

GALATIANS 1:1-10

INTRODUCTION:

This letter was written to “the churches of Galatia.” (1:2) It brought a greeting from Paul (v 3-5).

QUESTION: What seems to be under attack, judging from what Paul says in these opening ten verses?

EVIDENCE: What does the evidence of these verses indicate about the attack?

1. Why does Paul bring up the subject of his apostleship? What seems to be the charge?
 1. Some apparently thought that Paul had been given his apostleship by men. This is denied in verse 1
 2. The statement that he was NO an apostle FROM MEN suggest that NO council of men ordained him.
2. How did men normally become apostles?
 1. There is no indication here.
 2. Acts 1:21-22 suggest that those who were with James were candidates. They had to be witnesses to the fact that Jesus had been resurrected.
3. Why was Paul a special case in the matter of becoming an apostle?
 1. I Corinthians 15:8-9 Paul calls himself “untimely born.”
 2. I came through God the Father who raised Jesus from the dead (1:1).
 3. Through Jesus Christ (1:1).
Other passages:
Acts 9:4-6 - Paul heard the Lord.
Acts 22:14-15 - Paul was appointed by God to be a witness of what he had seen and heard.
4. Why does Paul bring up the subject of the Gospel (1:6)?
 1. Because they were giving up the Grace which was give of God (v 15; 5:8)
 2. They were being taught a different Gospel (v6). This was dangerous as some where trying to cause trouble for the Galatians.
 3. They were really perverting the gospel of Christ (v 7) which is another name for turning or changing the gospel into something entirely different.

.... How did the gospel come to the Galatians? Paul (1:8)
4. Who changed the gospel?
Not Paul (1:8) Not an angel from heaven (1:8) Then WHY use this illustration?
If Paul nor an angel could change it, then why could anyone else?
5. What would happen to someone who perverted the gospel?
They would be eternally condemned.....
5. Why does Paul bring up the subject of pleasing God or man (1:10)?
 1. Had Paul been pleasing men when he persecuted the church? (See Acts 9:1-2).
 2. Is Paul setting the stage for the harsh things he is about to say in this letter?
 3. Paul recognized that he could not please Christ and man at the same time (1:10).

CONCLUSION:

1. That Paul's:
 1. Apostleship and gospel came from God, not man.
 2. Position is that (though attacked his:
 1. Apostleship cannot be denied,
 2. Gospel cannot be changed because there is but one gospel, all else is false.

2. That Paul's personal decision is, when God and man clash, he will"
 1. Please God
 2. Not please man.

GALATIANS 1:11-24

INTRODUCTION: Paul's introduction in our last lesson taught that his apostleship was not from man. Since Paul's apostleship was not from man, his gospel would not be from man either. Since it was not from man, it could not be changed without being perverted.

In this lesson, Paul continues discussing his gospel.

QUESTION: How could the Galatians know that Paul's Gospel was from God, and not man?

EVIDENCE: What does the evidence of the passage indicate Paul's proof was?

1. How could Paul claim his gospel was not from man? His claim was:
 1. It was not after man (1:11) meaning received from man.
 2. It was not received from man (1:12) meaning that he did not get it second hand.
 3. It was not taught to Paul by man (1:12) meaning

2. How could Paul prove his claim that his gospel was not from man? (GROUP ANSWER)
 1. Immediately after Paul's conversion he:
 1. Straightway conferred not with flesh and blood (1:16)
 2. Did not go up to Jerusalem to the other apostles (1:17)
 3. Instead he went away into Arabia and returned to Damascus (1:17).
 4. Acts 9:20 reveals that Paul preached IMMEDIATELY.
 2. Three years later he:
 1. Went to Jerusalem where he saw only Peter and James (1:18-19).
 2. Only stayed for 15 days (1:18).
 3. Had already been preaching for 3 years before going to Jerusalem (Acts 9:20; Gal 1:18)

3. Did Paul get his gospel from Judea?
 1. Paul visited the regions of Syria and Cilicia (1:21)
 2. But he was still unknown by face to the churches of Judea (1:22). He preached the faith he once persecuted (1:23) and they glorified God in Paul (1:24).

4. How could Paul claim his gospel was from God?
 1. His gospel came through revelations of Jesus Christ (1:12).
 2. His former life was one of:
 1. Persecuting Jews and made havoc of the church (1:13)
 2. Advanced in study of the Jewish religion (1:14).
 3. Was a zealot for the traditions of his fathers (1:14)
 3. His changed life showed:
 1. He now preached the faith (1:23)
 2. He now preached among the gentiles (1:16).
 4. How could this amazing change take place?
 5. God in His good pleasure separated Paul from his mother's womb (1:15) and called

- called Paul through His grace (1:15).
6. Is Paul suggesting that nothing other than God could cause such a change?

CONCLUSION:

7. That Paul's gospel was not from man because:
 1. Paul consulted no one about the gospel immediately after his conversion yet he began preaching immediately (Acts 9:20).
 2. Paul only had 15 days in Jerusalem to see two people, with no time to learn the gospel.
 3. Paul was unknown personally to the brethren in Judea, and as such, could not have gotten the gospel from them.

8. That Paul's gospel was from God because:
 1. Nothing else would have turned him from a fanatical persecutor of the faith into a zealous preacher of the faith!

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. Was Paul pre-destined to be an apostle? If so, why can't we be pre-destined to be saved the same way?
 1. Paul was separated by God (1:15).
 2. But even Paul admitted the possibility of his falling away (1 Cor. 9:27).

2. Was Paul "swearing an oath" in Galatians 1:20? If he did, was this a violation of James 5:12 and Matthew 5:33-37?
 1. The context of the other passages condemn a frivolous use of oaths.
 2. Paul was giving a solemn (not a frivolous) testimony.

GALATIANS 2:1-10

INTRODUCTION: In the first chapter of Galatians, Paul established that his apostleship and gospel were from God, and not from man.

In this lesson Paul shows how his gospel fits into the overall scheme of things.

QUESTION: Why did Paul have to defend his gospel against circumcision?

EVIDENCES:

1. Why does Paul bring up the point about going to Jerusalem?
 1. Paul notes that it was 14 years after he began preaching before he went up to Jerusalem (2:1)
 2. Paul also notes that his going to this center of Judaism was by revelation (2:2)
 1. It was not Paul's need for some help on the gospel
 2. It was God's idea!
2. Why did Paul go to Jerusalem?
 1. Paul went up to present the gospel which he preached among the gentiles (2:2).
 2. Paul did it privately before those who were of good reputation (2:2) **WHY?**
 1. Paul did not want to have run or be running in vain (2:2)
 2. Paul wanted to assure the leaders of the church of what he was doing as he did not want his work to become ineffective.
3. Why does Paul make it clear he gained nothing from the leaders of the church in Jerusalem?
 1. What did men of repute have to do with Paul's mission in Jerusalem?
 1. Such reputations didn't matter to Paul (2:6), but Paul knew they did to others.
 2. Paul, like God, did not accept a man's person (2:6), but he knew that others would be watching to see what their attitude was toward Paul's gospel.
 2. What does Paul say he gained from the leaders at Jerusalem?
 1. They imparted nothing to me (2:6).
 2. Paul wanted men to know that he did not get his gospel from them.
4. Why was Titus not being circumcised important to Paul?
 1. What was Titus racially? - (A Greek 2:3.)
 2. Why was Titus important?
 1. Paul would not allow Titus to be circumcised (2:3).
 2. If Titus could be a Christian without being circumcised, then no one had to be circumcised to be a Christian; therefore Titus was a "test case" precedent!
 3. Why did Paul's opposers want Titus circumcised?
 1. They wanted to spy out the Christian's liberty he had in Christ (2:4).
 2. They wanted to bring Christians into bondage (2:4)
 4. What was Paul's reaction to the idea of circumcision for Titus?

