

Galatians Translation

Fred R. Coulter

Open the Bible to the book of Galatians, chapter two, and open your *King James Version* to chapter two. We're going to do some alternate reading. Galatians is the most difficult, the hardest to understand and *the most misunderstood book of the whole Bible*. Unfortunately, most people go to Galatians first *rather than later*. Let me give you, for an example, the writings of the Apostle Paul, the order of difficulty of these three technical books:

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

In order to understand Galatians, you should understand Hebrews first, then Romans, then Galatians. Why do I say that? *Almost all Protestant doctrine is based upon misinterpretations and misunderstandings of Hebrews, Romans and Galatians!* Not only do the Protestants misunderstand it, they go to it and they use certain verses to do away with the requirement to keep the commandments of God. Plus, the translation of the *King James Version* of the Bible gives credence to their interpretations of it. We'll compare that when we get to Romans and here in Galatians in just a minute. In translating Galatians I found one explosion and two bombshells. Let's look at the first explosion:

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

What does *dissimulation* mean to you? *Pretend! hypocrisy!* The Greek does show *hypocrisy*. Why was he hypocritical?

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

Verse 12: "For, before certain *ones* came from James... [the brother of the Lord, the apostle at Jerusalem] ...he was eating with the Gentiles. However, when they came, he drew back and separated himself *from the Gentiles*, being afraid of

those of *the* circumcision party. And the rest of *the* Jews joined him... [because that's what it means in the Greek] ...in *this* hypocritical act, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy" (vs 12-13).

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

Acts 10:24: "And on the next day, they came to Caesarea. Now, Cornelius was expecting them *and* had called together his kinsmen and *his* intimate friends. And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him *and* fell at *his* feet, worshiping *him*" (vs 24-25).

You can tell that Peter was not the first pope. He didn't say, 'Cornelius, glad to see you're on your knees, kiss my ring.'

Verse 26: "But Peter raised him up, saying, 'Stand up, for I myself am also a man.' And as he was talking with him, he went in and found many gathered together. And he said to them '**You know that it is unlawful for a man who is a Jew to associate with or come near to anyone of another race....**'" (vs 24-28).

Which law in the Bible says it's unlawful? This is good instruction on what does it say and what does it not say so we can understand it. "...**You know that it is unlawful for a man who is a Jew...**" He did not say, "the Scriptures say that an Israelite cannot keep company of one of another nation."

What does the Old Testament tell us about the inter-relationship of the children of Israel and Gentiles? *One law! One standard for the Gentiles that live within Israel!* They followed the same law. They had the same judgment. They had the same standard. What law is this talking about? *Tradition! A law of the Jews!* A Jew is one who practices Judaism. Judaism is not the religion of Moses—did you know that? Most people don't! While Judaism claims to follow the religion of Moses, it does not! The rabbis in Judaism proclaim that their sayings and their laws are greater than the laws in the Bible. If anyone transgresses their laws, they are subject to hell.

What God was doing in this particular instance with Peter was that He was showing that

that law of Judaism had no standing before God, had no standing within the Church of God. God was now going to deal with all nations, all people, and He was going to deal with them without the laws of Judaism.

I want to show you what Jesus said concerning the traditions of men. The traditions of men then were codified into law. Next sermon I'm going to read to you out of the *Code of Jewish Law*. I'm going to read to you out of the code of Buddha law, Hindu law, Muslim law and Catholic law. *I will show you a work of law from Scripture*, a work of law from every one of these. But here's what Jesus said concerning their traditions. I know this may be a little repetitious from what we had before, but it's very important that we understand this concept.

Remember: *Jewish law is not Scriptural law*—please understand that! Jewish law, Catholic law, Hindu law, Muslim law, Buddhist law—ALL—**are all against the commandments of God!** If you don't believe that then you watch PBS—there should be separation of religion and state—Deepak Chopra is a wizard of the Hindu religion. Listen to him and pick up all the *works of law* that they have:

- meditation
- breathing
- reading
- thinking

—**all works of law!** Declared by Christ null and void! Chopra wrote the book: *Seven Laws of Spiritual Success*.

