

Pastor Jeremy M. Thomas
Fredericksburg Bible Church
107 East Austin
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624
830-997-8834 jthomas@fbgbible.org

A1002 – January 10, 2010 – Galatians 2:1-10 – The Case Of Titus

The problem so far has been, fundamentally, that Paul was not one of the twelve apostles. And therefore the Judaizers seized this apparent weakness in Paul and contradicted his gospel by saying that Paul had no apostolic authority. So the first thing Paul has to do is defend that he has the same apostolic authority as the twelve, despite the fact he's not one of the twelve. The question is how do you do that? How do you defend that you have Peter, James, John, Matthew, the twelve that were with Christ, walked with Christ, talked with Christ, were personally trained by Christ, spent the Last Supper with Christ, saw the resurrected Christ, all of this and then you're Paul, you share none of this, but you have the same authority as them? That's a tough argument to make. For those who think he's the real twelfth apostle, why didn't he just say so? End of story. A very easy thing to say. Just ask Peter, James, John, they'll tell you. But he doesn't do that, he goes into a very lengthy defense of his apostleship from a number of arguments and we're working through his defense.

The way he does it is he makes a proposition, two propositions actually, but the first proposition he makes to assert equal authority with the twelve is this: you have got to show that you received it by divine revelation. And that's the proposition Paul is making. He has a number of arguments to support that proposition. So let's review Paul's arguments. Paul is a huge intellect so sometimes you can lose the forest for the trees. We don't want to do that. There's no substitute for review. If you don't review you don't learn. The proposition is this: he received the gospel by divine revelation and not from men (v 1, 11-12). This is in verse 1. Paul, an apostle, parenthetical remark, right from the start wants to get in some words about the source of his apostleship, "(not sent from men nor through the agency of man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father...)" You see the proposition again

in verse 11 and this is a formal proposition, “For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. ¹²For I neither received it from man, nor was I taught it, but I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ.” That’s the main proposition of Gal 1-2. I just summarize it by saying Paul received the gospel by divine revelation and not from some human transmission. Here are the five arguments he uses to support it. First, I received it from the resurrected Christ. Now that’s a requirement to be an apostle - you had to have seen the resurrected Christ and at the end of verse 1 he says, I received it “through Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised Him from the dead)” It was the resurrected Christ I got it from you nitwits! Second, I’m not the only one who preaches this gospel. Look at verse 2, “And all the brethren who are with me, to the churches of Galatia:” So this letter is not strictly from Paul. Paul wrote it but all the brethren with him in Antioch signed off on the letter, so they all believe the same gospel Paul believes. He’s not a lone shark in his gospel. Third, during my former manner of life in Judaism I persecuted Christianity severely and the only thing that could change my outlook was divine revelation. He describes his former life in v 13, “For you have heard of my former manner of life in Judaism, how I used to persecute the church of God beyond measure and tried to destroy it...” and so forth. Does that sound like someone open to the gospel? What could change a person from being a persecutor of Christ to a proclaimer of Christ? That, Paul says, is my argument, only divine revelation could do that. Fourth, it was God’s pleasure to choose to reveal His Son in me on the Damascus Road, this is not my plan. For this look at verse 15, “But when God, who had set me apart even from my mother’s womb and called me through His grace, was pleased ¹⁶to reveal His Son in me so that I might preach Him among the Gentiles...” So God initiated this; it was His pleasure in history to elect Paul before time, call him in time on the Damascus Road and send him to the Gentiles. If things were left up to Paul he’d still be persecuting Christians. And fifth, from that time forward there was no time when the gospel was transmitted to Paul by men. This is in verses 16-24. After Damascus he went away to Arabia, he came back to Damascus and preached, three years after his conversion he went to Jerusalem for fifteen days where he only saw Cephas and James, and he only went there to get acquainted with Cephas. He was shipped out immediately after and went into Syria and Cilicia and it wasn’t until fourteen years after his conversion that he went up to Jerusalem again and that brings us to Gal 2:1. So far at least five arguments support the proposition that Paul did not get his gospel

from men, he got it by divine revelation on the Damascus Road. Today he gives a new argument and this one is that when he goes to Jerusalem this second time his gospel and the gospel of the Three Pillars of the early church, Peter, James and John, are the same. They have the same gospel but different spheres of preaching. If it was a different gospel there would have been a terrible mess at this point and the church would have divided, so this is an important prelude to the Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15.

