

Review:

Why this visit to Jerusalem is not the Jerusalem council visit (3rd) of Acts 15.

1. Crucial to Paul's argument here to refute the Judaizers (legalists) and their gospel of works is to present all the apostolic discussion related to the issue at hand as he writes. 49 AD.
2. A failure to cite the famine visit of Acts 11:26-30 (2nd) would leave a gap in his historical argument.
3. Paul went to Jerusalem because of a revelation, not as the result of a dissention and debate Acts 15:2.
4. This meeting covered in 2:1-10 is a private one while the Jerusalem council meeting was basically open therefore a public debate. Pastors from all over.
5. I believe that if this was the Jerusalem council visit Paul would have cited the decisions and conclusions they arrived at and sent out in a letter to the churches. Acts 15:23-29
6. I don't believe the next incident with Peter would have taken place after the Jerusalem council.

2:11-14 Paul's defense of the Gospel's application to life.

- gives a summary first then the details

Paul once again with this incident with Peter dramatically supports his claim to possess an authority equal to and independent of that of the other apostles.

Must keep in mind that here we have a shift in focus from what we have already covered:

- (1) a new issue--foods rather than circumcision;
- (2) a new area of the faith--Christian living rather than the basis of salvation;
- (3) a new subject-- Jewish liberty rather than the liberty of Gentile Christians.

2:11 Statement of Peter's guilt

But when Cephas came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned.

I opposed him ἀντίστημι basic to stand against, to set oneself against; to oppose

because he stood condemned. καταγινώσκω

- condemn, declare to be wrong, judge to be guilty

Summary vs:11

1. Peter's actions here when he came to Antioch, a Gentile area, had great impact on the believers' there.
2. Paul was quick to act decisively because he knew how extensive and detrimental this type of influence could be.
3. Peter was not ignorant of the truth, the principles of doctrine that are pertinent to Christian living.
4. The issue here is freedom of Jews to eat and fellowship with Gentile believers.
5. The hygiene and dietary regulations of the M/L were important to their lives as Jews.
 - had benefits from obedience to them, many health benefits.
 - therefore were used to demonstrate volition, sin, and spirituality (relationship)
6. Peter stood condemned in 2 ways:
 - #1 self - condemned by his own conscience; he knew what was right and failed to apply it; succumbed to the pressure from others.
 - #2 condemned in the sight of others - as a result of the evaluation of his actions.
7. Failure to resist compromising BD puts the believer on the gory road, headed for discipline.
8. The P/T has the responsibility to expose false doctrine that infiltrates the congregation.

2:12 Details the background of Peter's hypocrisy

We find first here what Peter was up to, what he did.

For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles;

When Paul says he used to eat he puts the verb for eating in the imperfect tense, indicating that this was Peter's usual pattern, that is to fellowship with the Gentile believers, as fellow believers in Christ.

Peter makes a change when the delegation arrived on the scene.

but when they came, he began to withdraw and hold himself aloof,

Reason given - personal fear: fearing the party of the circumcision.

2:13 Peter's actions influenced others

The rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy, that is the Jews in the church at Antioch.

What's happening here with these leaders who should be setting an example?