scriptures, any more than Catholicism has to do with the New Testament. Both are based upon traditions and both have their own religion. While claiming one thing,

they actually do something entirely different and they are very hypocritical in it.

"...how I was excessively persecuting the Church of God and was destroying it. And I was advancing in Judaism *far* beyond many of my contemporaries in my *own* nation, being more abundantly zealous for *the* traditions of my fathers" (vs 13-14). Now that's why with this new book of Judaism we sent out the CD that has 20 sermons, forty tracks, on *Scripturalism vs Judaism*. You're going to be amazed of the clarity of the difference through the Gospels and the rest of the New Testament.

So let's come on over here to Galatians 2. There was a problem with physical circumcision, because—and we'll just put this into the record here—under the covenant with Israel, any Gentile or stranger—as they're called, either one—could enter into the worship of God and be able to offer sacrifices at the temple, etc., and be able to take the Passover and keep the Holy Days, if the man was circumcised in the flesh.

The Jews in Judaism also made that a requirement for the proselytes. In order for them to attend synagogue, they had to be circumcised. When Christianity started, it was first preached to the Jews. There was not even a single controversy over circumcision. Then you know the whole history in Acts 10 about Cornelius and his household. In order for God to show that He was not going to require the Gentiles to be circumcised in the flesh, He sent the Holy Spirit upon Cornelius and his household while they were listening to Peter preach.

Now that was not to show, 'You don't need to be baptized anymore.' That was to show that the Holy Spirit was given by God to the Gentiles without the requirement of circumcision. Now this set the Church in Jerusalem right on edge. Then Paul, as we know, in Romans explains that it is the circumcision of the heart, which is greater. Well, the Judaizers would come along and say, 'It's required.' As a matter of fact the Pharisees were saying, the Pharisees who believed for a while, that it's required that all the Gentiles *must* be circumcised or they cannot be saved *and* they must keep the law of Moses, which to the Pharisees included all the traditional laws.

So this was the controversy. That's why if you don't have the series on Galatians that we have, we have I think eight or nine, maybe ten sermons on the *Circumcision Wars* and the history of that is really very interesting. So if you don't have it, get it.

Galatians 2:3: "But indeed, Titus, who *was* with me, being a Greek, was not compelled to be circumcised." Then he says, when they were coming up there spies came in to check out who was

circumcised and who wasn't. Because for Judaism you could not do anything concerning God unless you had first been circumcised. So this is why Paul wrote later in another place, he said, 'Those who want to circumcise you I would they would cut themselves off'—if you want to circumcise, do the whole thing. So Paul went up and explained:

Verse 5: "To whom we did not yield in subjection, *not* even for one hour... But *the gospel that I preach did not come* from those reputed to be something.... [In other words, the Gospel he was preaching didn't come from Peter or James or John.] ...*(Whatever they were does not make any difference to me; God does not accept the person of a man.)*.... [And God does not expect us to be respecters of persons.] ...For those who are of repute conferred nothing upon me. But on the contrary, after seeing that I had been entrusted with the Gospel of the uncircumcision, exactly as Peter *had been entrusted with the gospel* of the circumcision..." (vs 5-7).

Which tells you what? *Peter never went to Rome*—very simple. All you have to do is read the book of Acts and when Paul was in prison in Rome in 61_{A.D.} he called for all the elders of the Jews and they said, 'Well, we've heard of this sect, but we don't know anything about it.' And supposedly, the Apostle Peter went to Rome in 42_{A.D.}; however, that was *another* Peter; that was actually Simon Magus. We won't get into a long historical situation there. But since Peter was the apostle for the circumcision, were the Italians and Romans circumcised? *No*, never went there.

"(For He Who wrought in Peter for *the* apostleship of the circumcision wrought in me also toward the Gentiles); and after recognizing the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas... [who was Peter] ...and John—those reputed to be pillars—gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, *affirming* that we *should go* to the Gentiles, and they to the circumcision. *Their only request was* that we remember the poor, which very thing I was also diligent to do" (vs 8-10).

Now here is the crux of one problem; there are many in Galatians. Verse 11: "But when Peter came to Antioch... [Now why would he come to Antioch? *Antioch was a way to get over to Babylon*. And what does it say where Peter was in 2-Peter? *Babylon*. The scholars today say, 'Oh, well, that's an encrypted signal meaning Rome.' Well, did Peter know how to say Rome? *Of course!* 'I'm in Babylon, no I mean Rome, that's 800 miles to the west. I'm confused, no one gave me a compass.'] ...when Peter came to Antioch, I withstood him to *his* face because he was to be condemned. For before certain *ones* came from James..." (vs 11-12).