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

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

Verse 5: “For this reason, the Pharisees and

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

I want you to understand that! God is interested in the heart—is He not? Can you do something outside of your body with your hands and your feet and rules and regulations, but it does not affect your heart? *Certainly!* So, God is saying that He wants **the heart** made right. “...you hypocrites...”—those are not very nice words. Christ was not an ecumenist. He didn't come along and say, ‘Well now, you scribes and Pharisees, I know that you have your ways, but I have My way and what we need to do is we'll just get along and love each other until the crucifixion and then you can hate Me and kill Me. How's that? Does that sound like a good game plan?’ *No way!*

“...‘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... [emptiness, purposelessness, no account, no good, nothing to God] ...they worship Me, teaching *for* doctrine the commandments of men.” For leaving the commandment of God”’” (vs 6-8).

That's what happens when you have all of these traditions, when you have all of these *works of law* (see #10 this series). I'm building on that with this. What happens when you lay aside the commandment of God? Let's just see if we can apply some principles:

If you look at a commandment of God and you say, ‘We'll change that, we don't need that’—what are you doing?

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

Very basic! Very profound! Very necessary to understand!

“...you hold fast the tradition of men, *such as* the washing of pots and cups; and you practice many other things like *this*.’ Then He said to them, ‘Full well do you **reject the commandment of God**... [not only do they lay it aside] ...**so that you may observe your own tradition**” (vs 8-9)—which is saying, ‘We are better than God!’ Think about that!

Think about that in relationship to Sabbath-keeping and Sunday-keeping. Jesus said the ‘Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath; therefore, the Son of man is LORD of the Sabbath Day.’ He’s not Lord of Sunday. Men come along and what do they do? *They judge God!* They want to keep their tradition of Sunday-keeping! They *set aside or reject* the commandment of God that they may keep *their own* tradition, which is *a work of Protestant and Catholic law*. It doesn’t come from God.

There was a survey sent out that said: ‘Dear Brethren... [we’ll keep this anonymous, all you have to do is put in the first three numbers of your zip code] ...Do you want to keep the Holy Days? *Yes or no!* If you want to keep the Holy Days, should we keep them in August or September? *Yes or no!*’ And the answer was already completed when they got it back. ‘We’re not going to keep them at all.’

They have judged God! They have set aside the commandments of God with their own reasoning. Also, breaking the third commandment: taking God’s name in vain. How dare you say something ‘God said’ *when He didn’t say?* How many times have we covered Deut. 18? Think on that! Can a man speak for God when God hasn’t spoken something? *NO!* A lot of people think that the Jews kept the laws, but they didn’t, *they kept their own*. The ‘Friends of the Sabbath’ and their ecumenical thing is a huge trap as big as the Grand Canyon. It’s like flying around in a helicopter observing the Grand Canyon, and it’s all wonderful until you crash to the bottom. It’s going to happen.

Verse 10: “For Moses said, ‘Honor your father and your mother’; and ‘The one who speaks evil of father or mother, let him be put to death.’ But you say, ‘If a man shall say to *his* father or mother, “Whatever benefit you might receive from me *is* corban”’ (that is, *set aside as a gift to God*)...” (vs 10-11). Merchandised for money; same old thing it’s always been.

“...he is not obligated to help his parents.’ And you excuse him from doing anything for his father or his mother, nullifying the authority of the Word of God by your tradition, which you have passed down; and you practice many *traditions* such as this.” (vs 11-13).

Review:

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

Those are pretty strong words! There are some people today who are following Judaism:

- rejecting Jesus Christ
- rejecting the New Testament as pagan

There is an active mood to do away with Christ—in any form—in every church, everywhere, regardless if they are Sunday or Sabbath-keepers that name the name of Christ. We need to be fully aware that that is the program that’s going on.

- they have eliminated Christ from the government
- they have eliminated Christ from radio, television, schools, public affairs
- they’re going to eliminate Him from the churches

If you don’t believe that, watch the 50th anniversary {1998} for the U.N., the inner-faith service from San Francisco. Brethren, this is exactly what’s happening in the world today. They are *setting aside, rejecting* and *making the Word of God of none affect* in those people’s lives.

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

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

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

- All goodness of men is not Godliness from God!
- That is profound to understand!*
- All righteousness of men is not the righteousness of God!

That is also profound to understand. These two verses encapsulate the whole thing.

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

Jews.

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

- By what?
- What did He show Paul by Divine revelation?
- Did he not have a vision? *Yes, he did!*

Divine revelation is pretty profound; that's direct from God!

- Can there be any greater instruction? *No!*

“...*that* no man should be called common or unclean” (v 28). Big time understanding necessary! In the Jews' view:

- How is a man *common*?
- How is a man *unclean*?
- Do you know?