1. Paul did not give in to them, not for a moment (2:5).
 2. Paul wanted the truth of the gospel to continue with them (2:5)
 3. Accepting circumcision would have been removing to a different gospel (1:6).
 4. Paul called those who insisted on circumcision, “false brethren”. (2:4)
 5. Why did Paul not give place?
5. If Paul learned nothing from the leaders at Jerusalem, why does he even mention them? (To show their approval and endorsement)
1. Those of repute saw Paul had been entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision (2:7).
 1. Peter had the gospel of the circumcision (2:7)
 2. The same God who worked through Peter to apostleship of the circumcision, worked also for Paul for apostleship to the Gentiles (2:8).
 2. Those of repute perceived the grace given to Paul (2:9).
 3. James, Peter, and John (reputed to be pillars in the church) gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship (2:9).
 1. That Paul and Barnabas should go to the gentiles and Peter to the circumcision (2:9).
 2. That Paul and Barnabas should remember the poor, as Paul was zealous to do (3:10).

CONCLUSION:

1. That Paul learned nothing about the gospel from the leaders of the circumcision:
 1. His trip was the direct result of God’s revelation.
 2. He went 14 years after he started preaching.
 3. The leaders there imparted nothing to him.
2. That Paul’s purpose at Jerusalem was:
 1. To unite his efforts with the leaders of the circumcision so that his efforts (his running) should not be in vain,
 2. To show in Titus that the Law’s provisions (like circumcision) were not any part of the gospel.
 3. To show that the circumcision leaders of the church accepted and endorsed his gospel ministry, without binding circumcision on Gentile Christians.

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. Is the conference described in Acts 15 and Galatians 2 the same? What insights do we gain if they are the same?
2. In I Cor. 15:1-4, Paul referred to the gospel as the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Does he mean exactly the same thing by the work “gospel” in this lesson? Is Paul concerned about adding circumcision to the death, burial and resurrection?
 1. In I Cor. 15, Paul establishing the facts of the gospel.
 2. In this context, Paul is establishing the commands of the gospel (2:2-5)
3. Did Paul and Peter have different gospels? Paul had the gospel of the uncircumcision and Peter the gospel of the circumcision (2:7).

1. No? How would you prove that?
 2. This merely described the different spheres of preaching, not a different message.
4. Paul circumcised Timothy (Acts 16:3), but refused to circumcise Titus (Gal 2:3). Was Paul inconsistent?
1. No, because Timothy had a Jewish mother, and it was expedient in Paul's opinion, to circumcise him, lest he offend his Jewish brethren.
 2. Titus, on the other hand, was a Greek and had no expedient reason for being circumcised, except to please the Jews, who wanted to bind the Mosaic law on Gentiles.

GALATIANS 2:11-21

INTRODUCTION:

Paul has pointed out previously that his apostleship and gospel were from God, and not from man.

But he also noted that his gospel was approved by the leaders of the church, although that approval was more important to Paul's critics than it was to him.

Since Paul's gospel was God's revelation, then nothing could be added to it, not even circumcision.

QUESTION:

1. Why does Paul make such a big issue out of Peter refusing to eat with Gentile Christians?
 1. What part did Peter have in this incident?
 1. What did Peter Do?
 1. He came to Antioch (2:11)
 2. While there he ate with Gentile Christians before "certain men" came from Jerusalem (2:12); drew back and separated himself (2:12) and; influenced others to do the same as he did (2:13).
 2. Why did Peter do what he did?
 1. Peter knew it was all right to eat with the Gentiles before the Jews came (2:12).
 2. However, he feared the Jews and their beliefs. (2:12)
 2. What Part did Paul have in the incident?
 1. What was Paul's reaction?
 1. Paul resisted Peter to the face (2:11).
 2. He did this by speaking to Peter in front of them all (2:14),
 3. He said - **read verse 2:14-17.**
 4. What was Paul charging Peter with?
Inconsistency with the gospel?
 2. Why did Paul react to Peter's refusal to eat with gentiles?
 1. To do what Peter did was inconsistent? HOW?
 - (1). If I build up again those things which I destroy, I prove a lawbreaker (2:18).
 - (1) Why would Paul be a lawbreaker?
 - (a). Paul, through the law, died unto the law that he might live unto God (2:19).
 - (b). Paul was crucified with Christ and am no longer living, but Christ was living in him (2:20).
 - (c). Paul's life in the flesh was lived by faith in the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself up for him (2:20).
 2. To act as Peter did would void the grace of God? HOW?
 - (1) Paul said he didn't void the grace of God (2:21) by refusing to add the law onto the gospel.
 - (2) If the way to attain righteousness was through the law, then Christ died for nothing (2:21).

CONCLUSION:

1. That if Jewish Christians are saved by faith (and not by works of the law), it is inconsistent to require obedience to the law by Gentile Christians.

2. That refusing to allow the law to be added to the gospel is not rejecting God's plan of grace; rather, to exalt the law would show that Christ's death served no worthwhile purpose.
3. That not only was Paul's gospel approved by the other apostles, but his practice in such things as eating with Gentile Christians, was actually superior to that of Peter or Barnabas!

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. How could an inspired apostle like Peter misunderstand the gospel as badly as he does in this lesson?
 1. He didn't misunderstand. (See Gal. 2:12; Acts 10:28; 11:8,9).
 2. His problem was fear (2:12).
 3. What does the word "dissimulation" indicated about Peter (2:13).
 - (1.) The same word is used in Luke 20:20 and Mark 12:15 - HYPOCRISY!
 4. Paul is accusing Peter of being hypocritical.
 5. Paul then, is accusing Peter of being hypocritical and not doing what he knew was right!
 6. It appears that even apostles could live beneath their understanding of truth, just as we sometimes do!
2. What does the word "gospel" mean in this context today?
 1. In I Cor. 15:1-4 it means the facts of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection.
 2. In this context, it includes "the truth by which we walk uprightly (2:14)

GALATIANS 3:1-14

INTRODUCTION:

Paul has previously shown in this book that he was not dependent on men for either his apostleship or his gospel. He received both from God.

Furthermore, Paul pointed out that his gospel was accepted by the leaders of the church. In one case, Paul showed his understanding of the meaning of the gospel was better than that of Peter.

In today's lesson, the apostle reveals the absurdity of having the Galatians go back to another gospel.