Now we read in Acts 21 that they became absorbed into also the Church at Jerusalem with James and the elders there, the sacrifices, and also the traditions. So notice what happened when they came down from Jerusalem. And, of course, Jerusalem, that's where the world exists. Anything less than Jerusalem, just like it is today, is nowhere.

So they came down. "For before certain *ones* came from James, 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*" (v 12).

1. Politics—right?
2. He was worried about himself that he didn't want to have a bad report go back to the brother of Jesus, James, that Peter was eating with the Gentiles.
3. It was a respecter of persons

Let me just state here, very clearly. I will pay anyone \$10,000 cash if you can find anywhere in the Old Testament where it says *you shall not eat with men who are Gentiles and uncircumcised*, because if you do, you are sinning and you are against God and you have fallen from God's grace if you do that. So this is what's going on. Now notice what happened because there were still some Jews in the congregation down there.

"And the rest of the Jews joined him in *this hypocritical act...*" (v 13). *Playing politics!* Have we been in the Church and seen what happens when politics are played? *Yes, indeed!* What happens? *It gets corrupt*—doesn't it? And what else happens? *It cuts people off from a relationship with God.* and it sets up a hierarchy of things to do not found in the Bible.

"...insomuch that even Barnabas... [Who was ordained as an apostle with Saul, before he became Paul. And Barnabas was what? *A Levite!*] ...even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy" (v 13). So the problem here, let's understand, is this:

1. It's not the law of God
2. It is a Jewish tradition, a Jewish law *from Judaism*, not from God

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, and not according to Judaism, why do you compel the Gentiles to Judaize?'" Now that is the most accurate translation possible from the Greek.

Now let me read you from the *King James Version* and I'll read that and then I'll read on from there. This is important for you to understand that there were additions to the text which were not noted

as additions. Now, additions have been traditionally shown to be noted by being put in *italic* print, but they did not do this in Galatians 2.

I'm going to read from the *King James Version*, v 15: "We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by **the** works of **the** law..." (vs 15-16). Now when you read that '**the** law' tells you what? *First five books of the Bible*—right? But in the Greek there is no definite article in either place, before 'works' or before 'law.' So Paul is writing specifically to show *a work of law, not contained in the Scriptures*. There was no reason to put the definite article there. The translators made a fatal mistake in doing so, and so set Protestantism on the course to lawlessness. Because then people read this and say, 'Well, I don't have to keep the law.' That's what they read out of it. The different other modern translations likewise do not translate it any differently than this, in most cases.

"...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" (v 16, *KJV*).

If you start out as a novice, like a little kid in the first grade drawing your first picture of the sun or the moon, and you know nothing about it, you think immediately, 'Oh, we don't have to keep the commandments of God. Yeah, the preacher's right. There it is right in the Bible, right in black and white. And after all, the *King James* translators of the Bible were good and honest and decent men and knew what they were doing.' *No, not so!* They lacked knowledge. They lacked understanding. Therefore, they improperly translated it incorrectly.

Now let's read this now in the *Faithful Version*. And in this I have reflected *literally* what the Greek says. Now remember, what we're dealing with here in Acts 2 is what? What is the law we're dealing with? *A law of Judaism*, where it was required that Jews could not eat with Gentiles, because they would become unclean and would not be justified before God if they ate with them. So the only way to be justified before God is to stiff-arm them, separate, and eat separately. How's that for the love of Christ?

See what happens when politics, wrong understanding, and Jewish tradition is mixed in? Now let me ask you a question straight out, which is this: All of those of you who have gotten involved in some form of Messianic Judaism or Hebrew Roots Judaism, hasn't it caused a lot of problems? 'Oh, you've got to use this name, or you have to use that name.' That's why we have, I don't know how many we have on sacred names, but there's one that's most

important, *What Are the Sacred Names of the New Testament? God the Father and Jesus Christ!* That's superior to anything else.

So here was the problem. You talk about a problem in church. Now think about this: Here you have heard that representatives from the Apostle James, the brother of Jesus, are coming to Antioch for—and some people think this was the Feast of Tabernacles—to be with us. And you're all excited, you're all ready to go to church, and I don't what kind of building, or how many were there, but you get there and all of a sudden you see all the Jews over there on one side and all the Gentiles over here on the other side and Peter and Barnabas are with them. Now how would you feel walking into a congregation like that?