When I tell you, you're going to understand why Paul's writing in Rom. 2, about the uncircumcision that keep the righteousness of the Law shall judge the circumcision who break the Law. How do they break *their* law? *By boasting in tradition and breaking the commandments of God!*

- A man who is **common**: A Gentile who has been circumcised is *common*! He is *common* because he is not a genetic born Jew, but a proselyte. That means *being circumcised and following Judaism*.
- A man who is **unclean**: One who is a Gentile who was not circumcised and has not followed anything concerning the true God.

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

Man called up Rush Limbaugh and said, 'Jewish descent dittos.' He had to immediately say he was a Jew. Someone is surely going to say, 'Fred is an anti-Semite.' *NO!* Jews are anti other people—*period!* They don't like to tell you that. They are anti-Christ! They will not admit it, but they are! What God was doing here was striking all of this down. If you think it's bad today, trust me, back then it was far worse, *far, far worse!* Peter was the one who was used to do this, the first one!

Verse 29: “‘For this reason, I also came without objection when I was sent for. I ask, therefore, for what purpose did you send for me?’ And Cornelius said, ‘Four days ago I was fasting until this hour, and *at* the ninth hour I was praying in my house; and suddenly a man stood before me in bright apparel’” (vs 29-30).

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

Verse 31: “And said, ‘Cornelius, your prayer has been heard and your alms have been remembered before God. Now then, send to Joppa and call for Simon who is surnamed Peter; he is lodging by *the* sea in *the* house of Simon, a tanner. When he comes, he will speak to you.’ Therefore, I sent for you at once; and you did well to come. So then, we are all present before God to hear all things that have been commanded you by God” (vs 31-33) Why was Peter the hypocrite?

Verse 34: “Then Peter opened *his* mouth and said, ‘**Of a truth I perceive that God is not a respecter of persons**, but in every nation the one who fears Him and works righteousness is acceptable to Him. The word that He sent to the children of Israel, preaching the Gospel of peace through Jesus Christ (**He is Lord of all**), you have knowledge of; which declaration came throughout the whole of Judea, beginning from Galilee, after the baptism that John proclaimed’” (vs 34-37).

Let's add a little more fuel to Peter's fire. We won't burn him at the stake, but we will find out why he was called *the hypocrite*. The account in Gal. 2 happened *after* Acts 15:5; there had been much disputing.

Acts 15:5: “But there stood up certain of those who believed, who were of the sect of the Pharisees, saying, ‘It is **obligatory** to circumcise them... [the Gentiles] ...**and to command them to keep the Law of Moses.**’”

How are we going to understand that? First of all, the Pharisees' version of the Law of Moses was not the Law of Moses, but very much akin to the Catholic view of the Bible. They don't follow it, but they have *their tradition*, and from the writings of the fathers' application of *their religion*. The Pharisees were exactly the same way. Did we just not read where they rejected the Law of Moses? Their version of the Law of Moses was all of their own laws; they presumptuously and arrogantly called the Law of Moses. This is what is being

talked about here.

Now then, "...It is **obligatory**... [needful] ...to circumcise them... [the Gentiles] ...and to command *them* to keep the Law of Moses" (v 5). Furthermore, it was obligatory to do so, because unless they were physically circumcised, salvation was impossible! They were even twisting and perverting the true religion of Christ very early on. That's what it means.

Verse 6: "Then the apostles and the elders gathered together to see about this matter. And after much discussion had taken place, Peter stood up and said to them..." (vs 6-7). We got them on record in Acts 10. Now we've got them on record here in Acts 15.

"...Men, brethren, you know that from *the* early days, God made *the* choice among us *that* by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe. And God, Who knows the heart... [in Greek this means *the heart-knowing* God!] ...bore witness to them *by* giving them the Holy Spirit, even as *He did* to us, and made no difference between us and them, *and* has purified their hearts through the faith" (vs 7-9).

There are other details that are here, Galatians 2:12: "For, before certain *ones* came from James, he was eating with the Gentiles.... [putting no difference] ...However, when they came, he drew back and separated himself *from the Gentiles*, being afraid of those of *the* circumcision party."

A political move; a reversion to Judaism. He was afraid they would go back and tell James that he was eating with Gentiles.

Verse 13: "And the rest of *the* Jews joined him in *this* hypocritical act, insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy." This was big deal!