QUESTION:

1. Why didn't Paul allow the Galatians to "tack" the law onto the gospel?
2. What does the evidence of the passage indicate Paul's reasons were?
 1. Why did Paul think the Galatians were foolish (3:1, 3)
 1. They were acting so strangely that Paul suggested they were "bewitched." (3:1)
 2. What questions did Paul ask to reveal their foolishness?
 1. Did you receive the Spirit by the works of the law or by the hearing of faith (3:2)?
 2. Have you begun in the Spirit, and are now perfected in the flesh (3:3)?
 3. Did you suffer so many things in vain (3:4)?
 4. Does the one who supplies the Spirit and works miracles among you do it by the works of the law or the hearing of faith (3:5)?
 3. How did these questions reveal their foolishness?
 1. The obvious answer to each question is that none of these benefits came from the law; all came by faith.
 2. It must have been painfully clear that since the gospel had given them so much more than the law, why should they go back to the law?
 2. Why does Paul bring up Abraham?
 1. How was Abraham justified?
 1. Abraham believed in God (3:6).
 2. It was credited to him for righteousness (3:6).
 2. How were gentiles justified?
 1. The scripture foresaw that God would justify the gentiles by faith - 3:8).
 3. How does the justification of Abraham and gentiles tie together?
 3. They that are of faith are the sons of Abraham (3:7).
 4. The scriptures testified (Gen. 12:3) to Abraham, "In thee shall all the nations (Gentiles?) Be blessed" (3:8).
 5. So they that are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham (3:9). This would include Gentiles!

3. Why could the Galatians not be justified by the Law?
 1. Because as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse (3:10).
WHY?
 1. It is written in the scripture (3:10). Refer to Deut. 27:26.
 2. What is the Curse?
 - (1) The curse was in not doing the law (3:10).
 2. Because no man is justified by the law before God (3:10)? Why Not?
 1. The righteous shall live by faith (Gal 3:11 citing Habakkuk 2:4).
 2. And the law is not of faith (3:12). WHY NOT?
 - (1) Paul meant the law was not a faith system; rather, “he that does them shall live in them (3:12) citing Lev. 18:5).
 - (2) The law was primarily a system of doing, not believing, in order to be made righteous.
 3. Because Christ redeemed them from the curses of the law (3:13).
 1. How did Christ do that? HE became a curse for us! (3:13).
 2. Why was Christ’s death a curse? Gal 3:13 “Cursed is everyone that hangs on a tree” Citing Deut. 21:23).
 3. Why did Christ redeem us from the curse of the law?
 - (1) So that upon the Gentiles might come the blessing of Abraham in Christ (3:14).
 - (2) So that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (3:14).

CONCLUSION:

1. That Paul wanted the foolish Galatians to see how all their blessings had not come through the flesh, but through faith.
2. That even their favorite Jewish hero (Abraham) was saved by faith.
3. That all Gentiles saved by faith are Abraham’s sons.
4. That Gentile Christians should not go back to the law because:
 1. Man cannot be justified by the law.
 2. The law (due to man’s inability to keep it) became a curse!
 3. Christ died to redeem us from the curse of the law!

GALATIANS 3: 15 - 22

INTRODUCTION:

Paul's apostleship and gospel came directly from Jesus Christ. His gospel was approved by the pillars of the church.

Paul taught that going back to the law of circumcision, or using it to prove one ought not to eat with Gentile Christians, was to "pervert" the gospel.

Christ died to deliver us from the curse of a law we could not keep. We then have no reason to go back to it.

1. **QUESTION:** - Why didn't the law alter the promise of Abraham?
2. What does the evidence of the passage teach us?
 1. What does the nature of man's covenant have to do with Paul's argument?
 1. What is the nature of man's covenant?
 1. It can be confirmed (3:15).
 2. Then: No one can void it OR add to it (3:15).
 2. What Covenant is Paul really teaching about?
 1. It was the covenant God made with Abraham (3:16).
 2. Refer to Gen. 12:1-4; 13:15; 17:7-8 for background.
 2. How does God's covenant with Abraham fit into Paul's argument?
 1. To who was this promise given?
 1. It was spoken to Abraham (3:16).
 2. It was spoken to his seed (3:16). Paul interpreted this as singular - meaning Christ was the seed.
 2. How did the promise come to Abraham?
 1. It was not through angels nor the hand of a mediator, as the law came (3:19).
 2. God (who is one) had no mediator between him and Abraham (3:16,20).
3. How did the law fit into the picture?
 1. When did the law come?
 1. It came 430 years after the covenant with Abraham (3:17).
 2. It was too late to have priority over the covenant!
 2. How did the law come to man?
 1. It was ordained through angels (3:19).
 - (1). See Acts 7:38, 53 and Heb 2:2 for background.
 2. It was ordained by the hand of a mediator (3:19).
 - (1). Moses - refer to Deut. 5:5 if needed.
 - (2). Why was the point about a mediator significant?
 - (a). Two parties must have been involved, or there would have been no need for a mediator (3:20).
 - (b). Someone had to stand between God and man in receiving the law.

3. What was the effect of the law on the promise?
 1. It did not disannul nor make the promise of none effect (3:17).
 2. Why? A covenant can be confirmed. Once it is, no one can make it void or add to it (3:15).
4. Was the law of any value? (Yes) HOW?
 1. It was added because of transgressions until the seed should come to whom the promise had been made (3:19).
 - b. What did it do for man?
 - (1). The scripture shut up all things under sin (3:22).
 - (2). WHY? Then the promise by faith in Jesus might be given to them that believe (3:22).
5. Why couldn't the inheritance be of the law?
 1. The two were mutually exclusive; that is, if it were by law, then it couldn't be of promise (3:18).
 2. Was the law then against the promise of God?
 - (1). God forbid (3:21).
 - (2). The law could only shut up all things under sin, but it could not make anyone alive. If it could have, then righteousness would have been by the law (3:21-22).

CONCLUSION:

1. That even human covenants (once made) cannot be altered later.
2. That God's covenant:
 1. Was with Abraham and his seed (Christ).
 2. Came before the law.
 3. Came directly to Abraham and not through angels or a mediator.
3. That the law:
 1. Came 430 years too late to have priority over the covenant, and could not alter it.
 2. Came indirectly through angels and a mediator.
 3. Was not against the promises, but its nature, was unable to make men righteous.

GALATIANS 3:23 - 29

INTRODUCTION:

Since Paul Taught that his gospel came from God and not man, he defends his gospel against going back to circumcision, Jewish eating restrictions, and in general to the curse of a law man couldn't keep.

Paul also showed that the law came 430 years too late to change the promise made to Abraham.

Sooner or later, the question had to arise as to whether or not the law served any purpose at all.

1. **QUESTION:** Since the law couldn't alter or replace the promise, then why have the law at all?
2. **EVIDENCE:** What does the evidence of the passage suggest?
 1. What was the situation before faith came?
 1. They were kept "in ward" under the law (3:23). Meaning:
 - (1) This same word is used in other passages:
 - (1). 2 Cor 11:32 - "guarded" the city.
 - (2). Phil 4:7 - God "guard" your hearts.
 - (1) 1 Peter 1:5 - "Guarded" through the faith.
 - (2) What does these used mean of the word "Guarded."
 - (1) It was not necessarily an unpleasant guarding.
 - (2) Was it like "protective custody?"
 2. They were "shut up" unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed (3:23)
 - (1) How is this word used:
 - (1) Luke 5:6 - "Enclosed" fish in nets.
 - (2) Rom 11:32 - God "shut up" all unto disobedience.
 - (3) Gal 3:22 - Scripture "shut up" all things under sin.
 - (2) What do these uses indicate?
 - (1) In some way they were enclosed in the law and set on a course in the direction of faith.
2. What did the law do for them before faith came?
 1. The law became their tutor (3:24).
 - (1).. The word TUTOR is formed from two words ("child" plus "lead, guide"); therefore, it has the idea of "child leader."
 - (2) This word was applied in Greek society most often to a trusted slave who took a young boy to and from school.
 - (1) 1 Cor 4:15 indicates that the tutor was someone other than the father who helped in a child's training.
 2. What did the law do for them in its role as tutor?
 3. It brought them unto Christ (3:24)
 4. Was it by showing them how they were cursed in not being able to keep the law (3:10)?
 5. Was it by letting them see how Christ became a curse for them (3:13)?
- C. What happened after faith came.
 1. They were no longer under a tutor (3:25); that is, the law.
 2. They could be justified by faith (3:24).