And you've seen that in churches where there are a lot of politics. What happens? Well, all of the mucky-mucks get over here and converse with each other and all the mucky-mucks' wives get over there and converse with each other, and then what you see, all the wives who are beautiful get together and all of the uglies are over here on the other side. Isn't that true? And all the intellectuals get together over here and they talk. And all of the dunces get over here and they're practical and know that all of this is a bunch of nonsense and can see that this is a bunch of hypocrisy. We've had similar things, too—haven't we? You're heard it said, some ministers would say when there's a question that they don't want to answer or they don't want to get involved in things they would say, 'Who is the elder here?' No, if I said that, Dolores would really let me know. 'Fred, that ain't the way to do it.' No, and I don't do it that way either, so she doesn't have to tell me.

Let's read it here in the *Faithful Version*, Galatians 2:14: "But when I saw that they did not walk uprightly according to the Truth of the Gospel... [So they were practicing something contrary to the Truth.] ...I said to Peter in the presence of them all, 'If you, being a Jew, are living like the Gentiles, **and not according to Judaism**... [That clarifies the problem and that's what it is in the Greek. Since the *King James Version* translators did not understand Judaism, they didn't translate it correctly. The closest they came was in chapter one, 'the religion of the Jews.'] ...and not according to Judaism, why do you compel the Gentiles to Judaize?'"

In other words, if you force them to separate from you, you're forcing them to follow a tradition of Judaism. Now we could do something like that today—couldn't we? I know what would really set a congregation on end. We'll put a little half fence right down the middle of the aisle. All the women on this side and all the men on the other side, and all the old men up front and all the young men go to the

back. Boy, would there not be a real upset! Same thing here.

Now v 15: "We who are Jews by nature—and not sinners of *the* Gentiles—Knowing that a man is not justified by **works of law**... [What was the works of law they were doing here that came from Judaism? *Separating from the Gentiles to eat*. And they thought they would be more righteous before God if they did that. Were they justified before God? *No!*] ...but through *the* faith of Jesus Christ... [Because when you go against what the Bible says and the Scriptures say, you are going against the faith of Christ—right? What He taught. *Yes!* And the only way of justification is through the sacrifice and shed blood of Jesus Christ, Rom. 3.] ...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" (vs 15-16). Why? *Because law tells us*

- what the knowledge of sin is
- what to do
- what is right
- what is good

Then we add to that all the teachings of Jesus and all the teachings that we have in the Bible. **Only the sacrifice can make you justified**; that sacrifice is the **sacrifice of Jesus Christ**, not your personal tradition of separation or hand washing or as we saw on television on the Day of Atonement the Jews at the Wailing Wall. Some of them were taking a white chicken and waving over their head, a live one, because this was supposed to help get rid of their sins. They better not whirl it around too much because something may happen to their little beanie on top of their heads.

"...and **not by works of law**; because by works of law shall no flesh be justified. Now then, if we are seeking to be justified in Christ, *and* we ourselves are found to be sinners... [Which in doing what they were doing, were practicing a sinful thing that was not right before God.] ...*is* Christ then *the* minister of sin? MAY IT NEVER BE! For if I build again those things that I destroyed..." (vs 16-18)—because he was a chief mucky-muck in Judaism. You can put in Phil. 3 about how he was really a Pharisee of Pharisees, born in the Pharisee family. You can't have a pedigree any better than that.

So what did he do? He said, 'I count all of that as dung.' He got rid of it, destroyed it, repented of it. "For if I build again those things that I destroyed, I am making myself a transgressor. For I through law died to law... [Now what does that mean? 'I through law'—the wages of sin is death and sin is the transgression of the law; 'died'—through baptism; 'to law'—in this case law means,

the *works of law*. He died to it; he quit doing it; no longer practiced it.] ...in order that I may live to God.... [See how this next verse ties in with Rom. 6, about being co-crucified and buried into His death]: ...I have been crucified with Christ, yet I live. *Indeed*, it is no longer I; but Christ lives in me. 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. I do not nullify the grace of God... [which would be with the separation from the Gentiles] ...for if righteousness... [right standing with God.] ...*is* through *works of law*, then Christ died in vain” (vs 18-21).