Think of it this way: You come to church one day and you hear there's going to be a big meeting and Peter's going to be there and Paul is going to be there and certain ones from Jerusalem are going to be there—this may have been a Feast day—and you're all excited and the deacon stands at the door and says, 'Gentiles to the right, Jews to the left; Gentiles eat over here, Jews eat over there.' How are you going to feel?

Verse 14: "But when I saw that they did not walk uprightly according to the Truth of the Gospel, I said to Peter in the presence of them all, 'If you, being a Jew, are living like the Gentiles...'—eating with them, mingling with them, and so forth.

"...and not according to Judaism, why do you compel the Gentiles to Judaize?" (v 14)—and separate themselves from the Jews. 'Judaize' has

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

Verse 15: "We who are Jews by nature—and not sinners of *the* Gentiles—knowing that a man is not justified by works of law..." (vs 14-16).

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

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

Let me use a couple of examples here to show *justifying by works of law*, and we'll use a work of law we can relate to today; then we'll show the difference.

If you go through a stop sign and you get a ticket, you have transgressed the law that says, 'thou shalt not go through a stop sign.' Suppose you ignore the ticket and decide, 'I don't believe there should be a stop sign there so I am not going to pay this fine. I'm convinced there should not be a stop sign there. It's irritating to me; I don't want one.'

So you ignore the fine. They send you a notice: We're going to increase your fine unless you pay it by such and such a date. You ignore it. Payment of the fine would justify you for that transgression. You continue to ignore it; they send you another notice. Finally, after a certain period of time, they issue a warrant for your arrest. One day you're driving down the street and you have another traffic infraction, a policeman pulls you over, reads your license number, pulls that license number up on his onboard computer and finds out there is a warrant for your arrest. He comes back to you and says to you, 'Get out of the car, you're under arrest'—slaps the handcuffs on you, throws you in back of police car, takes you on down to the jail and now your car is towed and you're going to pay storage.

You stay in jail overnight and you come before the judge and the judge says, 'Why didn't you answer the notices for your fine.' *Well, I don't believe there should be a stop sign there.* 'But you didn't pay the fine.' So now, he slaps on a stiffer sentence.

He was not justified! His *work of law* could have been to pay the fine, then you're justified. Is there any *work of law* to justify you before God in heaven above?

One more example: Supposing you murdered a man. Now you've transgressed the Law of God. What is going to justify you to God? Not murdering any longer? *Repentance! That's all!* Just like the stop sign: If you go before the judge because you're hauled in because you didn't pay that fine. You said, 'Judge I've stopped at every stop sign since then.' He says, 'That doesn't matter, you're supposed to stop at all of them.'

(go to the next track)

If you separate yourself from the Gentiles to eat, does that make your heart right or wrong? *It makes it wrong!* God is interested in the heart—remember we said, the *heart-knowing* God!

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

- (KJV): “Knowing that a man is not justified by **the** works of **the** law...”

Here we see the terrible mistranslation. Both of those definite articles *the* are not in the Greek. It does not mean by keeping the commandments of God, but by *works of law*. Both of the definite articles *the* are not in the original Greek! This is why there's so much confusion.

- (FV): “Knowing that a man is not justified by works of law, **but through the faith of Jesus Christ...**”
- What does *faith* require?
- Is faith something external *or* internal?
- *Internal!*

You must believe! That's the only way you're justified because of what God did through Jesus Christ. As we pointed out, God took upon Himself when Jesus was manifested in the flesh, all the sins of the whole world. ***You must believe on that justification!***

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

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

“...we also have believed in Christ Jesus in order that we might be justified by *the* faith of Christ, and not by works of law; because by works of law shall no flesh be justified!” (v 16). Isn't going to happen!

- unless you repent

- unless you believe
- unless you obey
- unless you love God

I hope this makes it real clear!

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

“...MAY IT NEVER BE!” (v 17). The Greek there is ‘me ginoito’ which means *don't ever let this thought come into existence*—MAY IT NEVER BE! A true, literal translation would be: MAY THIS NEVER BE CONCEIVED OF, because ‘gennao’ means *to impregnate*. ***May this never come into existence or be conceived of!***

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

Verse 19: “For I through law died to *works of law*...” What does this mean? Let's see if we can answer the question this way: ‘the wages of sin is death’; ‘sin is the transgression of *the Law*’

- How could Paul write this if he were literally dead? *He couldn't!*
- What death did he die?