Now we said last time that in Gal 2:1 Paul went back to Jerusalem for the second time since his conversion. He was converted in AD34, he went up three years later in 36/37 and then again he went up 14 years later in AD47, we're counting part of AD34 and part of AD47 to get that year. The ancient people considered any part of a year to be a full year, even one day, that's just how they wrote. Any part of a day was considered a full day, any part of a year a full year. So part of AD34 and part of AD47, if you do the math it yields 14 years. So Gal 2:1 is AD47. We're going to have a difficult text before us today. Sir William Ramsay who wrote a historical commentary on Galatians says, "It is really one sentence that runs through verses 1-10...Never was such a sentence penned by mortal man before or since. Never has so much been said in so few words. Never has it been said in such defiance of ordinary construction, and yet on such a high intellectual level." What Ramsay is saying is that the way you read it in the English may sound easy but it's not easy in the original. This section will give you a headache beyond comparison if you get into the original. In the original there are some strange combinations of verb tenses, he mixes the aorist in with the present a number of times and what Paul is saying by writing this way is I'm giving you a snapshot of an event here, a snapshot of an event there. So the right way to approach the text is to think of these as little snapshots. It might help to think of yourself filming a movie and you're on set and on Monday you're going to film a scene and so you do it, then you come along on Tuesday you're going to film another scene and so you do it and so forth and you're filming scene after scene, you'll put it all together later. Now that is one thing that seems to be happening here.

So let's look at verse 1, the first snapshot. Something happens here in AD47 that brings three guys to Jerusalem to meet three other guys. They're going to have a meeting and in the meeting they're going to find that they're all on the same page. Verse 1 is pre-meeting, **Then after an interval of fourteen**

years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking Titus along also. ²It was because of a revelation that I went up; So the thing that took them to Jerusalem was a revelation and by that we mean God spoke into history in human language to Paul or some other individual. We don't really know if God spoke to Paul here or God spoke to someone else and in lieu of that Paul went up to Jerusalem. But it seems that the revelation is in Acts 11:27-30. So let's turn back to Acts 11:27. In Acts 11:27 Paul is in Antioch of Syria. Remember, Paul had been up in Cilicia, he had his fallout with his dad so he went out into Cilicia and Syria. Antioch is in Syria. When the church at Antioch got going the Jerusalem Church sent Barnabas up to check things out, that's verse 22. Here's a bit about Barnabas, "The news about them reached the ears of the church at Jerusalem, and they sent Barnabas off to Antioch. ²³Then when he arrived and witnessed the grace of God, he rejoiced and began to encourage them all with resolute heart to remain true to the Lord; ²⁴for he was a good man, and full of the Holy Spirit and of faith. And considerable numbers were brought to the Lord." So the gospel was making tremendous inroads in Antioch. Barnabas sees this and he knows these new believers are going to need sound teaching so who does Barnabas think of? A guy that left Jerusalem 11 years ago named Saul. Saul was a powerful teacher of the word of God. Last Barnabas knows Saul went into this territory so Barnabas says, aha, Saul's the man. Verse 25, "And he left for Tarsus to look for Saul; ²⁶and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. And for an entire year they met with the church and taught considerable numbers; and the disciples were first called Christians in Antioch." So things are really getting going, believers are getting trained and now they're called Christians. That was actually a name given to them by pagans we think, it was not a name the believers came up with. It was a term their enemies came up with - oh, they're the Christians, the one's who follow the Christ. Yeah we are, so what are you going to do about it? And so they were making waves in Antioch and the movement was gaining steam. Verse 27, "Now at this time some prophets came down from Jerusalem to Antioch. ²⁸One of them named Agabus stood up and began to indicate by the Spirit that there would certainly be a great famine all over the world. And this took place in the reign of Claudius." So, there's the revelation Paul's talking about in Gal 2:1-2. It was a revelation that came to the prophet Agabus about this famine and in verse 29 these Christians respond, "And in the proportion that any of the disciples had means, each of them determined to send a contribution for the relief of the brethren living in Judea." We call

this the famine relief fund, they want to help out the Jewish brethren, they send a gift, and who do they send it by? Verse 30, “And this they did, sending it in charge of Barnabas and Saul to the elders.” Those are the two guys put in charge of the fund.

