

# IF YOU, BEING A JEW...

## GALATIANS 2:11-16

by Avram Yehoshua

[The Seed of Abraham](#)

Paul wrote the Letter to the Galatians about 53 AD when he was in Ephesus, which is in the western part of modern day Turkey. The region of Galatia, for it wasn't a city, but a province, covered north central Turkey. Ephesus was about 300 miles (480 km) west of Ancyra, a major city of Galatia situated in mid-Asia Minor (Turkey).

From the very beginning of the Letter to the Galatians to its end the Apostle Paul rebukes and teaches the Galatians because they had been greatly deceived, and believed the lie that the (male) Gentile believer needed to be (physically, covenantally) circumcised<sup>1</sup> and keep Mosaic Law *along* with faith in Jesus in order to be justified or saved. Adding anything, though, to the finished Work of Redemption in Jesus, even God's holy Mosaic Law,<sup>2</sup> *nullifies* that Work (Gal. 5:1-4).

One can understand Paul's deep frustration when he speaks of the Galatians turning from the grace of Messiah Yeshua (Jesus) to a 'different Gospel,' which Paul calls a perverted Gospel (Gal. 1:6-7). He twice pronounces a curse upon those who taught it (Gal. 1:8-9), and later asks the Galatians, who had bewitched them into believing it?! (Gal. 3:1) That false Gospel would sever the Galatian from his hope of salvation.

Paul also makes it crystal clear that the Gospel he taught wasn't learned from any man, but came to him by revelation from Yeshua (Gal. 1:17-18), and also, that it was the *same* Gospel the Apostles in Jerusalem taught. This has tremendous ramifications for Christian lifestyle today due to the fact that Christianity has misunderstood the Letter to the Galatians in relation to Mosaic Law.

### Before the Confrontation

Galatians Two opens with Paul saying that he had previously gone to Jerusalem and presented his Gospel to the other Apostles to make sure that it was correct and that he hadn't preached 'in vain' (Gal. 2:2), meaning that he hadn't preached the wrong Gospel, especially when it came to the issue of Gentile circumcision. He writes that "James, Cephas<sup>3</sup> and John" gave Barnabas and him "the right hand of fellowship," confirming to Paul that his Gospel was identical to theirs. Paul must have been grateful for the confirmation and not a little relieved when he was assured that his Gospel was in line with theirs, for they had preceded Paul and knew Yeshua both 'in the flesh' and in His glorified form *after* the resurrection.

In Gal. 2:3 Paul presents his second proof to the Gentile Galatians that they should *not* be circumcised.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Gal. 2:3, 7-8, 9, 12; 5:2-3, 6, 11; 6:12-13 (twice), 15. There is only one physical circumcision in Scripture, which God began with Father Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14). Scripture speaks of this circumcision being done to Gentiles in order to be one with Israel (Ex. 12:43-49). The Galatians were doing this physical circumcision.

<sup>2</sup> Deuteronomy 4:5-8; Rom. 7:12, 14.

<sup>3</sup> Cephas is Peter's Grecianized Hebrew name of Kayfa.

He relates that when he was in Jerusalem, Titus, a Gentile believer who had come with him, *was not required by the Apostles to be circumcised*. This, of course, is what the Council of Acts 15 had decreed five years earlier (48 AD). Therefore, the Galatians should realize that not only Paul, but *the Mother Church in Jerusalem* didn't teach nor want Gentiles to be circumcised, so why had the Galatians listened to those false teachers?

Paul calls them false brethren who came in to spy out their *liberty* in Messiah, which liberty speaks of the Gentiles not needing to be circumcised in order to be saved or justified, and in order to be *one* with their Jewish brothers who believed in Yeshua—to make sure they were included in the Kingdom of Yeshua's Israel. At that time Judah was still a nation and seen as the Chosen People of God. Those Galatian Gentiles, wanting to make sure that they were included with God's Chosen People, were deceived into believing that faith in Yeshua wasn't enough—they had to have faith in Yeshua plus keep the Law, *symbolized in circumcision*, for entry into the Kingdom and eternal life. Then Paul presents his third proof, a confrontation that he had with Peter, most likely before Acts 15, over the very question of the place of the non-circumcised Gentile believer in the Kingdom of Messiah.

## The Confrontation

In Galatians 2:11-15 Paul rebukes Peter for being a hypocrite (v. 13). Paul writes that Peter had been eating with the Gentile believers in Antioch,<sup>4</sup> but when certain Jewish believers ('those of the circumcision,' v. 12; i.e. Jewish believers, cf. 2:9; the false brethren) from Jerusalem got there, they influenced Peter to not eat with the Gentiles and to separate from them. Peter's Jewish believing friends, including Barnabas (v. 13), joined him in the *perversion of the Gospel* and the hypocrisy (cf. vv. 14, 16). Paul castigates Peter for being a Jew, *but acting like a Gentile* (v. 14). Paul writes:

<sup>11</sup>“Now when Peter had come to Antioch I withstood him to his face because he was to be blamed, <sup>12</sup>for before certain men came from James, *he would eat with the Gentiles*, but when they came *he withdrew and separated himself*, fearing those who were of the *circumcision*. <sup>13</sup>And the rest of the Jewish believers also *played the hypocrite* with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy.” (Galatians 2:11-13)

