

Gal 2:6-14

## Legalism and Hypocrisy

vs.6- "of these" - Paul is referring to the apostles he met with in Jerusalem (Peter, James, John)

- "somewhat" - meaning highly esteemed of the Christians in Jerusalem

- "no matter to me" - this is not a harsh or prideful statement but means that Paul was not swayed by them due to their outstanding reputation

- "God accepts no man's person" - meaning that God does not show partiality so Paul can't either (Rom.2:11, Eph.6:9)

- "added nothing" - they imparted no new information, interpretation, application, or revelation to the doctrine Paul believed and the message he preached

(vs.7-8)- there was no difference in the message Peter preached and the one Paul preached

\*It was just to a different audience (uncircumcised- Gentiles / circumcised- Jews)

- "wrought effectually" - (energeo) to put forth power, to display one's activity

vs.9- "perceived the grace" - they reflected on the manifestation of God's grace in Paul and his calling- they recognized his equality with them

- "fellowship" - this is a gesture that confirms Paul as a colleague to the other apostles

(It was a sign of joint participation and cooperation and confirms Paul is preaching truth)

- "should go" - since Paul had already gone to the Gentiles once, this phrase implies they are urging him to continue with the work God has for him

vs.10- Judea had famines often and the Christians there suffered the most due to religious hatred from unregenerate Jews and so they were often outcasted

\*(Paul would later go to the churches throughout Asia and Macedonia to take collections for the struggling Christians in and around Jerusalem)

vs.11- here is where this chapter shifts from legalism to hypocrisy

\*this would have been after Peter's vision at Joppa (Acts 10:10-16)

\*keep in mind that God used Peter to lead the 1<sup>st</sup> Gentile to Christ- Cornelius

(He knew that God was no respecter of persons and even states this in Acts 10:34)

- "to the face" - this would be how to handle matters according to Matt.18:15-17

vs.12- first thing we need to understand is that Paul did not mention this to expose fault in Peter, but to show that Peter's apostleship was not superior to Paul's

\*Look at what Peter said in Acts 15:7-9

- "that certain" - these were probably some of the Judaizers that left Jerusalem after the Council verdict and made their way to Antioch

\*either way, this group was still observant of Levitical dietary laws found in Leviticus

- Peter was eating and fellowshiping with Gentile believers and was fully aware that God had abolished such laws (this was the point of the vision he had at Joppa)

\*when this group shows up, Peter withdrew himself from this fellowship out of fear

vs.13- "dissembled" - (sunupokrinomai) to act hypocritical

\*Peter's actions of withdrawal led others to do the same (even Barnabas)

- "dissimulation" - (hupokrisis) hypocrisy

\*imagine the negative impact this was having on these new Gentile converts

- Peter and Barnabas knew the Gospel of grace but were acting as if they were accepting Jewish legalism

vs.14- by withdrawing from the Gentile Christians, Peter and company were not in line with God's Word (they had deviated from the standard of what Christ taught them)

- "why compellest" - these young Christians looked to Peter for spiritual guidance and growth

\*What was he teaching them by doing this?

- the rebuke was necessary as Peter was compromising and being hypocritical

\*So, did Peter despise Paul for this? II Peter 3:15

- Peter knew he was wrong and was appreciative to have someone to care enough to speak up