1. This was important as they could not be justified by the law (3:21).
2. Now, having come to Christ, they could be justified by faith (3:24).
3. They were all sons of God (3:26). **How did this happen?**
 1. It was through faith in Christ Jesus (3:26).
 2. As many as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ (3:27).
4. They were all one man in Christ Jesus (3:28).
 1. Neither Jew nor Greek.
 2. Neither bond nor free.
 3. Neither male nor female.
5. They were heirs according to the promise (3:29). HOW?
 1. They were Christ's (3:29). HOW (by faith)
 2. They were also Abraham's seed (3:29). HOW
 - (1) Abraham was saved by faith (3:6).
 - (2) Christ was Abraham's "seed" (3:16).
 - (3) When they were saved by faith in Christ, they became Abraham's seed also (3:7).
 3. They were heirs of Abraham's promise through faith in Christ (3:29), with no reference necessary to the law.

CONCLUSION:

1. That the law of Moses kept Jews "guarded" in some sense while they waited for faith to be revealed.
2. That the law (although man was incapable of becoming righteous by it) did nevertheless serve as a tutor to bring them to Christ.
3. That when faith came:
 1. They were no longer under a tutor; that is, the law.
 2. They could now be justified by faith.
 3. They could now all be sons of God without regard to any Judaizing distinctions.
 4. They could now claim the promise given to Abraham by Faith whether they had ever been under the law or not!

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. Galatians 3:28 is quoted by Women's lib and others to prove that all distinctions between the roles of men and women are wrong. Is this what Paul intended to teach?
 1. What does this lesson indicate?
 - (1) The Judaizers were trying to say men could not be Christians without keeping the law (circumcision etc.)
 - (2) Paul was specifically denying that!
 2. What light do other passages shed on this question?
 - (1) Does Paul mean all slaves were freed when they became Christians? What does Eph. 6:5-9 indicate?
 - (2) Does Paul mean that the roles of men and women are exactly the same? What does Eph 5:23-24 and 1 Peter 3:1-7 indicate?

GALATIANS 4: 1- 11

INTRODUCTION: Paul defended the gospel against returning to a law which man could not keep, and which in no way nullified the promise to Abraham.

But Paul taught the law served a purpose by keeping them in some kind of custody until faith came.

QUESTION: In What sense were they in custody of law, according to today's lesson?

1. What does the evidence of the passage indicate?
 1. Why did Paul bring up the idea of a child heir?
 1. This was an illustration of how they had been under the law (4:3).
 2. What was it like to be a child heir?
 1. The child heir was lord of all (4:1).
 2. But he was no different from a bond servant as long as he was a child (4:1).
 3. He was under guardians and stewards (4:2).
 4. A guardian was a man put over others by the lord and master - Matt 20:8.
 5. A steward was one set over a household business - Luke 12:42; 16:1).
 2. How did the man under law resemble the child heir?
 1. They were children held in bondage under the rudiments of the world (4:3).
 1. Children - meaning they have not come to their full rights.
 2. Rudiments - The simple, fundamental elements of anything. Refer to Heb 5:12; Col 2:8, 20; II Pet 3:10, 12 for other usages.
 2. They did not know God (4:8). IS HE SPEAKING OF THE GENTILES HERE?
 3. They were in bondage to them that by nature are no gods (4:8).
 1. Is he speaking about gentiles here? Or Idolatry? Ref I Cor 8:5ff).
3. Why was the end of law an important time?
 1. What change took place?
 1. They came to know God (4:9).
 2. Or rather they came to be known by God (4:9).
 2. When did the change occur?
 1. It was when the fullness of time came (4:4). That is, it was when God sent His Son who was born of woman, under the law (4:4).
 3. Why did Christ come?
 1. He came that he might redeem them that were under the law (4:5).
 2. This is important as through Christ they could receive the adoption of sons (4:5).
 3. Because they were sons, they received the Spirit of His son into their hearts, crying, ABBA FATHER (4:6).
 4. If they were no longer bond servants but sons, then they were heirs through God (4:7).
4. Why did they still have problems if they were out from under the law?
 1. They were turning back to the weak and beggarly rudiments (4:9).
 2. They were desiring to be in bondage over again (4:9).
 3. They were observing days, months, seasons, and years (4:10).
 1. Gentile or Jewish observances? Perhaps both: Galatians is fighting the return to Judaism practices, however, Col. 2:16 indicates the same problem

at Colossae.

4. Paul was afraid of them (4:11). Why?
 1. Returning to Jewish rituals was a retreat from the gospel.
 2. Such a return would indicate Paul had bestowed labor upon them in vain (4:11).

CONCLUSION:

1. That the analogy of a child heir applies to those under the law.
2. That being under law, they were in bondage to the rudiments of the world.
3. That when Christ came, they were redeemed from the slavery of law and became sons.
4. That they (in going back to law) were returning to bondage again.

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. Who is the “Spirit of His Sons” mentioned in 4:6?
 1. Romans 8:9-10 uses almost the same term.
 2. It suggests that the “Spirit of God” and the “Spirit of Christ” are the same.
2. Does “born of a woman” (4:4) imply the doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus?
 1. Jesus was uniquely born of a woman, with no human father (see Matt 1:18ff).
 2. We cannot be sure if Paul is trying to make this point here.

GALATIANS 4: 12 - 20

INTRODUCTION: Last week Paul taught the Galatians that being under the law was like being an heir who had not yet fully come into his inheritance.

In this lesson, he advances more personal reasons why they should not go back to the law.

QUESTION: Why does Paul not want them to go back under law, according to this lesson?

1. What does the evidence of the passage suggest?
 1. What does Paul mean when he beseeches them to become as he has become? (4:12).
 1. What had Paul before?
 1. He had been a Jew (2:15) and had been under the law (1:14).
 2. What was Paul now?
 1. He had become like the Gentile Christians (4:12) He had died to the law (2:19), and since he was out from under the law, he was like a Gentile.
 3. How were the Gentiles to become like Paul?
 1. Gentiles had not been under the law (2:3, 14).
 2. The Judaizers had encouraged Gentile Christians to come under the law, (2:3, 4, 14).
 3. Now Gentile Christians have a chance to die to the law as Paul had done (4:12).
 2. Why is the relationship Paul had with the Galatians important?
 1. Why did Paul say they done him no wrong?
 1. Paul preached the gospel to them because of an infirmity of the flesh (4:13).
 - (1). In reaction, they could have despised or rejected him (4:14).
 - (2). But they received him as Jesus Christ and as an angel or god (4:14).
 - (3). If possible, they would have plucked out their eyes and given them to Paul (4:15).
 2. Why does Paul say, “Am I become your enemy by telling you the truth?” (4:16).
 1. Was Paul saying that their relationship had been good so far?
 2. Was he asking them if they were now going to allow truth to make them enemies?
 - C. Why is the motive of the Judaizing teachers important to Paul’s argument?
 1. They were zealously seeking the Galatians in no good way (4:17).
 2. They wanted to shut the Galatians out.
 1. First, they had to bind the law on them.
 2. Then just being a Christian would not be enough to save them.
 3. Then the Galatians would be shut out again.
 4. The Galatians would then have to seek the Judaizing teachers’ help (4:17).
 5. Then the Judaizers would have what they wanted; namely, to be sought after as teachers (4:17).
 - D. What was Paul’s motive?
 1. Paul wanted them to be zealous in seeking good at all times and not just when he

- was with them (4:18).
2. Paul was in travail (Gal 2:20 - childbirth) over the Galatians. He wanted Christ to be formed in them, the self must die for Christ to live.
 3. Paul wanted to be present with them.
 4. He wanted to change his tone.