<sup>14</sup>“But when I saw that they were not straightforward about *the Truth of the Gospel*, I said to Peter before them all, ‘If you, being a Jew, *live in the manner of Gentiles, and not as the Jews, why do you compel Gentiles to live as Jews?*’ <sup>15</sup>We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles, <sup>16</sup>knowing that a man is not justified by the Works of the Law, but by faith in Yeshua the Messiah, *even we have believed in Messiah Yeshua, that we might be justified by faith in Messiah*, and not by the Works of the Law. For by the Works of the Law no flesh shall be justified.” (Gal. 2:14-16; cf. Rom. 3:20)

Noted conservative scholar John Gresham Machen (1881-1937), writing on the passage in the *New Bible Commentary*, states that Paul would not allow Peter to present a *false Gospel*:

*“To Paul had been revealed the full implications of the gospel; to him the freedom of the Gentiles was a matter of principle, and when principle was at stake he never kept silent.”<sup>5</sup>*

<sup>4</sup> Antioch is in northern Lebanon and about 230 miles north-north east of Jerusalem.

<sup>5</sup> Moisés Silva, *Galatians*, New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition; ed. D. A Carson. et al.; Accordance electronic ed. (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1994), p. 1211; J. Gresham Machen, *The Origin of Paul's Religion* (Macmillan, 1921), p. 102.

Machen, in speaking of Paul having received the ‘full implications of the gospel,’ and ‘the freedom of the Gentiles,’ implies that the Apostle Paul taught that Christians were ‘free’ from Mosaic Law, and that only Paul knew this—not the other Apostles. This is a common Christian interpretation of the passage because Paul speaks of justification by faith in Yeshua, not by ‘the Works of the Law;’ a euphemism for observing Mosaic Law, which is symbolized in physical covenantal, biblical circumcision (Genesis 17:10-14; Exodus 12:43f.). The Galatians had been deceived into believing they needed circumcision in order to be justified for salvation and assured that they were included with Israel—God’s Chosen People.

Machen, along with many theologians, believed that the other Jewish Apostles who kept Torah (Mosaic Law; Acts 21:20) were wrong. Yet, Paul himself writes that his Gospel was identical to that of James, Peter and John’s, which included the walking out their faith in Yeshua through Mosaic Law (Acts 21:20-24; cf. 15:21). Also, it would seem extremely strange that *only Paul* knew the ‘full implications’ of the Gospel, which means that Yeshua had intentionally withheld that knowledge from all His other Apostles and His own half-brother, James, but this is what the Church teaches—Paul’s Gospel ‘set them free from Mosaic Law’ because Christians are ‘under Grace,’<sup>6</sup> and only Paul knew it. How very strange, indeed!

Machen also states that “when *principle* was at stake Paul *never kept silent*,” but one has to wonder what Machen thought when James, the half-brother of Yeshua and the Prince<sup>7</sup> of the Assembly of all the Jewish believers in Jerusalem, including the Apostles, led the Apostle Paul to take **the Nazarite Vow** and *Paul remained silent!* Wasn’t *principle* at stake here?

The Nazarite Vow is “*the most Mosaic Law thing*” that any Jew could do because the essence of the Vow speaks of the person being totally and unreservedly dedicated to God and His Way of living (i.e. Mosaic Law). The Vow placed the person on the same level of holiness as the High Priest of Israel, meaning that it was the most significant and holy vow of Mosaic Law that one could take (Num. 6:1-21).<sup>8</sup> That’s why James wanted Paul to take it; to show everyone that he still kept Mosaic Law. It also required the person to *sacrifice* at least three animals—one for a sin sacrifice, another for a total dedication (the ‘whole burnt’) sacrifice, and the third for a fellowship or oneness with God peace sacrifice (Num. 6:14).<sup>9</sup> Paul agreed to pay for the animal sacrifices of the four men that he had joined, who were also taking the Nazarite Vow.

James tells Paul to take it because of its holiness in the eyes of the Jewish believers so that they could see that Paul was totally devoted to God *and His Torah*, and realize that the things they had heard about him, that he taught Jews *not* to keep Mosaic Law and not to circumcise their baby boys, was malicious, false

---

Machen was quite a respected scholar and ‘boat-rocker.’ See [John Gresham Machen](#).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Acts 20:24; Rom. 3:24; 4:4, 16; 5:2, 15, 20, but also compare Acts 11:23; 13:43; 15:11; Rom. 6:1, 15; 11:5.

<sup>7</sup> In Hebrew the word נָשִׂי (nasi) means prince. James was the recognized head of all the Jewish believers in Jerusalem, including the Apostles, because he was the (oldest) half-brother of Yeshua (Gal. 1:19; Mt. 13:55; Mk. 6:3; cf. Acts 1:14; 15:13-19f.; 1st Cor. 9:5), and consequently, ‘next in line’ for the kingship of Israel, after Yeshua. Note also how, in Gal. 2:9, Paul places James first, or in the position of prominence, before both Peter and John. Most English Scriptures call James the ‘president’ of the Council.