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

Romans 6:1 tells us how we die: “What then shall we say? Shall we continue in sin so that grace may abound? MAY IT NEVER BE!...” (vs 1-2). The same expression—Paul uses this over and over again—‘me ginoito.’

“...We who died to sin...” (v 2). That's what you died to. What Judaism and Judaism's law sin? *Yes!* Was Peter going back and sinning? *Yes!*

“...how shall we live any longer therein? Or are you ignorant that we, as many as were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into His death? Therefore, we were buried with Him through the baptism into ***the death***... [His death] ...so that, just as Christ was raised from *the* dead by the glory of the Father, in the same way, we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been conjoined together in the likeness of His death, so also shall we be *in the likeness* of His resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man was co-crucified with *Him* in order

that the body of sin might be destroyed, so that we might no longer be enslaved to sin; because the one who has died *to sin* has been justified from sin” (vs 1-7).

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

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

“...For *the life* that I am now living in the flesh, I live by faith—that *very faith* of the Son of God, Who loved me and gave Himself for me” (v 20). That’s something! God does this on an individual basis. That’s what’s so fantastic about it.

Verse 21: “I do not nullify the grace of God; for if righteousness... [that right standing before God] ...*is* through *works of law*, then Christ died in vain” (vs 20-21).

If you can make yourself right by separating from the Gentiles, Christ is no effect; He died in vain! Whatever law you want to have: washing of pots and cups—and you’ll find from the *Code of Jewish Law* what that means.

I want to cover two other things here. this is one of these big bombs! Galatians 3:1:

- (KJV): “O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you, that you should not obey the Truth before whose eyes Jesus Christ has been evidently set forth, crucified among you?”

What does ‘set forth’ mean to you? *Shown, portrayed, talked about, prophesied!* The Greek is even stronger.

- (FV): “O foolish Galatians, who has bewitched you **into not obeying the Truth...**”

Is that happening today? *Yes!* What is Truth?

- ✓ *Your Word* is Truth!
- ✓ *Your Law* is Truth!
- ✓ *Your Commandments* are Truth!

- “...before whose eyes Jesus Christ, crucified, was set forth in a written public proclamation?”—*for all to read!*

That is much more profound than just ‘evidently’ set forth. Why did I translate it that way?

- (*Interlinear*): “O senseless Galatians...”

That means *without brains*; you aren’t even thinking! If I were translating it into German it would be ‘dumb heads’

- ...who you bewitched, the Truth not to obey? Whose before eyes Jesus Christ **was openly** set forth among you—crucified?”

Look at the two words:

- ‘was openly’—the four Greek letters are pronounced ‘proe’ which means *before publicly*.
- ‘set forth’—those Greek letters are pronounced ‘graphe’

the whole word is ‘prographo’—meaning *written*.

- What are the Scriptures called? ‘*graphe*’
- What are we then talking about? *They had to have had the Old Testament!*
- Was not all the prophecies of Christ written as a ‘public declaration’ in the Old Testament? *Yes!*
- What else could this include? This was written in about 54_{A.D.}—what else could this include? *New Testament Scripture!*
- Could this also have included the book of Luke?
- Who was Luke? *The one who traveled with Paul; wrote the book of Acts!*
- What was the first coming of Jesus Christ?
- Was it not the most profound event in the history of the world? *Yes!*
- Should that not have been written about? *Yes!*
- Was God going to leave the writing of the New Testament to people who didn’t believe in Christ and let them write it after the death of the apostles?
- Do you think that the new disciples were without written record of Christ?

They have found and could date accurately to 54_{A.D.} a fragment of the book of Matthew written in Greek! Let’s read the first few verses in Luke, because this gets exciting.

Luke 1:1: “Since many have taken in hand to compile a *written*... [set forth; draw up] ...narration... [What is that? *Writing a history*] ...of the matters, which have been fully believed among us, as they delivered *them* to us...” (vs 1-2). Luke is saying, ‘We received some of these written narrations.’ It’s like delivering the newspaper.

“...those who from *the beginning* had been eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word...” (v 2). What is this telling us? *Clearly, those were eyewitnesses and ministers of the Word!* Who were the ministers of the Word? *The apostles!* *Yes!* This is

basic! They were writing it up and delivering it to the disciples.