CONCLUSION:

1. That Paul wanted the Galatians to become like him, by giving up the law as he had done.
2. That Paul had no reason to lie to them about the law:
 1. The Galatians had treated him well.
 2. Surely they would not become enemies now simply because he told them the truth.
3. That the Judaizers who were encouraging them to go back to the law had self-seeking motives, and Paul did not.

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. Do you think Paul's "infirmity of the flesh" in this lesson is the same as Paul's "thorn in the flesh" mentioned in 2 Cor. 12:7?
 1. Both were physical problems.
 2. This one seemed to have something to do with his eyes (4:15).
 3. We cannot be sure they are the same.

GALATIANS 4:21 - 31

INTRODUCTION: In our last lesson, Paul made some personal appeals to the Galatians not to go back to the law.

In today's lesson, Paul gives a reason based on the allegory.

QUESTION: How does Paul use an allegory to prove his case?

1. What does the evidence suggest?
 1. What question was Paul trying to solve?
 1. Do you desire to be under the law? (4:21).
 2. Are you not aware of what the law says? (4:21).
 2. To what Old Testament event does Paul refer to help solve this problem? (See Genesis 16-18 and 21 for background).
 1. Abraham had two sons (4:22).
 1. One was by a handmaiden (4:22).
 2. One was by a freewoman (4:22).
 2. Importance?
 1. The handmaid's (Hagar) son (Ishmael) was born after the flesh (4:23).
 2. The freewoman's (Sarah) son (Isaac) was born through promise; that is, it was God's idea, promise and power.
3. How was this event an allegory?
 1. What does Hagar represent?
 1. She represents the covenant from Mt. Sinai in Arabia (4:24-25). She bears children into bondage (4:24). She answers to Jerusalem that now is (4:25) in bondage.
 2. What does Sarah represent?
 1. She represents Jerusalem that is above (4:26). In that, Jerusalem, like Sarah, is free (4:26). That Jerusalem is our mother (4:26).
 3. Why does Paul quote Isaiah 54:1 in Galatians 4:27?
 1. Does it parallel the case of Hagar and Sarah?
 2. Do the words describe Sarah? *"Be glad, O barren woman, who bears no children; break forth and cry aloud, you who have no labor pains; because more are the children of the desolate woman.."*
 3. Do the words describe Hagar? *"...than of her who has a husband."*
 - (1). Hagar for a while had Sarah's husband, and a son.
 - (2). But eventually Sarah's need (that is, all those of promise born by faith) outnumbered Hagar's.
4. How does this allegory apply to the Galatian problem of going back to the law?
 1. We are as Isaac was; that is:
 1. Not the children of the handmaid (4:31).
 2. But the children of Promise (4:28), and the freewoman (4:31).
 2. How did this fit the Galatians situation?
 1. Isaac was (1) born after the Spirit (4:29), (2) persecuted by him that was born after the flesh (4:29). See Genesis 21.
 2. How were the Galatians like that? Were not the Jewish Christians who

- held to the law persecuting the Gentile children of promise?
5. What solution to the problem did the allegory give?
 1. Paul asks, "What does the scripture say? (4:30). Citing Gen. 21:10. "Cast out the handmaid and her son". Why? Because the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman.
 2. What is Paul saying the Galatians should do?
 1. Forget the fleshly tie through the Law?
 2. Cling to the tie which is through promise, without the law?

CONCLUSION:

1. That Paul was trying to convince the Gentile Christians of Galatia not to go back to the law.
2. That Paul cites the story of Hagar and Sarah as proof of how God has always dealt with man.
 1. Not according to flesh.
 2. But according to the spirit and promise.
3. That this allegory proves to be a true parallel to Christians; namely, that:
 1. We are not children according to flesh.
 2. We are children according to promise.
4. That the law therefore (as seen in the allegory) has no place in a Christian's inheritance anymore!

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. How would you compare Romans 9:6 - 9 with this lesson?
 1. Gal. 4:21-31 is the allegorical argument.
 2. Romans 9 is a logical statement of the same point:
 - (1). Not all decedents from Israel belong to Israel (9:6).
 - (2). Only through Isaac were decedents named (9:7).
 - (3). Therefore the decedents are (9:8);
 - (a). Not the children of flesh,
 - (b). But the children of promise.

GALATIANS 5: 1 - 12

INTRODUCTION: In the book of Galatians thus far, Paul has given numerous reasons for a Christian not going back to the law.

In today's lesson, Paul explores the reasons which have to do with freedom and grace.

QUESTION:

1. Can we fall away from grace today, as Paul said the Galatians were in danger of doing?
2. What does the evidence of the passage indicate?
 1. Why did Paul make freedom an issue?
 1. Christ had set them free for freedom (5:1)
 1. They should stand fast (5:1)
 2. They should not be entangled again in a yoke of bondage. Tying to bind circumcision and other parts of the law on Gentiles.
 2. Why did Paul make circumcision an issue?
 1. How would going back to circumcision hurt their freedom?
 1. Christ would profit them nothing (5:12). If they accepted circumcision they would nullify all that Christ died to provide. Placing them back under the curse of the law (see Gal 3:13).
 2. They would be debtors to do the whole law (5:3). Circumcision would usher them back into the law and obligate them to keep the whole law. See Genesis 17:11).
 2. Why did Paul mention the preaching of circumcision in 5:11?
 1. Some apparently accused him of preaching it (5:11) It could have been because he circumcised Timothy (Acts 16:1-5). Read Verse 11 for Paul's response.
 3. How did Paul see circumcision for Christians?
 1. It availed nothing! (5:6)
 2. What was important in Christ?
 - (1). They waited for the hope of righteousness through the Spirit by faith (5:5).
 - (2). Faith working by love was the thing which availed something in Christ (5:6)
 3. Why was HOW they were justified an issue with Paul?
 1. They could be severed from Christ (5:4).
 1. One could be justified through Christ or through law, but not both, because they were different systems.
 2. To be justified by law meant one had to cut himself off from Christ.
 2. They could fall from grace (5:4).
 1. One could try to be saved by law or grace.
 2. Any effort toward being saved by law meant one had to "fall from grace" as a means of justification.
 4. Why were those hindering the Galatians an issue?

1. How had the Galatians been doing before?
 1. They had been running well. They were like racers running down the track
2. What happened to them? They had been hindered (5:7).
3. What is Paul concerned about?
 1. Paul said, “A little leaven will leaven the whole lump”. (5:9)
 2. Was the leaven/yeast the Judaizing teachers who persuaded and troubled the Galatians? Or was it the persuasion which might give them another mind? (5:8, 10)?
4. What does Paul think the outcome will be?
 1. Someone other than Paul brought this idea to the Galatians (5:8).
 2. Paul has confidence they will not be otherwise minded than what he has already taught them (5:10).