<sup>8</sup> See [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#), *Observe No Such Thing!*, pp. 151-160, for why the Nazarite Vow placed the Nazarite on the same level, or even a greater level of holiness than the High Priest of Israel. Also, see p. 168f., note 677 for understanding that Paul and the others were actually entering into the preliminary seven day process of cleansing or purifying themselves in order to begin the Nazarite Vow, which at that time usually lasted either 30, 60 or 100 days.

<sup>9</sup> Some Christians, seeing that Paul was stopped from making animal sacrifices before the Vow was over, say that God stopped it to show us that Mosaic sacrifice was done away with at the cross. Yet, nowhere does Paul nor anyone else say that it was wrong for him to enter into the Nazarite Vow or sacrifice animals, something we’d expect from either Paul or Luke or James, etc., if God had wanted us to know that He had stopped it to tell us that Mosaic Law had ended at the cross.

and slanderous (Acts 21:21). James says to Paul:

<sup>23</sup>“Therefore, do what we tell you: We have *four men who have taken a Vow*. <sup>24</sup>Take them and *be purified with them, and pay their expenses* so that they may *shave their heads*, and that *all may know* that those things of which they were informed concerning you are *nothing*, but that you yourself also walk orderly **and keep the Law**.” (Acts 21:23-24)

The reason why *Christian* theologians and commentators say this was the Nazarite Vow that Paul was entering into is because of the phrase, ‘shave their heads’ (v. 24). The Nazarite Vow is the only vow that speaks of this.<sup>10</sup>

If Paul *really* thought that Mosaic Law had been nullified for Christians *this would have been the perfect time and place for a showdown!* ‘Everyone’ was in Jerusalem—James and all the Jewish Apostles and all the Jewish believers. Paul could have ‘set all of them straight!’ Yet, Paul doesn’t even open his mouth. He says *nothing* to James, remains *silent*, and enters into the preliminary purifying stage of the Mosaic Law’s Nazarite Vow.

Scripture really doesn’t get any clearer than this—Paul took the Nazarite Vow to show everyone *that he kept Mosaic Law* as God’s way to walk out his faith in Yeshua. Either that or he laid down a most cherished principle of his (according to Machen and Christianity), that Mosaic Law wasn’t for Christians, so as not to cause a stir? Machen was right—if *principle was involved*, Paul would have fought it. As he didn’t fight the taking of the Vow *nor did he ever say anything against it*—either in Acts 21 or in any of his letters referring back to the incident in Acts 21, it’s a biblical fact that Paul took the Nazarite Vow to show everyone, including us today, that he ‘walked orderly **and kept the Law**.’

It’s hard to argue with the only authoritative and divine *history* of the early Church that is the Book of Acts, but most Christians are so convinced (bewitched?) that Paul taught a “No Law! Gospel,” that many of them say that Paul was only being ‘a Jew to the Jews.’<sup>11</sup> Some interpret the passage in Acts to mean that Paul didn’t say anything because in Jerusalem ‘with the Jews,’ he would keep Mosaic Law, but he wouldn’t keep it outside of Israel nor teach it to his Gentile converts. This ‘interpretation’ of Acts 21:23-24 is preposterous because its underlying assumption is based on Paul being a hypocrite, the very thing he accused Peter of.

In this case Paul would be sinning by taking the most holy vow of Mosaic Law only to appease James and

---

<sup>10</sup> “Then the Nazirite *shall shave his consecrated head* at the door of the Tabernacle of Meeting, and shall take the hair from his consecrated head and put it on the fire which is under the sacrifice of the peace offering. And the priest shall take the boiled shoulder of the ram, one unleavened cake from the basket, and one unleavened wafer, and put them upon the hands of the Nazirite *after he has shaved his consecrated hair*.” (Num. 6:18-19)

<sup>11</sup> The phrase is, ‘to the Jews I became as a Jew;’ 1st Cor. 9:20. Some interpret it to mean that Paul that Mosaic Law didn’t matter to Paul, but that’s not what the Apostle said. ‘To those without Law’ (i.e. the Gentiles) Paul meant that he *would associate with them*; something he *never* would have done as an unbelieving Pharisee (Acts 26:5). *This* is why he rebukes Peter—for *not associating* with the Gentile Christians, when Peter knew better (Gal. 2:11-15; Acts 10:15, 28, 34-35). It doesn’t mean that Paul or Peter ate unclean meat, as some wrongly teach, as there’s no mention of what food they had been eating in Galatians Two. Paul’s remarks in 1st Cor. 9 also mean that he *would relate to Gentiles on their own terms*, bringing the Gospel to them in ways they could understand, speaking of what the God of Israel had done for them in Yeshua (see Acts 17:15-30f., where Paul doesn’t voice his thoughts about their perverse idolatry, but speaks of Messiah to them in a way they could understand, for they didn’t know the Law as the Jews did). It didn’t mean that he would sin against God in the process, by breaking the Sabbath, eating pig, keeping Easter or ‘living like a Gentile sinner,’ as he writes (Gal. 2:15; 1st Tim. 5:22). To the Jew, who knew the Law, Paul spoke in terms of the promised Messiah; that He had come, and of their need to be forgiven of their sin by His atoning and substitutionary sacrifice, etc. (cf. Rom. 2:1f.). Note also in v. 21 that Paul speaks of being ‘under Law toward Christ,’ which means that he kept Torah ‘in Messiah Yeshua.’