In other words, all you need is the religion of Judaism, then—right? You don't need Christ. All you need are all their works of law. That's why we have thirty-two pages in the back of this book—*Judaism: A Revelation of Moses or Religion of Men?*—directly from the *Code of Jewish Law* and you can read those things. Some of them are pitiful. Some of them are hilarious and some of them are absolutely stupid.

(go to the next track)

Get on your thinking caps, because we are going to tackle the most difficult chapter in all the Epistles of Paul—Galatians 3. We will read some of it from the *KJV*, but now that you know the difference between 'works of law,' and 'the works of the law,'

Let's come back here to Romans 2:14. This will help us understand something very important. "For when the Gentiles, which do not have *the* law, practice by nature the things contained in **the** law... [God's law] ...these who do not *the* law are a law unto themselves." Because to do what is right, to do what is lawful, according to God, is always the right thing to do, so it's a law unto itself.

Verse 15 becomes absolutely important to understand, because this is the only verse in all the writings of the Apostle Paul where he used the two definite articles. Every place else it is 'works of law.' That's differentiated them from '**the** works of **the** law,' which are a good thing to do.

Verse 15: "Who show the work of the law written in their own hearts..." If the law is done away with to accommodate the Gentiles, why praise them if they're keeping the law? *But Paul did, and says it's written in their hearts*. So 'the work of the law,' that's the only place in the entire New Testament where it is written with the definite articles. Every other place does not have them. That's where the *King James* translators have so poorly translated Galatians that it has completely misled people for over 400 years. So don't accuse me of picking on the Protestants all the time. They've been picking on us for 450 years—over 400

years. So this shows '**the** work of **the** law' refers to the laws and commandments of God and are a good thing to do—correct? *Yes!*

That's why Paul, in all the other places, deliberately did not put the definite article. Did he know how to do it? Of course, he did it in Rom. 2:15—didn't he? So therefore, if he meant to do it, he would have done it—correct?

Galatians 3:1: "O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you... [What is bewitching? *That is deceiving, using demonic things combined with it.*] ...who has bewitched you *into* not obeying the Truth..." What is the Truth?

- the Word of God
- the commandments of God
- the precepts of God
- the teachings of Jesus

Right? Jesus said, 'I am the Way, the Truth and the Life'—correct? *Yes!*

"...before whose eyes Jesus Christ, crucified, was set forth in a written public proclamation?" (v 1). And that's what the Greek means. In other words, they had many parts of the Gospels already done, probably all of the Gospel of Matthew was done and well circulated. And if you read in the appendices—please read those—and if you read the commentaries—please read those—those are there and necessary to help you understand the Bible.

If we just strip all of those out and publish just the Scriptures, we would be no different than any other Bible that is kind of like an ad hoc on the shelf. And it's just an eeny, meeny, miney, moe which one you're going to choose. But these tell you

- how we got the Bible
- how it was canonized
- how it was preserved
- when was it written
- when were the books of the New Testament written

—and you're going to find they were written very, very, very early on. So Matthew was probably done by 33-34-35_{A.D.} at the latest. So the written proclamation, that's what it means in the Greek. You don't find that in the *King James*: "...before whose eyes Jesus Christ has been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" (v 1). Well, what does that mean? Jesus wasn't crucified among them—was He? *No!* They never even heard about Him until they came preaching the gospel there.

So that's why it's translated this way in the *Faithful Version*, v 1: "...before whose eyes Jesus Christ, crucified, was set forth in a written public proclamation?" *The written Gospel!* Where does it

tell us about this? Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. So if they had the book of Matthew, had everything about the crucifixion of Christ.

Verse 2: "This only I desire to learn from you: did you receive the Spirit of God by works of law..."

King James says: "...receive you the Spirit by **the** works of **the** law?..." Makes everything confusing, because Peter also said, 'God does not give the Holy Spirit to those who do not obey Him.' So 'works of law,' in other words by the tradition of the Jews.