CONCLUSION:

1. That the Galatians were in danger of losing the freedom Christ had intended for them, and going back to the law as the basis for their salvation.
2. That circumcision was an issue because by keeping it, they showed they would:
 1. Get no profit from what Christ had done for them.
 2. Become debtors to keep the whole law.
3. That how they were justified was an issue because they would fall from grace if they:
 1. Left the grace of Christ as a basis for their salvation.
 2. Turned to law-keeping as a basis for their salvation.
4. That for us to fall from grace as they did, we would have to:
 1. Quit trusting the grace of Christ for salvation.
 2. Start trying to be saved by law-keeping.

OTHER QUESTIONS:

1. Do we normally use Galatians 5:4 properly when we say a Christian can “fall from grace?”
 1. Don’t we usually mean a Christian can fall into sin and be eternally lost?
 2. Paul was not talking about the falling into moral sin, but about leaving the grace of Christ and trying to be saved by the law.

GALATIANS 5:13 - 21

INTRODUCTION: Paul has made it clear in Galatians that going back to the law was a return to bondage. Likewise he has pointed out that a return to being justified by the law meant being saved from Christ and galling away from being saved by grace.

In today's lesson, he pursues the question of whether their new freedom in Christ makes any ethical demands on their lives.

QUESTION:

1. Are we free in Christ today with no rules for our behavior?

2. Let's look at the evidence of the passage:
 1. What was the Galatians problem?
 1. The flesh was lusting against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh (5:17)?
WHY?
 1. The two were contrary to one another (5:17).
 2. This conflict kept them from doing the things they would (5:17).
 2. They had to decide which was going to lead them.
 1. If they were led by the Spirit, then they were not under law (5:18).
 2. If they walk by the Spirit, they shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh (5:16).
 2. What does love have to do with the problem?
 1. Being servants to one another through love was the opposite of using their freedom for an occasion to the flesh (5:13).
 2. What is love's relation to the law?
 1. The whole law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself (5:14).
 - (1). Note, this is an Old Testament quote of Lev 19:18.
 - (1) Also note Jesus quotes this as the second commandment (Matt 22:39).
 - (2) James calls it the "royal law" (James 2:8).
 2. Does this mean love can break the law?
 - (1) Love is not in opposition to law.
 - (2) Love fulfills the law.
 3. Why does Paul bring up the subject of freedom?
 1. They were called for freedom (5:13)
 2. But they were not to use their freedom for an occasion to the flesh (5:13). How could they do this?
 1. They were biting, devouring, and consuming one another (5:15).
 2. Are the "works of the flesh" a "don't list"?
 - (1). They are a list of things a Christian (even though free) will specifically not do!
 - (2). It is not a complete list, because Paul adds "and such like" to show that other sins would fall under the name principle (5:21).
 3. What would happen if they did misuse their freedom?

(1). They would not inherit the kingdom of God - 5:21)

4. What categories of sin do you see in Paul's list (5:19-21)? What do they mean?

1. Sins of the fleshly appetite. Sexual Sins

1. Fornication, uncleanness

Rom 1:24 - *"Therefore God gave them over in the sinful desires of their hearts to sexual impurity for the degrading of their bodies with one another."*

2 Cor 12:21 - *"I am afraid that when I come again my God will humble me before you, and I will be grieved over many who have sinned earlier and have not repented of the impurity, sexual sin and debauchery in which they have indulged."*

2. Lasciviousness

Rom 13:13 - *Let us behave decently, as in the daytime, not in orgies and drunkenness, not in sexual immorality and debauchery, not in dissension and jealousy.*

2 Peter 2:18-19 - *For their mouth empty, boastful words and, by appealing to the lustful desires of sinful human nature, they entice people who are just escaping from those who live in error.*

3. Other sins of the appetite - Drunkenness - Revelings

Rom 13:13 - *Let us behave decently, as in the daytime, not in orgies and drunkenness, not in sexual immorality and debauchery, not in dissension and jealousy.*

1 Peter 4:3 - *For you have spent enough time in the past doing what pagans choose to do-living in debauchery, lust, drunkenness, orgies, carousing and detestable idolatry.*

2. Religious Sins

1. Idolatry

(1). Bowing before an idol created by man's hands (Rom 1:23)

(2). Also covetousness is idolatry (Col 3:5)

2. Sorcery - use of witchcraft, drugs, spells

3. Sins of the disposition (personality)

1. Enmities - hostile feelings such as Herod and Pilate had (Luke 23:12)

2. Strife - wrangling and contentions such as Corinth had (1 Cor 1:11, 12)

3. Jealousies - the feeling that Jews had when they saw the multitudes attracted by Paul (Acts 13:45).

4. Wraths - uncontrolled anger like Silversmith riot at Ephesus (Acts 13:45).

5. Factions - a personally ambitious rivalry among those who proclaimed Christ of Faction, not sincerely (Phil 1:17).

6. Divisions - standing apart, a dissension such as those in Rom 16:17 had.

7. Parties

(1). Dissension crystallized into parties

(2). Used elsewhere to describe parties at Corinth and destructive

heresies by Peter @ Peter 2:1.

8. Envy - Bitter feelings felt by those who delivered Jesus to Pilate for envy (Matt 27:18)
4. And such like
 1. Not a complete list
 2. Similar things included by the same principle

3. CONCLUSION:

1. That we must fight the battle and decide to walk by the Spirit and not fulfill the lust of the flesh.
2. That love is not in opposition to the law-keeping, but rather is the fulfillment of the law.
3. That our new freedom under grace should not be interpreted to mean we are free to take an occasion to the flesh and commit sins like the ones Paul puts on his "don't list".

GALATIANS 5:22-26

INTRODUCTION: In last week's lesson, Paul discussed the limits of the Christian's freedom in Christ.

Paul said a Christian's freedom is limited to the extent that such freedom may not be used as an occasion to the flesh in drunkenness, fornications, jealousy, and such like.

Paul also noted that under grace, love leads us to fulfill the law, instead of violating it.

In today's lesson, Paul turns from the negative to the positive things.

1. **QUESTION:** If a person doesn't manifest the fruit of the spirit on Paul's, "DO LIST", does this mean that person is not a Christian?
2. Let's see what the evidence of the passage suggests:
 1. Had the Galatian Christians been manifesting the fruit of the Spirit?
 1. Paul had to urge them, "If we live by the Spirit, by the Spirit let us also walk" (5:25).
 2. Also Paul had to admonish them, "Let us not become conceited..." (5:26)
 2. What is the fruit of the Spirit? (5:22)
 1. What is **LOVE**?
 - (a). There is more than one word used in Greek for "love".
 - (b). This particular word for "love" is used in John 3:16 and I Cor 13.
 - (1). The unconquerable benevolence of God.
 - (2). An act of the mind as well as the heart; that is, both will & emotion
 2. What kind of **JOY** is this?
 - (a). What kind of Joy is indicated in Romans 14:1; I Thess 2:19, 20, and Hebrews 12:2 when this same word is used?
 - (b). This is the kind of joy which is based in God and which minds not earthly things.
 3. What kind of **PEACE** is this?
 - (a). How does Paul use it in Phil. 4:7?
 - (b). This is the serenity of heart which comes from trusting God.
 4. What kind of **LONGSUFFERING** is this?
 - (a). How does I Peter 3:20 use this word?
 - (b). This is the kind of conquering patience exercised by God.
 5. What does Paul mean by **KINDNESS**?
 - (a). How did Jesus use this same word in Matt 11:30 (my yoke is easy...)
 - (b). This has the quality of gentleness which does not chafe nor gall.
 6. What is **GOODNESS**?
 - (a). Paul elsewhere puts it in company with righteousness and truth (Eph 5:9).
 - (b). Goodness seems to represent the deep quality of moral and spiritual rightness, with a touch of kindness.
 7. What is **FAITHFULNESS**?
 - (a). Fidelity, trustworthiness.
 - (b). Reliability