John, etc., and so lying in that he would keep Mosaic Law in Jerusalem, but not in Athens. The taking of the Nazarite Vow meant that he would keep God's Sabbath and Feasts and dietary laws, etc., wherever he was. He would not only be lying to all the Jews there, but also to any Gentiles who had come with him to Jerusalem (cf. Acts 21:27-29). The very reason that Paul took the Nazarite Vow was to show everyone that the false charges against him, that he didn't keep Mosaic Law and that Jews shouldn't circumcise their sons, was just that—false (Acts. 21:21). Lying and being a deceiving hypocrite, though, is something that the Apostle Paul would never do or be, which means that he actually kept Mosaic Law as his biblical lifestyle, whether he was in Jerusalem or Athens.<sup>12</sup>

The Church's "No Law! Paul" is the creation and heresy of the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>13</sup> Christians don't realize that their "No Law!" Paul is a heresy of Catholicism, and also, that the Reformers, like Luther, who began the Protestant churches, grew up Roman Catholic and took "No Law! Paul" with them when they left the Church of Rome. All the Apostles, however, including Paul, kept all Mosaic Law that applied to them. If not, why did Paul take the Mosaic Law's holiest vow—the Nazarite Vow? Certainly not to be, 'a Jew to the Jews.' Also, Acts 21:20-24 was the second time that Paul had taken the Nazarite Vow. The first time was in Cenchrea (Acts 18:18), a seaport near Corinth, Greece, which is nowhere near Jerusalem, so he wasn't trying to impress or deceive any Jews, *and he initiated it himself. Obviously*, Paul kept Mosaic Law and he taught it to his Gentile converts for their lifestyle (cf. 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 11:1).<sup>14</sup>

As for the other Apostles, they knew Yeshua before His death, and had also seen Him alive from the dead for 40 days *after* the resurrection in which the Word of God specifically mentions that Yeshua *taught them about the Kingdom.* As we don't see any Scripture about Mosaic Law being set aside for the Gentile (or the Jew) in the entire Book of Acts, which covers the history of the early Church (30–64 AD), it's evident that Yeshua *didn't* teach the Apostles that Mosaic Law was nullified (Acts 1:1-4), and it should be equally obvious that Paul wouldn't teach it, either, since his Gospel was identical to theirs.

Yeshua's Body is not divided and there is only one Flock, not two (John 10:14-16). Machen's, and ultimately Christianity's interpretation of New Testament Scripture that is used to nullify Mosaic Law is wrong, and in fact, it's anti-scriptural and anti-God.<sup>15</sup> The Pharisees, too, had their Scriptures to support

---

<sup>12</sup> See 1st Cor. 5:6-8 where Paul exhorts the Corinthians to keep Passover, and also, read [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21, Observe No Such Thing!](#) p. 152f., to understand that the phrase, found in Acts 21:25 (KJV and NKJV) does not negate Mosaic Law, but speaks of Gentiles refraining from being circumcised.

<sup>13</sup> See Samuele Bacchiocchi's Christian classic, [From Sabbath to Sunday, Rome and the Origin of Sunday](#), p. 98f. and my one page handout, [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#).

<sup>14</sup> Paul desired to keep 'the coming (*Mosaic*) feast in Jerusalem' (Acts 18:21). In Acts 22:12; 23:1-6, Paul backs down from speaking harshly against the High Priest, citing Mosaic Law; Ex. 22:8). He speaks highly of Mosaic Law in Acts 24:10-18; 25:8; 26:6-8, 18, 20-23; and in 28:17-20, Paul speaks of having done nothing against Mosaic Law nor that it had been invalidated by Yeshua. See also Rom. 3:31; 7:7, 12, 14, 16, 22, where Paul states that the Law is established by faith in Messiah, and he speaks highly of Mosaic Law, and 1st Cor. 5:6-8; 7:17-19; 2nd Cor. 12:16-18. There are also a number of places in First Corinthians where Paul uses Mosaic Law to support his points. This would have been meaningless if Mosaic Law had been done away with:

1. Paul encourages the Corinthians to keep 'the Feast' (1st Cor. 5:6-8). This can only be Passover—The Feast of Unleavened Bread as he's just said to the Corinthians to be unleavened bread (Ex. 12:8-20; Lev. 23:6).
2. He sums up his ability to receive funds from the Corinthians by citing the Law (1st Cor. 9:8-9f., don't muzzle the ox; cf. Dt. 25:4).
3. He tells them that women should not speak in the assembly, again citing the Law (1st Cor. 14:34-35).
4. In 1st Cor. 16:8 Paul speaks of staying at Ephesus until Pentecost, which is from the Greek word for the Mosaic Law's holy day of *Shavu'ot* (the Feast of Weeks; Ex. 34:22; Lev. 23:15-22; Num. 28:26; Dt. 16:9-10, 16). Why would Paul 'note time' to *Gentiles* by an 'outdated' Jewish feast unless he still kept the Law and taught it to them? (cf. Phil. 3:17; 4:9; 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 11:1)

their teachings, but we know what Yeshua thought of them and their teachings (Mt. 15:1f., 16:6f.).

The altercation that Paul had with Peter wasn't about whether the Gentiles should keep Mosaic Law or not, but whether the Gentiles were just as accepted by God, and 'one' with Israel, as Peter was, despite their not being circumcised.