Now turn back to Gal 2:1, notice who’s mentioned in verse 1. Paul, of course, Barnabas and then Titus. Titus wasn’t mentioned in Acts 11. Why wasn’t he mentioned? Because he wasn’t put in charge of the fund, he was just along for the ride, and that’s why verse 1 ends, **taking Titus along also**. At the time they didn’t think much of it. But Titus is going to settle some things in history, or rather God is through Titus. God is the orchestrator of history. Pagan man says it’s all chance, it’s all circumstance. The word of God says there is no chance, every circumstance is carefully planned, and it’s not all purposeless, meaningless chance. History runs according to a plan, a well-thought out plan. There is meaning to history, there is a shape to history and God is the one who gives it meaning and shape.

So verses 1-2 are your first snapshot. They go up with the famine relief fund, that’s the occasion, Jewish believers need help, but with that occasion comes an opportunity and that’s what Paul describes in his second snapshot; **and I submitted to them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but I did so in private to those who were of reputation, for fear that I might be running, or had run, in vain**. Who are those of reputation? They’re the pillars of the church in v 9, James, Cephas, who is Peter, and John. Those guys had quite a reputation among the early church and it wasn’t because they wanted the reputation, it’s just that men looked up to them because they’d been with Christ. And now Paul submits his gospel to them. Paul’s already been preaching this gospel for fourteen years. Now the question here is why is he submitting to them the gospel? Is he doing this to get authorization? If so, this would totally destroy his case. Then Paul’s enemies could say, well Paul, we see you’re authority really is derived from men after all. And that’s what Paul is denying. His whole argument is contrary to that. So that’s not why he’s submitting his gospel to them. Why he’s doing it is simply for the sake of unity. What higher authority could Paul have than God’s revelation on the Damascus Road? There is no higher authority. So Paul is merely **submitting** it for the sake of unity. We don’t want a controversy here; we want to make sure we are all on the same page. Because if we’re not then I’ve been **running in vain**. He doesn’t mean that

maybe I made a mistake; maybe I got the wrong gospel. He means that all the work I've done with the Gentiles is going to suffer if you preach a different gospel. I've been preaching a gospel of no circumcision; if you've been preaching a gospel of circumcision then we're going to have a serious church split on our hands. So a theological division over the gospel at this point would have been disastrous.

But verses 3-5 God solves it in advance. **But not even Titus, who was with me, though he was a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.** ⁴*But it was because of the false brethren secretly brought in, who had sneaked in to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, in order to bring us into bondage.* ⁵*But we did not yield in subjection to them for even an hour, so that the truth of the gospel would remain with you.* Now this is a prophetic analysis, the prophets (and Paul was a prophet) main function was to give a divine analysis of history. The prophets do tell the future, but the main function is not to tell the future, it's to analyze history from the divine perspective. All the OT prophets do this. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, all those books are prophetic analysis. They are written after the facts of history and as they reflect or read the facts of history in the chronicles they would pick out certain events and say, this event is highly significant and this is what this event means. That's why when you read of the kings in the OT you don't read every event that happened in their administration. The prophets are very picky as to what they choose to record. And the prophets are unique in their analysis of history because as prophets they are able to step outside of the stream of history, every other history is given by people who are caught inside the stream of history. Only the OT prophets are able to step outside of history and give an analysis from outside. And that's exactly what Paul is doing in verses 3, 4 and 5. He's saying, this is the prophetic analysis of history; this is the prophetic analysis of events that happened in Jerusalem. So Paul went in and submitted his gospel to Peter, James and John and he says, by the way, when all was said and done, Titus was standing right there in the room the whole time and Titus was a Gentile and we were discussing the gospel I preached to Gentiles and no one stood up and said, "You did have Titus circumcised, didn't you?" If circumcision was required then certainly Titus would have been compelled to do so. Paul may not have even seen it as significant that Titus was in the room, but upon prophetic analysis God had planned for Titus to be in that room. God through Titus was solving a

problem they didn't even know existed. Where's the problem? The problem is vv 4-5.