(FV): "...or by *the* hearing of faith? Are you so foolish? Having begun in *the* Spirit, are you now being perfected in *the* flesh?" (vs 2-3). You can't be perfected by physical things—right? *No!*

"Have you suffered so many things in vain, if indeed it *has been* in vain? Therefore *consider this*... [I want you to read this carefully, and think about it.] ...He Who is **supplying the Spirit** to you... [Stop and think for just a minute. Look at the words 'supplying,' and then after that 'the Spirit.' Can you supply a person? But you can supply the Spirit of the God coming from God Who supplies it. So this shows that the Spirit of God is **not** a person. It doesn't say, 'Who supplies Jesus to you.' No, but 'He Who is supplying the Spirit to you.' And what did Jesus say, 'The Father will send the Spirit, and I will send the Spirit from the Father.' They're both involved in it. So it's supplied to you.] ...and Who is working deeds of power... [or miracles] ...among you, *is He doing it* by works of law or by *the* hearing of faith?" (vs 4-5)—because you believe.

Now if they separated and didn't eat with the Gentiles:

- Was a miracle performed?
- Was fire called down from heaven? *No!*
- Were the sick healed? *No!*
- Did you have a change in conversion of mind? *No!*

That's what it's talking about.

Verse 6: "*It is exactly as it is written: 'Abraham believed God... [Gen. 15] ...and it was reckoned to him for righteousness.'* Because of this, *you should* understand that those who *are* of faith are the *true* sons of Abraham" (vs 6-7). Now I want you to think about this because Abraham is brought up here in many different places showing what? *The basis of the Gospels began with the covenant to Abraham beginning in Gen. 15.* So if you say the whole law is done away and we don't have to even read it—what do you do? You cut off the understanding as to what it's talking about with Abraham here and you don't know what it's saying—right? *Yes!*

Verse 8: "Now *in* the Scriptures... [Utt, oh! How can they say Jesus did away with the law, Paul did away with the law, when Paul refers to the Scriptures?] ...God, seeing in advance that He would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand to Abraham, saying, 'In you shall all the nations be blessed.'" And that started right with Abraham, went right on through to the twelve tribes of Israel and their modern day descendants, the preaching of the Gospel, bringing the Gentiles into the Church, going all the way down through to the return of Jesus Christ, all the way down through the Millennium, all the way down through to the fulfillment of the Last Great Day.

Verse 9: "It is for this reason that those who are of faith are being blessed with the believing Abraham...."

Verse 10 (KJV): "For as many as are of the works of **the** law are under **the** curse..." That is the key verse that they use to say, 'The law is a curse.'

1. It doesn't say that
2. It's not talking about the Law of God

"...for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that continues not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.'" Therefore, it's done away.

Now let's read it in the *Faithful Version* and we'll get an entirely different concept of it, v 10: "For as many as are *relying* on works of law... [traditional laws of Judaism] ...are under a curse..." Why are they under a curse?

Let's understand that the traditional laws of Judaism are held in higher esteem than the laws of God, and the teachings of the rabbis as greater than the teachings of God. That's why you need this book, *Judaism: A Revelation of Moses or Religion of Men?* and you need to read it. You need to understand it. Phil Neal did a tremendous job in writing this, he really, really did.

Mark 7 talks about the traditions of the Jews. It was about not washing their hands, which was what? *A law of the Jews: wash your hands.* In the appendix here with the *Code of Jewish Law* we have that the first thing in the morning that anyone who practices Judaism you get out of bed and you have to wash your hands immediately. You have to have a basin there and a pitcher of water. What you do, you take the water in the left hand and your pour it over the right hand. And then you take the water in your right hand, pour it over the left hand. You do this three times. You know why you do that? Because when you're sleeping a demon descends upon you and that's the only way you get rid of it. ***A work of law based upon a lie and superstition.***

And if you do those things, you've forsaken the laws and commandments of God. And when you forsake the laws and commandments of God, you're what? *Under a curse!*—correct? So as many as are of works of law **are under a curse** because if you do Judaism works of law, you reject the commandments of God, which is worse than transgressing.

Let's read it here. Mark 7:5: "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?'.... [This is almost like a Protestant coming up to a Sabbath-keeper and saying, 'Why do you keep the Sabbath and not Sunday?'] ...And He answered *and* said to them, 'Well did Isaiah prophesy concerning you hypocrites, as it is written, "This people honors Me with their lips, but their hearts are far away from Me. But in vain do they worship Me, teaching *for* doctrine the commandments of men." For leaving the commandment of God, you hold fast the tradition of men... [**works of law**] ...*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, so that you may observe your *own* tradition'" (vs 5-9).