## *Mercurial Peter*

Paul states that Peter was being a hypocrite because he stopped eating with the Gentiles and separated himself from them (Gal. 2:13). 'Separation,' then, is the key to understanding the passage. This "not eating with a *brother*" and separating himself from him is classic Pharisaism, and why the Jewish Christians that came from Jerusalem had to be Pharisees who had come to believe in Yeshua (Gal. 2:12), but who still clung to the Pharisaic understanding that justification was earned by keeping Mosaic Law, symbolized in physical covenantal circumcision. According to them the Gentiles needed to be circumcised and keep the Law for justification/salvation *along with* faith in Yeshua (Acts 15:1, 5).

Of course, the traditional Pharisees, whom Yeshua scathingly called hypocrites and a brood of vipers,<sup>16</sup> would never dream of eating with a Gentile, but few Christians realize that they wouldn't even eat with their Jewish brethren who weren't Pharisees. The Pharisaic version of defilement kept them from eating with, and associating with, Jews who weren't Pharisees. This practice still exists today among the spiritual descendants of the Pharisees known as the Orthodox Jews. The Orthodox Jew will not eat with another Jew except he be an Orthodox Jew, for fear of defilement.

The traditional, non-believing Pharisee is the 'Jew' that Paul is speaking of when he reprimands Peter 'for living in the manner of the Gentiles' (Gal. 2:14). This is exactly what a Pharisee, or an Orthodox Jew today, would say about his *Jewish brethren* who weren't as religious as he was. *The Pharisee would call his Jewish brother—a "Gentile!,"* because he didn't live as he, the Pharisee, lived in his skewed punctilious observance of Mosaic Law (cf. Mt. 23:23). Paul would certainly know this because he was a former Pharisee himself (and possibly now a believing Pharisee),<sup>17</sup> and had kept Mosaic Law *according to the strictest way possible*, as he himself admits.<sup>18</sup> Peter would also know it, along with all the Jews of his time, having grown up and lived in the land of Israel *and knowing the Pharisees and their 'social' ways*.

The last part of v. 14 has Paul asking Peter why Peter 'compelled' the Gentiles to act like (Pharisaic) Jews, in being *separated from the Jewish believers* (i.e. Peter and friends). Obviously, Peter didn't instruct the Gentiles in this. Paul is speaking about Peter's action of not eating with them and withdrawing from them, which was a greater form of teaching than if he had actually spoken it. The Gentiles were now 'acting like Pharisees' in that they were separated from their Jewish brethren.

Peter had been swayed to act like a Pharisee, and Paul, the former Pharisee, took Peter the fisherman to task for his ungodly behavior and his perversion of *the Truth of the Gospel*.<sup>19</sup> The verse in question, then,

---

<sup>15</sup> Luke states that during those 40 days Yeshua spoke "of the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God" (Acts 1:3). If Mosaic Law had been nullified at His death, Yeshua would have told the Apostles, but nowhere do any Apostles teach that in Acts. How very strange, indeed, if Mosaic Law had been declared invalid for Christians.

<sup>16</sup> Mt. 23:13, 14, 15, 33, etc.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Acts 23:6; where Paul speaks in the present tense, "I *am* a Pharisee!"

<sup>18</sup> Acts 26:5; Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:3-7.

<sup>19</sup> Also of note, it doesn't say that Peter, his Jewish friends and the Gentile believers were eating unclean meats, but only that Peter and they ate together. Some Christians use this passage to declare that they can eat anything, as long as they bless it, but that isn't the issue in this passage, and actually, all new Gentile believers would learn that eating unclean meats was prohibited for them, too (Acts 15:21), in their new lifestyle of following their Sav-

should be interpreted to read like this:

“But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the Truth of the Gospel, I said to Peter before them all, ‘If you, being a Jew, live in the manner of Gentiles (from the Pharisaic point of view, Peter was certainly living like a Gentile in just being around Gentiles and not being as punctilious as the Pharisees), and not as the (Pharisaic) Jews, why do you compel Gentiles to live as (Pharisaic) Jews?!’ (by forcing them to be separate from you and not allowing them to eat with you?!) Gal. 2:14

Mercurial Peter, at the instigation and prodding of the Pharisaic believing Jews from Jerusalem, had reverted back to his pre-Yeshua days, *where he wouldn't have dreamt of eating with a Gentile* (cf. Acts 10:28) because *God* had commanded Israel *to be separate* from them. In Mosaic Law, Israel wasn't to fellowship with, nor marry Gentiles because they were idolaters and Israel would stumble and fall into idolatry and sin against God.<sup>20</sup> God had called Israel to be a *separate* and holy people unto Himself.<sup>21</sup>

This was modified by Yeshua's death and resurrection, which allowed the Jewish believer to mingle with, and associate with (and eat with) the Gentile. *This is the Truth of the Gospel* that Paul speaks of in Galatians 2:14. Titus didn't have to be circumcised (Gal. 2:1-5)—the Gentile believer, without circumcision, was just as acceptable to God as the Jewish believer with circumcision was. It has nothing to do with the Gentile being free from Mosaic Law.