After the meeting they head out onto the streets of Jerusalem. This is the third snapshot, it's the streets of Jerusalem. Jerusalem at the time was laid out like the Romans laid out most cities. Streets ran east and west and north and south. And they had a *Cardo*, a main street; they had an *Agora*, or market and this was where most of the activity took place and somewhere out on the streets look what happened. **But it was because of the false brethren secretly brought in, who had sneaked in to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, in order to bring us into bondage.** In other words, it seems like Paul is saying the private meeting with the pillars of the church occurred just in front of this confrontation because these guys were going to try and bring Gentile Christians into bondage. So just before it happens God makes sure they have their private meeting and they're all on the same page so they're not going to budge out on the streets.

Now here we have evidence of a group of legalist fanatics growing in Jerusalem. They may be genuine believers, they may not be, the text doesn't say, but apparently they see Paul, Barnabas and Titus. Titus is a Gentile and they attack them for being with Titus. Gentile believers can't associate with Jewish believers. You can't eat together. This is a problem. And Paul, look at his prophetic analysis, says this was a covert op going on; it was all satanically inspired that these **false brethren** would come in secretly to spy out our liberty. This is intrigue, this is conspiracy. People get all upset when you talk about conspiracy theory. Oh, you're one of those conspiracy nuts. There are conspiracy nuts. But as a Christian we ought to at least evaluate. What do we know from Scripture? We know that there are demonic forces. We know that Satan is the chief of the demonic forces. We know that he's the prince of the power of the air. We know he's the god of this world. We know he's a liar. We know he's trying to destroy the plan of God. So is Satan a conspirator? Of course he is. Therefore biblically speaking there is such a thing as conspiracy. The thing is, ultimately it's not human in origin, it's satanic in origin. He's the prince of the power of the air and what is the air but the place that ideas float around, and that's Satan's chief objective, to infiltrate people's thinking. We're in a conflict with demonic forces, powerful forces. Don't be deceived, there is a war being waged for the minds of men.

And if you don't see the bullets flying all around you then you're blind to the conflict that's raging. You need to wake up to the fact that there is a war being fought for the hearts and minds of men. And one of the attacks is to destroy Christian liberty. And Paul knew that, and knowing that he says my prophetic analysis tells me what was really going on in those streets, there was a covert op going on to destroy the **liberty we have in Christ Jesus in order to bring us into bondage**. Now all Christians are born in bondage. We're in bondage to sin. But at salvation we have liberty in Christ. So it was an attempt to bring them back into bondage. Now, **liberty in Christ Jesus** means that the Christian is free from the power of sin; this is actually a sanctification verse. There are three phases of salvation you want to keep separate; we talk about justification, being saved from the penalty of sin, sanctification, being saved from the power of sin and glorification, being saved from the presence of sin. Now watch, the first thing to know is that all men are born under the penalty of sin. We are in Adam and we sinned in Adam and therefore the human race is under the penalty of sin. What's the penalty of sin? Eternal condemnation, eternal separation from God in the lake of fire. Now at the moment of faith alone in Christ alone you're position changes from being in Adam under the penalty of sin to being in Christ and freed from the penalty of sin. At that moment you are justified, you are declared righteous in God's court of law. That is phase one, your position is now in Christ. The second phase has to do with your experience and here we talk about being sanctified, freed from the power of sin. Because you are now justified, sin no longer has power or dominion over you. You now have the means of living a life that pleases God by means of the Spirit of God. This is a grace operation. You are no longer the slave of your sin nature, you are set free from the power of sin as you utilize the faith technique and walk by the Spirit. The third phase is glorification and that means you get a resurrection body and the day you receive your resurrection body you are set free from the presence of sin altogether. So at phase one by the grace of God through faith in Jesus Christ we are justified, set free from the penalty of sin which is eternal condemnation in the lake of fire. Phase two we are by the grace of God through faith in the word of God sanctified, set free from the power of sin in our lives so that sin doesn't dominate, the Spirit of God dominates. And phase three, we are by the grace of God through faith in God glorified, set free from the presence of sin altogether, that's the resurrection body. From beginning to end salvation is by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone. Now the point Paul is making here is that Titus may be justified, set