8. What is **MEEKNESS**?
 - (a). This is a hard word to translate as to its exact meaning.
 - (b). What shades of meaning are expressed in other uses of this same word?
 - (1). James 1:21 - Receive with meekness the implanted word. (Teachable?)
 - (2). I Cor 4:21? - Shall I come with a rod or in love and a Spirit of gentleness?
9. What is **SELF-CONTROL**?
 - (a). Another translation is “temperance.”
 - (b). How did Paul use the word elsewhere?
 - (1). I Cor 9:25 - An athlete striving in the game exercises self-control. (Disciplined training).
 - (2). I Cor 7:9 - One must exercise “continency (self-control) in matters of sex and if he cannot, he should marry, rather than burn in passion.
3. What does Paul mean, “There is no law against the Fruit of the Spirit?” (5:23).
 1. Unlike the works of the flesh, there is no prohibition against such qualities.
 2. No limit on how much they can practice these things.
4. Why does Paul bring up the subject of crucifying the flesh (5:24)?
 1. What is crucifying the flesh?
 - (a). Isn’t this what Paul is asking them to do when they give up the works of the flesh?
 - (b). Does Romans 6:2-6 give us insight into the process?
 2. Do we crucify the flesh before or after we become Christians?
 - (a). Paul says, “And they that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh” (5:24) (The aorist tense specified a particular point of action when this occurred).
 - (b). What of the flesh do we crucify?
 - (1). Passions (5:24) - This word always has a bad meaning in the New Testament. Note Romans 1:26 and I Thess 4:5).
 - (2). Lusts (5:24) - This word is not always bad (Note the good “desires” of Jesus and Paul in Acts 22:15 and Phil 1:23).

3. CONCLUSION:

1. That when one becomes a Christian, he should “crucify the flesh” at that time (5:24).
2. That the “fruit of the Spirit” should become characteristic of his life; that is, love, joy, peace.....
3. That if such fruit is not forthcoming, he should be admonished to produce it, as Paul admonished the Galatians.
4. That just as the presence of the “works of the flesh” in one’s life showed he was not “walking by the Spirit” (5:16), even so the absence of the “fruits of the Spirit” casts grave doubts as to whether or not one has “crucified the flesh.”

GALATIANS 6: 1 - 5

INTRODUCTION: In Chapter 5, Paul sketched the flesh and the Spirit as two opposite ways of living.

Paul pointed out that the person who is Christ's, will crucify the flesh and will not therefore manifest the works of the flesh. On the other hand, that same person will bear the fruit of the Spirit.

In Chapter 6, Paul approaches some practical points of how this new life in the Spirit will be manifested between brothers in Christ.

1. **QUESTION** - Is there a conflict in this lesson between each man bearing his own burden and each man bearing the other's burden?
2. What does the evidence of the passage indicate?
 1. How do we bear one another's burdens (6:2)?
 1. What kind of a burden is this?
 1. It is something we are "overtaken" in (6:1).
 2. It is something called a "trespass" (6:1).
 - (1). Rom 11:11-12 - The Gentiles experienced a fall or trespass which brought salvation to the Gentiles.
 - (1) It is often a sin, fault, a breach of God's will.
 3. How is this word "burden" used elsewhere in scripture?
 - (1). Matt 20:12 - Burden of work
 - (2). Acts 15:28 - Religious burden
 - (3). 2 Cor 5:4 - Distressing burden of life.
 - (4). 1 Tim 5:16 - Burden of supporting family
 2. Who should help?
 1. Ye who are spiritual (6:1).
 - (1). Those who walk by the Spirit (5:16, 25).
 - (2). Those who do not fulfill the lust of the flesh (5:16)
 - (3). Those who manifest the fruit of the Spirit (5:22-23)
 2. Could we classify ourselves as "Spiritual"?
 3. What should the Spiritual do?
 1. Restore such a one (6:1). Mending nets (Matt 4:21). Perfectly knit together (1 Cor 1:10).
 2. What do we do when we restore someone who has trespassed?
 - (1). Mend, knit them back into fellowship.
 4. How should the restoring be done?
 1. It should be done in a spirit of gentleness while we look to ourselves (6:1).
 2. Why should it be done that way?
 - (1). We too are in danger and might be tempted (6:1).
 5. Why should we bear one another's burdens?
 1. We do it in order to fulfill the law of Christ (6:2).

John 13:34 - *A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another.*
 2. How will each man bear his own burden? (6:5)

1. What kind of burden is this? This is a different Greek word from vs. 2.
 1. Acts 27:10 - Ship's cargo, lading.
 2. Matt 11:28, 30 - We are heavy laden, but Christ's burden is light.
 3. Matt 23:4 - Religious burdens laid on others.
2. How does bearing burdens affect how a man feels about himself?
 1. If a man thinks himself to be something when is nothing, he deceives himself. (Helping someone else does NOT lighten my burden.)
 2. Let each man prove his own work, and then shall he have his glorying in regard of himself alone, and not of his neighbor. (6:4).
 - (1). Only by proving one's self and bearing one's own burden, can we have any ground for glorying.

3. **CONCLUSION:**

1. That spiritual Christians have the responsibility of helping others bear burdens of trespasses by:
 1. Gently remembering they also might be tempted.
 2. Fulfilling the law of Christ who bore burdens for us we could not bear alone.
2. That we all still must bear our own burdens in the sense that:
 1. Others' faults will not excuse us, even though we, compare favorably with their lives.
 2. Each man ultimately will be accountable for himself.

IF YOU HAVE TIME:

4. Are you spiritual enough to restore someone?
5. What kind of burdens must we bear for ourselves?

GALATIANS 6: 6 - 10

INTRODUCTION: Paul has sketched out two ways of walking, that is, by the flesh or by the Spirit.

In Chapter 6, Paul has pointed out the obligation spiritual brethren have to help each other bear burdens occasioned by transgressions.

On the other hand, Paul also recognizes the ultimate burden of a man's accountability before God, remains each man's own burden.

In today's lesson, Paul continues to elaborate on the practical side of what it means to walk by the Spirit.