Five times in Galatians Paul speaks of the Truth,<sup>22</sup> which refers to the Truth of the Gospel—that the Gentiles should not be circumcised. In Gal. 5:1 he tells the Galatians to stand fast in *this* liberty or freedom. Christians think this means they don't have to keep Mosaic Law, but Paul is speaking against Gentiles keeping Mosaic Law, symbolized in circumcision, *for justification* (Gal. 5:1-5). Paul isn't coming against Mosaic Law *per se*, but its abuse as the Pharisaic means of salvation *along with* faith in Messiah. There is no eternal justification by the Law (Gal. 3:11). This is the central concern of Paul in his letter to the Galatians. It has nothing to do with nullifying Mosaic Law, but with not using it rightly.

This prelude, that Peter wasn't being 'straightforward about *the Truth of the Gospel*, is the one bookend for the passage, while v. 16, where Paul speaks about *not* being justified by the Works of Mosaic Law, but only by faith in Yeshua, is the other bookend of this Truth. The Gentiles were just as much accepted by the God of Israel as Peter was. Peter himself would make that very point on more than one occasion—that faith in Yeshua brought *both Jew and Gentile* into the Kingdom, not the keeping or Works (doing) of the Law.<sup>23</sup> Peter's circumcision didn't make it easier for him to enter the Kingdom nor did it make him better or more accepted than a believing Gentile who wasn't circumcised in the flesh. Therefore, Peter could, and should have continued to eat and fellowship with the Gentile believers in Antioch.<sup>24</sup>

This allowing of the Jewish believer to associate and fellowship with his Gentile believing counterpart didn't mean that all Mosaic Law was rejected and done away with by God, but that this specific aspect of it was *modified* after Messiah's death and resurrection.<sup>25</sup> It's an asterisk in the Law for *believing* Jews, but

---

ior Yeshua. For why the Mosaic dietary laws are still in effect for Christians, see [Law 102](#).

<sup>20</sup> From the days that Moses delivered Israel from Egyptian slavery until God destroyed the northern Kingdom for its idolatry in 721 BC, and the southern Kingdom for its idolatry in 586 BC, taking a few survivors into Babylonian captivity, the history of ancient Israel is riddled with their worship of the gods and goddesses of the pagan nations around them (cf. the Gold Calf fiasco, Ex. 32; their seduction by the daughters of Moab, Num. 25:1ff.; the Book of Judges, and the Prophets, who call Israel to accountability).

<sup>21</sup> Ex. 23:32-33; 34:12, 15; Lev. 20:22-26; Dt. 7:3-11; 23:6; Josh. 23:1-15; Ezra 9:1-10:44; Neh. 13:1-3, 23-28.

<sup>22</sup> Galatians 2:5, 14; 3:1; 4:16; 5:7.

<sup>23</sup> See Acts 10:45-48; 11:15-18; 15:7-11.

<sup>24</sup> Acts 11:1-18; Acts 15:7-11.

conceptually the commandment continues to be in force for both Jewish and Gentile Christians concerning marriage. Paul tells the Corinthian Christians:

“Do not be *unequally yoked together with unbelievers*. For what *fellowship* has righteousness with lawlessness? And what *communion* has Light with Darkness?” (2nd Corinthians 6:14)<sup>26</sup>

Jews and Gentiles can marry their own race or ‘intermarry’ (a Jew with a Gentile), as long as the other person is a believer in Messiah. God is still holy and the Body is to be *separate* and holy in this area.

In Peter fellowshiping with the Gentiles before the contingent from Jerusalem came, he was ‘acting as a Gentile’ in just being with them...according to traditional, Pharasaic understanding (and his previous Jewish understanding). In Peter leaving them, he was ‘acting as a Jew,’ a Pharisaic Jew, for the Gentile believers were brethren, but just not circumcised like Peter. In order for Peter the Pharisee to be able to eat and fellowship with them they needed to be circumcised so that they would be seen as *kosher* by Peter and the other Jewish believers, especially the Pharisaic believers. This is the unspoken atmosphere that Paul encountered in Antioch. Galatians is about biblical circumcision and how it doesn’t justify the Jew nor the Gentile, in terms of entering Messiah’s eternal Kingdom, and that the Gentile shouldn’t be circumcised. Galatians 2:11-15 is *not* about Mosaic dietary laws being done away with, as some erroneously teach, as no unclean food is even mentioned, let alone eaten by anyone.

Biblical circumcision was seen by the Pharisees as justification for the after-life. The Jewish people were going to Heaven because they were Jewish.<sup>27</sup> In tandem with this was the understanding that Mosaic Law was being kept by them for their justification. Of course, nowhere in Mosaic Law nor anywhere else in the Old Testament does God say that circumcision and/or keeping Torah mean that the Jew has eternal life, but by the days of Yeshua, until this present day, that is the Pharisaic, and now rabbinic, understanding of how a Jew gets to Heaven.<sup>28</sup>

In Gal. 2:15 Paul writes, ‘We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles.’ Paul is speaking of the *gross* idolatry of the Gentile peoples. In Paul’s day the Jewish people didn’t worship idols of wood and stone, gold and silver, nor use sex ‘to worship God,’ but the Gentile peoples did. They worshipped their idols through sacrificial, sexual idolatry and that made them gross sinners in the eyes of Jews like Paul.