free from the penalty of sin but if he hasn't been circumcised he can't be sanctified. These deceptions may admit that after you are justified in phase one, by grace through faith, now to be sanctified in phase two, it's by law through works, you've got to follow the law, you've got to be circumcised. Paul is going to say later, if you get circumcised you're obligated to the whole law and all you're doing is putting yourself into bondage. The law was a yoke of slavery, it didn't free a single soul from the penalty of sin or the power of sin ever in the history of the world.ⁱ Only God's grace through faith can justify and sanctify. Only God's grace can set us free. And this freedom was being challenged out on the streets of Jerusalem.

Verse 5, **But we did not yield in subjection to them for even an hour, so that the truth of the gospel would remain with you.** Paul, Barnabas and Titus stood up for their liberty, your liberty, my liberty and the liberty of all Christians out there on the streets of Jerusalem. They didn't put up with them **for even an hour.** Why? **So that the truth of the gospel would remain with you.** And for the life of me I don't know how compromising the gospel out on the streets of Jerusalem for one hour would have kept the gospel from remaining with the Galatians up in Turkey. I wish I knew but I don't know. But evidently if they had yielded to them for even an hour then the truth of the gospel would not have remained with them. And I simply don't know the full extent of what that means.ⁱⁱ I will venture to possibilities. First, the nature of the conflict is cosmic in scope such that anytime truth is compromised it gives demonic adversaries a foothold to take more ground. What this would mean is that every time truth is maligned or compromised in the pulpit, in a bible study, in a council, every time that happens you're giving ground to the enemy. Now that's why being a teacher of the word of God is taken so seriously in the Scriptures. That's why James 3 says, "Let not many of you become teachers, my brethren, knowing that as such we will incur a stricter judgment." It's a dangerous position to be a teacher of the word of God. We're prone to make mistakes. The tongue is a very dangerous instrument and unless a believer is mature in the word of God and able to tame the tongue and has the gift of teaching and is able to defend sound doctrine then he should not be a teacher. It compromises truth and gives the devil a foothold for further disturbance and destruction of truth. Second, and as a result of the first, if they had compromised it could have split the Church in two: a Jewish Church and a Gentile Church. Then you wouldn't have the unity of the Spirit. Satan would have caused division. But Paul, Barnabas

and Titus stayed strong that day and didn't budge one inch on the truth of the gospel and so that kept unity of Jew and Gentile in one church.

Verse 6 returns to the private meeting; let's see what else was agreed upon in that meeting. **But from those who were of high reputation (what they were makes no difference to me; God shows no partiality)—well, those who were of reputation contributed nothing to me.** Now verse 6 Paul seems to make light of their high reputation. But he's not doing that, he's just saying, these guys are the recognized leaders in Jerusalem. And naturally people look up to them. That doesn't make it right Paul says. We are what we are by the grace of God, God shows no partiality. And it's not right to go around saying I'm of Peter or I'm of Paul or I'm of any other human being. What's right is saying I am of Christ. So all that taken into consideration, **those who were of reputation contributed nothing to me.** Again, what's the argument? I didn't get my gospel from these recognized authorities. They didn't correct a single nuance of my gospel. Therefore I am not their apostle. I got my gospel from the Lord Jesus Christ on the Damascus Road.