1. **QUESTION** - To what is Paul referring when he says, "You'll reap what you sow?"
2. What does the evidence of the passage indicate?
 1. What does "Communication" have to do with it (6:6)?
 1. Who does the communicating? (The one who is taught in the word - 6:6)
 2. Who receives the communication? (The one who did the teaching - 6:6).
 3. What kind of communication is this?
 1. The same word, used elsewhere in scripture means "to share."
 - (1). Phil 4:15 and Rom 15:27 - Material aid.
 - (2). I Tim 5:22 - Another man's sin.
 - (3). I Peter 4:13 - The sufferings of Christ.
 - (4). Gal 2:9 - A common work shared with the right hands of fellowship.
 2. What does the context indicate they were to share?
 - (1). They were to share "all good things" (6:6).
 - (2). Many times this word refers to physical blessings. (See Luke 12:19; 16:25).
 2. To what spiritual principle does Paul appeal?
 1. What was the principle?
 1. God is not mocked (defied, make a fool of) (6:7).
 2. Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap (6:7).
 2. Why does Paul tell them not to be deceived (6:7)?
 1. Does this mean they had already been deceived or were in danger of becoming deceived?
 2. The Greek form indicates they needed to "quit being deceived."
 3. How does this spiritual principle work?
 1. If we sow unto our own flesh, we shall of the flesh reap corruption (6:8).
 1. How does one sow to the flesh?
 - (1). We do this by ignoring the fruit of the Spirit (5:22).
 - (2). By doing the works of the flesh (5:19)?
 2. How does one reap corruption?
 - (1). The works of the flesh will cause one not to inherit the kingdom of God (5:21).
 - (2). If we miss the spiritual, then all we have left is corruption when the flesh decays.

2. If we sow to the Spirit, we shall of the Spirit reap eternal life (6:8).
 1. How does one sow to the Spirit?
 - (1). By refusing to manifest the works of the flesh (5:19).
 - (2). By manifesting the fruit of the Spirit (5:22).
 2. How does one reap eternal life?
 - (1). The things of the Spirit last eternally.
 - (2). When do we reap eternal Life? After judgment!
4. How does this principle work in a practical way?
 1. In well doing (6:9).
 1. Had they been weary in well doing? (The Greek form indicates the meaning to be, "Don't start being weary.")
 2. Why were they not to be weary in well doing?
 - (1). In due season they would reap (6:9). When is this?
 - (2). If they did not faint, they would reap (6:9). Faint? - Give up?
 2. In good work (6:10).
 1. Towards all men (6:10), especially toward them that are of the household of faith.
 2. When is this work to be done?
 - (1). As we have opportunity (6:10).

3. CONCLUSION

1. That the one who receives teaching should share his physical blessings with the teacher.
2. That in such matters, God has a law which says, "You'll reap what you sow."
 1. If the flesh is sown (fornications, etc.), only corruption can be expected.
 2. If one sows to the Spirit, eternal life can be expected as a harvest.
3. That in the light of this spiritual law, we ought to:
 1. Not be weary in well doing.
 2. Help all men, especially those of the household of faith.

OTHER QUESTIONS (if you have time)

1. Does this Spiritual law apply to giving? (2 Cor 9:6-10: Luke 6:38)
2. Does this Spiritual law apply to forgiveness? (Matt 6:12)
3. Does it apply in other areas?

GALATIANS 6:11 - 18

INTRODUCTION: In the 6th Chapter, Paul has shown the practical implications of a man walking by the Spirit.

This spiritual man will bear his own burden, but will help others with their burdens whenever possible. He will sow to the Spirit and insure reaping eternal life.

In today's lesson, Paul attacks the Judaizers as having different motives from his.

1. **QUESTION** - What is the difference between Paul's motives and those of the circumcision party?
 1. What were the Judaizers' motives for wanting the Galatians to be circumcised?
 1. They wanted to make a "fair show" in the flesh (6:12).
 1. Literally to put a "fair show/good appearance" in the flesh (6:12).
 2. They wanted to not be persecuted for the cross of Christ (6:12). How would circumcision keep them from being persecuted?
 2. Paul was persecuted because he resisted circumcision.
 - (1). Note Acts 21:21 and Gal 2:3-5.
 - (2). Perhaps circumcising Gentiles would cut down the opposition from other Jews.
 3. Jews were tolerated by the ancient world to some extent; hence, if Christianity was just a small sect of Judaism, it might come under the same umbrella of tolerance.
 1. They wanted to glory in the Galatians' flesh (6:13). Meaning:
 1. It would show that a gentile Christian had to become a Jew by ceremonial conformity to the law, before he could be saved.
 2. It would keep the Galatian Christians subject to the Judaizing teachers. (See 4:17 also).
 2. Did the Judaizers really want the Galatians to keep the law of Moses?
 1. Apparently not.
 2. Not even the Judaizers who received circumcision kept the law themselves (6:13).
 - (1). Does Paul mean they didn't try to keep the law at all?
 - (2). Or does Paul mean they could not keep it perfectly? (Note 3:10; 5:3).
 - BB. What were Paul's motives in this conflict with the circumcision party?
 1. What did Paul glory in?
 1. He gloried in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. (6:14).
 2. Through the cross (6:14);
 - (1). The world had been crucified to Paul.
 - (2). Paul had been crucified to the world.
 2. How did Paul feel about circumcision?
 1. Neither circumcision nor uncircumcision was anything (6:15).
 2. What was more important to Paul than circumcision?
 - (1). Paul said a "new creature (creation)" was more important (6:15).

(Note Romans 6:2-4; Col 3:1-3; 2 Cor 6:17).

3. What "Rule" was Paul talking about in 6:16?
 1. How is this word used elsewhere in scripture?
 - (1). 2 Cor 10:13, 15 - A measure.
 - (2). Phil 3:16 - a rule of conduct or doctrine.
 2. What seems to be the "Rule" in this lesson?
 - (1). They were not to walk by circumcision (6:15).
 - (2). They were to walk (6:14, 15):
 - (a). As new creatures (creation).
 - (b). As those who gloried in the cross.

CONCLUSION:

3. That Paul unmasked the Judaizers as:
 1. Not interested in the law, because not even they kept it.
 2. Interested in:
 1. Looking good before the rest of Judaism.
 2. Dictating to the Galatians that they had to accept circumcision.
 3. Escaping persecution for the cross by allowing Christianity to be only a minor sect of Judaism.
4. That Paul's motives (unlike the Judaizers') were:
 1. To urge them to be new creatures (creation) and walk only by that rule which had no reference to circumcision.
 2. To have them glory only in the cross of Christ.

OTHER QUESTIONS (If you have time):

1. What does Paul's remark about "large letters" suggest (6:11)?
 1. Paul ordinarily used a stenographer. (See Romans 16:22; 2 Thess 3:17; 1 Cor 16:21; Col 4:18).
 2. Does this indicate:
 - (1). Special attention for the last verses Paul wrote?
 - (2). Paul's infirmity of the flesh affected his eyes? (See 4:13, 15)
2. How was Paul "branded" on his body with the marks of Jesus (6:17)?
 1. Were those the marks left by Paul's physical sufferings for the Lord? (See 2 Cor 11)
3. Who is the "Israel of God" Paul mentions (6:16)?
 1. All Christians, Jew and Gentile?
 2. Just Jewish Christians in distinction from those Gentiles who walked by the rule?

REVIEW OVER GALATIANS

(Discuss the following questions in the light of the entire book).

1. Why did Paul feel the Judaizers were teaching a perverted gospel when they insisted on adding circumcision to it? (1:6)
2. Why did Titus become a “test case” on circumcision? (Chapter 2:3)
3. Why did Paul get excited about Peters not eating with Gentile Christians? (Chapter 2)
4. Why could men not be saved by the law? (Chapters 2 and 3)
5. If the law did not save, what purpose did it serve?
6. What did Paul’s allegory about Sarah and Hagar establish? (Chapter 4)
7. Do we mean the same thing Paul does when we say someone has “fallen from grace?” (Chapter 5)
8. How can Christians today be the seed of Abraham? (Chapter 3)