Paul also speaks of coming into the Kingdom, not by the Works of the Law, but by faith in Yeshua. Christians interpret this to mean that Mosaic Law is nullified, yet Paul is only speaking about justification, not lifestyle. Only faith in Yeshua justifies anyone; Jew or Gentile, but once Born Again and in Messiah’s Kingdom, God’s holy Standard for what is right and what is wrong (sin) is Mosaic Law. Paul states, in his greatest theological letter, Romans, which was written a few years after Galatians, that it’s only through Mosaic Law that we know how God defines sin. Paul also writes that faith in Messiah Yeshua *establishes* Mosaic Law, which categorically overturns the false teaching that ‘Christ did away with the Law:’

“Therefore, by the *deeds* (Works/doing) of the Law no flesh will be *justified* in His sight,

---

<sup>25</sup> See [Hebrews and the Change of the Law](#) for laws that were amplified and altered, etc., for the Kingdom.

<sup>26</sup> The primary reason why Paul wrote that was so Gentile Christians wouldn’t sacrifice and fellowship with pagan gods and idols, but that it can, and is, used by many pastors concerning marrying an unbeliever is also applicable. Paul literally speaks of this in 1st Cor. 7:39. Also relevant to the fellowship of Jews with Gentiles is Paul’s passage in Eph. 2:11-15, which speaks of the ordinances of the Law (that were against the Jew associating with the Gentile) being broken down ‘in Messiah Yeshua.’

<sup>27</sup> Although Jewish women weren’t circumcised, they are biblically seen as ‘one’ with their fathers or husbands, and as such, would also receive eternal life.

<sup>28</sup> See [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#), *Acts 15:10—The Yoke*, p. 117ff.

for by the Law *is the knowledge of sin*” (Rom 3:20)

***“Do we then make void the Law through faith? Certainly not! On the contrary, we establish the Law!”*** (Romans 3:31)

No one is saved by keeping Torah, but once justified by faith in Yeshua, Mosaic Law reveals God’s Way and God’s Truth in how to live out God’s Life in Messiah Yeshua. Yes, they are designations for Yeshua (Jn. 14:6), who is called the *Word* of God (John 1:1-3; Rev. 19:13), and they are also synonyms for Torah, which is also the *Word* of God.<sup>29</sup> Without Mosaic Law a Christian is ignorant of many of the righteous rules and ways of his God. Paul, speaking of our faith ‘establishing’ Mosaic Law, means that the Law is to be used as God’s guideline for how we’re to walk out our lives of faith in Messiah Yeshua. After Paul came to know Yeshua, he realized that the Pharisees and he had profaned Torah by seeing it as a vehicle for Heaven. It was wrong and they should have known better because it wasn’t the Law that saved Israel from Egyptian slavery—it was the sacrifice of the Passover Lamb (Ex. 12:1f.), and once set free from Pharaoh’s Kingdom of Darkness, the Lord gave His people Israel rules to live out their *freedom* through. Mosaic Law is walked out through the freedom, grace and empowerment of Messiah Yeshua, and the Law is *established* and set in the place where God always intended it—as a way of life *after* one is justified.

The rest of Galatians Two, and then chapters three and four, are devoted to explaining why Christians, both Jewish and Gentile, are justified by faith in Yeshua, and are not under the Law,<sup>30</sup> which contrary to Christian understanding, does not mean that Mosaic Law is void or negated for Christians.

## Conclusion

In his letter to the Galatians Paul fought the Pharisaic false teaching on salvation, that the Gentile needed to be (physically, covenantally) circumcised in order to be saved, with a reference to Titus. The Apostles in Jerusalem didn’t think Titus needed to be circumcised, which showed the Galatians that they didn’t need it, either. Paul’s next point spoke of his Gospel being the same as the Gospel of James, Peter and John, which showed the Galatians that Paul wasn’t teaching them a different Gospel. This must have brought relief to the Galatians who had heard otherwise (from the Pharisaic believers). It also showed the Galatians that the Pharisaic ‘Gospel’ they had believed was not of God.

Then Paul revealed his confrontation with Peter in Antioch. Everything had been fine until some Pharisaic believers from Jerusalem showed up and persuaded Peter that he shouldn’t eat with the Gentile believers. Peter gave way to them, and all the other Jewish believers followed him until Paul rebuked Peter for his perversion of the Gospel. This didn’t have anything to do with the nullification of Mosaic Law for the Gentile, but with the Gentile being fully accepted by God without circumcision, and consequently, without needing to keep Torah in order to be justified. The Galatians were fully ‘one’ with their Jewish be-

---

<sup>29</sup> The terms, *way*, *truth* and *life* (John 14:6) are synonyms for Mosaic Law—God’s Word (Isaiah 1:10; 2:3; 5:24). Yeshua, speaking of them together, is emphatically declaring that He is the living Word of God; the living Torah, the embodiment of all the words or instructions of God. Torah, the Hebrew word translated as ‘Law’ means instruction or teaching. The *Way* is a synonym for Mosaic Law in Ex. 13:21; 18:20; 23:20; 32:8; Dt. 9:12, 16; 11:28; 13:5; 31:29; Ps. 25:8; 32:8; 119:1, 14, 27, 30, 32-33, 35 (path i.e. ‘way’), 104-105; 139:24; Prov. 2:20; 15:10; 23:19; 29:27; Jer. 6:16; Mal. 2:8-9, and *truth* is a synonym for Torah in Ps. 119:43, 142, 151, 160; Mal. 2:6, and *life* is a synonym for Mosaic Law in Dt. 30:15, 19-20; 32:47; Ps. 16:11; Prov. 3:1-3, 13-18; 6:23; 10:17; 12:28, etc. Yeshua didn’t do away with the Law of Moses. He amplified it (Mt. 5:17f.). See also Acts 9:2; 18:25-26; 19:9, 23; 24:12, 14 concerning The Way as the name of the movement for the Jewish (and Gentile) people who believed in Yeshua and walked out their faith in Him through God’s Torah.