So all the traditional works of law of Judaism *are against the laws of God*, and when you reject the laws of God and set the teachings of men in a superior position, you are sinning and you are under a curse. If you're relying on that for salvation, if you're relying on that for justification, *you have rejected Christ*. Has Judaism rejected Christ, except for a very few Jews, mostly in America? *Yes!* Why? *Because of their works of law and traditions!*

Galatians 3:10: "For as many as are *relying* on works of law are under a curse, because it is written, 'Cursed *is* everyone who does not continue in all things that have been written in the book of the law to do them.'" Now that does mean 'the book of **the** law'—which tells you what? *Just exactly as Jesus said*—right? You reject the commandments of God, which were found where? In the book of the law—correct?—that you may keep your tradition. And you're not continuing in those things, so therefore you are cursed. That's what that verse really means. Those Judaizers were trying to get them to do the commandments and teachings of men. They weren't trying to keep the Law of God. They had rejected it.

Now had they kept the Law of God, they would have what? *Been blessed*—right? *Not cursed!* The law is not a curse, but works of law—rejecting the laws and commandments of God, which also then rejects Jesus Christ, which also then rejects the

teachings of the New Testament—puts you under a curse!

Verse 11: "Therefore, *it is* evident that no one is being justified before God by *means of* law... [What is the only means of justification? *Rom. 3, the sacrifice and shed blood of Jesus Christ*. That's it! We'll expand this out: **No work of any law justifies you before God, because law was not given to justify**. So when they use works of law as a means of justification, they're under a curse.

"...because *it is* written, 'The just shall live by faith'" (v 11).

- believing in Christ
- keeping and obeying His teachings
- living by every Word of God
- believing in God the Father
- trusting in Him for salvation

All of this is by faith, because you receive the Spirit of God and now uniting with your spirit, you are now under grace so you can have a personal relationship with God the Father in heaven above. You don't have to worry about going to Jerusalem for a temple. Remember what the Jews say? 'Next year in Jerusalem.' You know what ought to be said, *everyday on your knees before God, praying to the Father through Jesus Christ*, because that's where the true Jerusalem is—is it not? *Yes!* Paul talks about it in Gal. 4.

"Now then, the law is not based on faith... [it's written out] ...but, 'The man who practices these things shall live in them'.... [Now how are we to live? Now we'll cover that again, because I'm sure there are at least two more sermons coming on *God's Grace and Commandment-Keeping*. Now we enter in to a whole different relationship with God. Now we enter into a relationship of *sonship*.] **...Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law...**" (vs 12-13).

Now let me see what it says here in the *King James Version*, v 13: "Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law..." Okay, that's a correct translation.

Verse 13 (FV): "...having become a curse for us (for it is written, 'Cursed *is* everyone who hangs on a tree')." "

Go back to 2-Corinthians 5:21: "For He [God the Father] made Him [Jesus Christ] Who knew no sin *to be* sin for us, so that we might become *the* righteousness of God in Him." So we're justified by that faith. Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse, taking all the sins of the world upon Himself.

Galatians 3:13: "...(for it is written, 'Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree').... [For what

purpose? Notice again here Abraham is mentioned.] ...In order that the blessing of Abraham might come to the Gentiles by Christ Jesus, *and* that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith” (vs 13-14). It's the Spirit that is the heart and core of our relationship with God. As we covered before, we receive the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Truth, so that we can have the laws and commandments written in our hearts and in our minds, so then we can keep them *spiritually* and we can overcome sin *internally*. Sin starts in the mind and that must be converted and changed. And we build faith by studying the Word of God, praying to God, and all of that.

Now, let me read from the *King James Version*, because here they *absolutely clobber the meaning* of these verses, and resulted in many mislead doctrines even within the Churches of God. Verse 15 (*KJV*): “Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though *it be* but a man's covenant, yet *if it be* confirmed, no man disannuls, or adds to it.... [Come down here to v 19]: ...Wherefore, then, serves the law? It was added...” Well, if it says you can't add to it, how do you add to it? *Mistranslation!*

Now let's read it in the *Faithful Version*, v 15: “Brethren (I am speaking from a human perspective), even when a man's covenant has been ratified, no one nullifies *it*, or adds a codicil to it.... [Because a covenant is established first, then sealed by sacrifice. Once that is done, you cannot add to or take away from. Remember it's the promises, no one can add to it or take away from.] ...Now to Abraham and to his Seed were the promises spoken. He does not say, ‘and to *your* seeds,’ as of many; but as of one, ‘and to your Seed,’ which is Christ. Now this I say, *that the* covenant ratified beforehand by God to Christ... [Gen. 15, that's when it was] ...cannot be annulled by the law, which was given four hundred and thirty years later... [Now the law means the whole law that was given by God to Moses for Israel. The law does not annul the promises.] ...so as to make the promise of no effect.” (vs 15-17).