Vv 7-10 we're back in the meeting, that issue out on the streets happened after the meeting, but here we get to see the conclusion of the meeting in the last snapshot. **But on the contrary, seeing that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been to the circumcised** ⁸**(for He who effectually worked for Peter in his apostleship to the circumcised effectually worked for me also to the Gentiles),** ⁹**and recognizing the grace that had been given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, so that we might go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised.** Now what we have here is recognition of the fact that Peter and Paul are on par with one another. They are both apostles and Peter is the apostle of the Jews while Paul is the apostle of the Gentiles. The rest of the Book of Acts will bear out that Peter and Paul have equal authority. Luke shows that Peter and Paul do the same miracles and we've done the comparisons in Acts, there's no reason to repeat them. They both heal lame men, they both raise people from the dead, they both do the same miracles and that's intentional. It is to show they have equal authority, despite the fact that their emphases are different, despite

the fact that Peter's emphasis is to the Jews and Paul's emphasis is to the Gentiles.

So there's unity and there's diversity and that's what we would expect from a Triune God. Let's look at it. Verse 7, **But on the contrary**, in other words, far from adding anything to correct my gospel, they saw I had been entrusted with the gospel to the Gentiles **just as Peter had been to the Jews**. They recognized that God had revealed himself to Paul on the Damascus Road and that there's a unity here on the issue of the gospel but there's diversity in the spheres of proclamation; Paul is going to preach the same gospel he'd been preaching to the Gentiles and Peter is going to preach the same gospel he'd been preaching to the Jews. There's no difference. Both Jews and Gentiles are justified by grace through faith and both Jews and Gentiles are sanctified by grace through faith and not by keeping the Mosaic Law, not by keeping the Ten Commandments.

Look at verse 8; verse 8 is an explanation, **for He who effectually worked for Peter in his apostleship to the circumcised effectually worked for me also to the Gentiles**. So they recognize that the source of Peter's apostleship is the same as Paul's apostleship. They were separated in time but they were not separated in source; the risen Lord Jesus Christ commissioned them both. God the Holy Spirit is efficient, he doesn't work with everyone in exactly the same way. Peter had certain strengths that would make him effective with Jews and Paul had certain strengths that would make him effective with Gentiles. Peter was a native Jew, he lived up in Capernaum and the Lord Jesus lived with him for a couple of years so he can be very effective in the land of Israel and he was very effective in Acts 2-11. In Acts 12 Peter is going to get booted out of Jerusalem by the Holy Spirit but his emphasis is still going to be Jews. It doesn't mean it's going to be exclusively Jews and he's never going to talk to a Gentile, it's just his emphasis is to the Jews. Early Acts records 3,000 Jews responding positively to Peter's message, by Acts 5, 5,000 men, not including women and children, so Peter's impact was largely felt in Jewish circles. Paul is suited for Gentiles, he was a Diaspora Jew, he was from Tarsus, he was familiar with Gentile thought, he was well schooled in Greek philosophy, but he was also an expert in Judaism. Paul's very well-rounded and he's going to be out in the Gentile world. But just because he's going to the Gentiles didn't mean he doesn't go to Jews. Every where Paul goes in the book of Acts he goes to the

Jew first, and that shows you that individual calling does not take precedence over doctrine. The doctrine is Rom 1:16, the gospel is the power of God unto salvation and the gospel is to the Jew first. Those are both present tenses. If the gospel is always the power of God unto salvation, and it is, then the gospel is always to the Jew first. And not even the apostle Paul has the authority to change that and go to the Gentiles first. And therefore everywhere Paul goes he goes to the synagogue first, he preaches there, when they reject it he goes out to the Gentiles. His impact was primarily felt among the Gentiles. They're the large responders to his ministry.

Verse 9 gives the results, **and recognizing the grace that had been given to me, James and Cephas and John, who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship**, so they're accepted fully. Here they partner up. You guys go one way, we go another way, and we'll meet in the middle. This was all decided by the end of Acts 11. This is a complete answer to the Judaizers who denied the genuineness of Paul's apostleship because he was not one of the twelve.

Verse 10, **They only asked us to remember the poor—the very thing I also was eager to do**. The only charge the apostles gave was to remember the poor, they did not commission me as an apostle, they commissioned me to remember the poor. Yet even that very thing **I was already eager to do**. The rest of Paul's life is a testimony to his desire to remember the poor. On numerous occasions he is rounding up funds to take to the brethren in Jerusalem (1 Cor. 16:1–4; 2 Cor. 8:1–9; Rom. 15:25–28). Paul was always concerned for his Jewish brethren despite his main sphere of ministry being to the Gentiles.