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

In Gal. 3:1 they had Jesus Christ publicly proclaimed in a written proclamation that He was crucified; which then is the whole story and the life of Christ. The more I get into the Scriptures, the more excited I become. I tell you when I was translating this back in Gal. 3:1 and I saw ‘grapho’ I just about came unglued! I about blew out of my seat and smashed my head on the ceiling—WOW! Look at that! Many people won’t get excited over that, but I did!

Galatians 3:2: “This only I desire to learn from you: did you receive the Spirit of God by works of law, or by *the* hearing of faith?”

- How are they going to hear?
- They are going to hear what?
- *What was written!*
- Is that not exactly what we are doing here today on the Sabbath Day?
- Are we not hearing the words of faith? *Yes!*

Verse 3: “Are you so foolish? Having begun in *the* Spirit, are you now being perfected in the flesh?”—through carnal means. That’s what Peter was doing. *The carnal mean of separating!*

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

“...you were in bondage to those who are not gods by nature” (v 8). Who wants to have religious service done to them, “...who are not gods by nature”? *Demons!*

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

Verse 8 (FV): “Now on the one hand, when you did not know God, you were in bondage to those who are not gods by nature.... [What is bondage? *Sin!*] ...But on the other hand, after having known God—...” (vs 8-9).

There are two words in the Greek that should be translated ‘on the one hand’ and ‘on the other hand,’ are there, but were not translated by the *King James* translators. I think it’s good because it shows the contrast.

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

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

Why did I translate that “You are *of* your own selves observing...”? This is the other one that I hit the ceiling when I came to this—this just blew me right away! In the Greek there is a special form called *the middle voice*. Let me tell you what that means and then I’ll try and explain it so you can understand it. ‘Middle voice’ means *you are the subject and you are the recipient of your action*—you receive your action. It’s all contained in one form of the verb. Let me use a couple of English examples here: I _[subject] see _[verb] the car _[object]. Your action of seeing the car. How could we express something similar where you received that action? Stand in front of a mirror and say: ‘I see myself.’ You are doing the action and you are receiving the benefit of seeing yourself.

This means, v 10: “You are *of* your own selves... [you’re the subject and the recipient of the action] ...observing days, and months, and times and years.”

In other words, they’re not doing it to God. They are not doing it *from* the Scripture *to* God. They are observing it on their own initiative and notice what they are observing: days, months, times and years.

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

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

- If he were talking about the Sabbath, would he not have said Sabbath instead of *days*?

- If he were talking about the new moon, would he not have said new moon rather than *months*?
- If he were talking about Holy Days, would he not have said Holy Days instead of *times*?

Yes!

Now, let's look at this again. What were they doing? *They were going back to something they had been doing before!* They were returning again. Days and months and times and years has nothing, *nothing, nothing* to do with Sabbath and Holy Days—*period!* All of the Protestant theologians say that it does—and *it doesn't!* What you're really dealing with is this: You're dealing with something that many of the theologians always do. They go to a verse to prove their position, *but it proves the opposite!* That's what we're dealing with here. They were doing it for themselves.

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

- Is that *a* day? *Yes!*
- Is Sunday *a* day? *Yes!*

So is Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday and Friday! *The Sabbath is GOD'S day, the Sabbath, the seventh day!* Which God, by creation, made for us to observe and fellowship with Him on the Sabbath.

- Does *any man have the right* to do away with what God has created and say, 'I'm serving God'? *NO!*
- Likewise the Holy Days—does *any man have the right* to say you don't keep these when God says, 'You shall keep them'? *NO!*

So, those were the profound things in Galatians. I know it's complicated enough even with it. Trust me, and understand this: ***IF*** you understand these sermons you understand the most difficult parts of the New Testament, bar none! They are technical! They are difficult! But they are also understandable! That's something, I'm amazed!

I've got people writing me and telling me they have never, never heard anything like what their getting in this series on Romans and this is what it needs to be. They need to know the doctrinal onslaught is coming and *unless you know and you are rooted and grounded in the Word of God,*

you're going to get swept away!

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

Scriptural References:

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

Scriptures referenced, not quoted:

- Deuteronomy 18:18-20
- Romans 2

Also Referenced: Books:

- *The Seven Laws of Spiritual Success: A Practical Guide to the Fulfillment of Your dreams* by Deepak Chopra
- *Code of Jewish Law* by Solomon Ganzfried & Hyman Goldin

FRC:bo
Transcribed: 12-10-10
Reformatted/Corrected: November/2016