“...law which was given four hundred and thirty years later... [—that's when God spoke the Ten Commandments and gave the laws and statutes and judgments to Israel at Mount Sinai] ...so as to make the promise of no effect. For if the inheritance... [This is the inheritance of eternal life he's speaking of. And even the inheritance of the land that they received.] ...For if the inheritance is by law, *it is* no longer by promise. But God granted *it* to Abraham by promise” (vs 17-18). And he walked in the land, but he never owned it. And Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob all died without ownership of the inheritance of the land that God promised. But God granted it to Abraham “by promise.”

Verse 19 (*KJV*): “Wherefore then serves the law? It was added... [Oh! So if it was added, we can

take it away—right? *No!*] ...It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; *and it was* ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” Now you read that and your eyes cross. What is this? It says you can't add to it, but he says it was added. That's not correct.

Verse 19 (*FV*): “Why then the law? It was **placed alongside**... [You can have covenants side by side—can't you? *Yes!*] ...was placed alongside *the promises* for the purpose of *defining* transgressions, until the Seed should come to whom *the* promise was made, having been ordained through angels in the hand of a mediator.”

Now let's look at this again. Some people read this, and this was taught in the Church of God for many years, and still is, that the law of sacrifices was added to the Ten Commandments. And it's not talking about adding anything to the Ten Commandments. It's talking about placing something *alongside* the promises. That was one of the first papers that I wrote when I was in the large church of God and boy, someone thought, ‘Who is Fred Coulter to write something to *correct* the apostle,’ when the apostle said, ‘If you find anything new, write it up and send it in. If it's correct, we'll agree with it and accept it.’ Isn't that lovely? But this was like the fly-trapping plant. Smack! I got in trouble, but it was correct. After the henchmen and the ‘religious mafia’ got after me, the apostle said that I was right, years later.

Verse 20: “Now then, a mediator does not *act on behalf* of one; but God is one.” So what does this mean? Moses acted as a mediator between God and the people. That's all its talking about. Christ now is Mediator between God the Father and us. If you're in a room all alone, you don't need a mediator. You can made up your mind whatever you want. You don't put my person A over here and my person B over here and say now, this argument and that argument, pro and con, and, ‘Oh, well, I'll mediate.’ Self-evident!

Verse 21: “*Is* the law... [And that's in the Greek, ‘the law.’] ...*Is* the law then contrary to the promises of God?... [*No!* But the Protestants believe that it was.] ...MAY IT NEVER BE! For if a law had been given that had the power to give life, *then* righteousness would indeed have been by law.” I've used the example of keeping 1,000 Sabbaths, if that were the requirement. And you only kept 999—forget it, you didn't make it. What law can give life? Law can do nothing. It is on the books. It states what is wrong/what is right.

Now come back here to Romans 8:4; let's read what the disposition of the law is to be for us, which we'll come back and cover again a little later.

We covered some of it this morning up north. Why do we have everything that we go through in the New Testament, everything in the book of Romans written up to this point, v 4 summarizes it. And notice this does not in any way give any indication that the laws have been abolished, rather it's the other way around.

Romans 8:4: "In order that the righteousness of the law... [The true spiritual righteousness and application of the law.] ...might be fulfilled in us..." And where does that true righteousness come? *From the Holy Spirit writing the laws and commandments in your heart and in your mind.* That also shows to you the sin within so you can repent. The true righteousness then, is based on loving God with all your heart and mind and soul and being, and the true fulfillment of the righteousness of the law, far from doing away with it—right? 'Be fulfilled in us.' That has been ongoing through the true Churches of God in the active work of the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ down through time. Far from having the law abolished, wouldn't you say? *Yes, indeed!*

The righteousness of the law can only be fulfilled with the Spirit of God. So there's no law given which can give life, because Jesus said, 'I'm the Way, the Truth, and the Life.' Eternal life comes through Christ. That's it!

Galatians 3:22 (KJV)—this is the one that the Protestants like: "But the Scripture has concluded all under sin... [correct] ...that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore, the law was our schoolmaster... [Everybody hates schoolmasters. Every time you think of that, especially a Catholic, he thinks of the nun walking around with a ruler.] ...to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under schoolmaster" (vs 22-25). Therefore, we don't keep the law.