To tie up a loose end, if they didn't have Titus circumcised, why did Paul have Timothy circumcised? Turn to Acts 16. If circumcision compromises the gospel then why did Paul have Timothy circumcised. The answer is very simple. Everything the Holy Spirit records in Scripture is there for a purpose, there's nothing that's not important and what's in this text about Timothy and what's in the Galatians text about Titus answer the question. Acts 16:1 highlights the fact that Timothy was the son of a Jewish woman and a Greek father. Now this was a unique case, in this kind of situation the parents wouldn't circumcise the child on the 8th day, instead he would be allowed to grow up to an age when he could decide for himself. If he wanted to be

identified with the Jewish people he would be circumcised, if he did not he would be identified with the Gentiles. So a child with a Jewish mother and a Gentile father had this choice. Paul evidently put before him this proposition. It would better serve the mission of Paul and Silas if Timothy were identified with the Jews for it would make it easier to minister to Jews, etc... Titus on the other hand, we infer had both a Greek mother and Greek father, he would forever be identified as a Greek and so it wasn't even an option on the table and would only confuse the issue for Gentile salvation. Timothy's circumcision was quite understandable from a vantage point other than the gospel; it was simply a desire to identify with the Jewish people. This seems logical enough in light of the fact it would make their ministry to Jews more acceptable.

Alright, to conclude what have we seen? We've seen that a meeting was held and it was recognized that Paul was an apostle on par with Peter. Paul didn't get anything contributed to his gospel. They both preached the same gospel; they both had the same authority. But in the meeting they divided the spheres of ministry, Paul to the Gentiles and Peter to the Jews. After this was decided and they hit the streets of Jerusalem it was immediately tested when the Judaizers tried to compel Titus to be circumcised. They didn't budge on the gospel because when you budge, when you compromise this gives Satan a foothold. But Paul and the others weren't compromisers, they stood for the truth. Now, by application let's say we are followers of Jesus. Do we believe what Jesus said about the gospel through Peter and Paul? If we're to be followers of Jesus don't we have to follow Jesus' gospel? Jesus said if we believe in Him we have been justified, set free from the penalty of sin. Is it okay to add to that? Well, that's all fine and dandy, but to grow you also have to obey the Mosaic Law? Paul says no, if you do that you are putting yourself in bondage and rejecting Christ. The Law does not help you grow spiritually. That's not its purpose, that's not its function, that's not its capacity. The Law shows you you're a sinner, but it can't sanctify you. To be sanctified you have to resort to grace. We are not under law but grace. We have got to live by the principles of grace in order to grow spiritually. What's grace? Grace is the enablement to please God and the grace is obviously in Galatians the Spirit of God. For a Christian to grow we have got to learn what it means to walk by the Spirit. That's where Paul is going with all this. The Spirit frees not to sin, but to righteousness, the Law enslaves. Next week Peter compromises and Paul corrects. Read ahead for next time.

ⁱ “It should be said that the Law of Moses was not bad, when properly understood, Paul says it was holy and good. But the Law was incapable of imparting life. In other words you couldn’t go out and keep the Mosaic Law, nobody could, and the Law wasn’t designed for that. The Law was designed to show us our sin so that men would resort to faith. If the Law could impart life then righteousness would be based on the Law and men who kept the Law would earn their own righteousness. But that’s not possible. Righteousness is through faith. So if the Law could not impart life to begin with then how could it continue to impart life after you believed? It can’t do that afterwards anymore than it could before. Christ is the source of the righteousness, not the Law.”

ⁱⁱ F. F. Bruce says, “How the circumcision of a Gentile Christian could have been supposed by any one, especially Paul, to help to maintain the gospel of free grace for Gentile Christians in general, passes understanding.” F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Includes Indexes. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1982), 113.

[Back To The Top](#)

Copyright (c) Fredericksburg Bible Church 2010