Let's read it in the *Faithful Version*, v 22: "But the Scriptures have shut up all things under sin... ['All have sinned and come short of the glory of God'—correct? *Yes!*] ...so that by *the* faith of Jesus Christ the promise might be given to those who believe.... [And you believe, and you're baptized, after you repent, and you receive the Holy Spirit—correct?] ...Now before faith came... [That is before Christ and before the Holy Spirit.] ...we were guarded under law... [You were protected by the law—right? *To keep you in the letter of the law in obedience toward God.* Nothing wrong with that. Don't you do that with your children? *Yes!*] ...having been shut up unto the faith that was yet to be revealed.... [And when it was revealed] ...In this way, the law was our **tutor**... [That's what it means

in the Greek, not schoolmaster.] ...to lead us to Christ that we might be justified by faith." (vs 22-24).

Now let me ask you a question. Do you use the same alphabet that you used when you learned to first sing the alphabet song, 'A, B, C, D, E, F, G, etc.'? *Yes!* Do you know more than you did when you first learned that song? *Yes!* Are all words made up of the same alphabet? *Yes!* Was your schoolmaster or your tutor good for you? *Because you wouldn't be able to understand the things that you understand today unless you had learned that—correct?* Does that mean when you become an adult you throw away everything that you have learned? *No!* What do you do? *You expand on what you have learned—right?* That's what God has done with the law and with Christ and with the Holy Spirit. He expands on what we learned. It wasn't some harsh thing that we're beaten up with in order to make us do it. But we're no longer under a tutor. Who are we under? **God the Father, Jesus Christ, and grace!** Is that better than a tutor? *Yes!*

Since you have finished your formal education by going to an institute of whatever level, have you learned more in your life since then, because of what you were taught when you were a wee little one and in the classes that you have gone through? *Yes!* And this is what really kind of aggravates me a lot is, you know, they talk about, 'Well, I went to Harvard.' or 'I went to Cambridge.' That's not the question. What have you learned since then and what have you unlearned in the wrong things that you did learn, now that you're not under your professor? Right?

If I relied on everything I learned and only what I learned at Ambassador College, I would be a pauper spiritually. I've learned far more since after graduating, and studying and learning, and all the things connected with what I've been doing since I resigned in 1979, and since I graduated in 1964.

You're no longer under a tutor, you're under God the Father and Jesus Christ for what? Verse 26: "Because you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus.... [*for sonship*] ...For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ" (vs 26-27). Rather than just a tutor, now you put on what Christ has and is and does, and through the power of the Holy Spirit it is through you—correct? *Yes!*

Now this is spiritually speaking: "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.... [*For salvation!* We still have male and female, we still have children and seniors, and all of that sort of thing. There are a lot of people who think they are free, but they're in debt, and they're in bondage to the lender.] ...Now if you *are* Christ's,

then you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" (vs 28-29).

And what was the promise? He said, 'Look at the stars, Abraham, and number them if you're able to count them. ***So shall your seed be.***'

Scriptures from *The Holy Bible in Its Original Order, A Faithful Version* by Fred R. Coulter; except where noted

Scriptural References:

- 1) Galatians 1:6-14
- 2) Galatians 2:3, 5-21
- 3) Romans 2:14-15
- 4) Galatians 3:1-10
- 5) Mark 7:5-9
- 6) Galatians 3:10-13
- 7) 2-Corinthians 5:21
- 8) Galatians 3:13-21
- 9) Romans 8:4
- 10) Galatians 3:22-29

Scriptures referenced, not quoted:

- Acts 10
- 2-Peter
- Acts 21; 2
- Romans 3
- Philippians 3
- Romans 6
- Genesis 15
- Romans 3
- Galatians 4
- Genesis 15

Also referenced:

Article: *Fourteen Rules of Bible Study*

Sermon: *What are the Sacred Names of the New Testament?*

Sermon Series:

- *Scripturalism vs Judaism*
- *Galatians*
- *Circumcision Wars*

Books:

- *Judaism: A Revelation of Moses or Religion of Men?* by Philip Neal
- *Code of Jewish Law* by Solomon Ganzfried and Hyman E. Goldin

FRC:lp

Transcribed: 8-17-10

Formatted: bo—8-19-10