<sup>30</sup> To understand the legal term, ‘under the Law,’ see [No Longer Under the Law?](#)

lieving brothers. This was the Truth of the Gospel that Paul referred to.

The passage in Gal. 2:11-16 is tied into the Law, but not the way the Church interprets it. Peter *separated* himself from the Gentile believers at Antioch and didn't want to eat with them anymore because they weren't Jews. With the help of his 'Pharisaic friends' Peter had slipped back into his 'pre-Yeshua' days when he never would have associated with, let alone eaten with, Gentiles (Acts 10:28, 34-35; cf. 11:1-3). The concept of Jews not eating with nor associating with Gentiles is part of Mosaic Law<sup>31</sup> because God didn't want His people Israel to be defiled by the idolatrous worship and lifestyle of the Gentiles (cf. Acts 17:16f.). There weren't any Gentile nations who worshiped the one true God—the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,<sup>32</sup> and much of the 'worship' of their gods and goddesses involved sacrificial sexual idolatry,<sup>33</sup> a satanic perversion of true worship. Satan knows how to get mankind to worship him—just equate worship with unrestrained sex and debauchery.

Yeshua's atoning death opened the way for individual Gentiles to find forgiveness of sin and eternal life in Him (cf. Is. 42:6). Before the fiasco at Antioch, God had used Peter as a spiritual bridge from the believing Jewish community into the God-fearing Gentile Cornelius (Acts 10:1–11:18).<sup>34</sup> This way, when Paul, 'the outsider' who hadn't walked with Yeshua 'in the flesh,' and had actually persecuted Jewish believers, came to Jerusalem and spoke of his Gentile converts,<sup>35</sup> it wasn't a shock for the Jewish leadership in the Mother Church at Jerusalem.

Just imagine if God hadn't led Peter to Cornelius, the first Gentile to come into the Kingdom, and no Gentiles had come to faith in Yeshua before Paul spoke in Jerusalem of his Gentile converts. If Peter, the chief Apostle, was lambasted by his friends, the Jerusalem Elders and the other Apostles, for going to the home of a Gentile, ten years *after* the resurrection (Acts 11:1-3, 18), Paul most likely would have been tarred and feathered!<sup>36</sup>

The incident at Antioch happened after Cornelius in Acts 10, and so mercurial Peter should have known better. It most likely happened before Acts 15, which means that the incident would help Peter to solidify his understanding of where the Gentile believer fit in with Israel, or rather, *how* the Gentile fit in. Peter would stand up at the Council of Acts 15 and silence the raging debate about Gentile circumcision by saying that God had used him to bring the *first* Gentiles into the Kingdom, and they came *the same way the*

---

<sup>31</sup> Ex. 23:32-33; 34:12, 15; Lev. 20:22-26; Dt. 7:3-11; 23:6; Josh. 23:1-15; Ezra 9:1-10:44; Neh. 13:1-3, 23-28; cf. Psalm 106:34-39. See also Peter's statement to Cornelius, 10 years *after* the resurrection, that it was unlawful for him, a Jew, to associate with, or to go to one of another nation (Acts 10:28), but God *had just shown him* (about nine years *after* the resurrection, in the vision, which concerned Cornelius) that he wasn't to call any Gentile common or unclean. It has nothing to do with eating unclean animals (Lev. 11:1f.).

<sup>32</sup> Ex. 6:8; 33:1; Num. 32:11; Dt. 1:8; 6:10; 9:5, 27, 29:13; 30:20; 34:4; 2nd Kgs. 13:23; Jer. 33:26; Mt. 8:11; Acts 3:13.

<sup>33</sup> See [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#), *Cult Prostitution in the Ancient World*, pp. 43-50.

<sup>34</sup> These God-fearers, like Cornelius (Acts 10:2), had given up idol worship, and in Cornelius' case, followed the Mosaic dietary laws as well as observance of the 7th day Sabbath, etc. That's why Peter could stay with, and eat in, Cornelius' house (Acts 10:48–11:1-3, 15-18).

<sup>35</sup> Acts 15:3-4, 12; cf. Acts 11:22-30; 13:1–14:28.

<sup>36</sup> While Paul was still raging against Jewish Christians, the Samaritans became the first non-Jews to come into the Kingdom. They were considered 'half-Jews.' They were circumcised, but they had altered Mosaic Law to make Mt. Gerizim God's mountain instead of 'Mt. Zion' in Jerusalem (cf. John 4:4-20f.), etc., and so they weren't considered Jews, but they weren't Gentiles, either, as they kept the Sabbath and didn't eat unclean animals, etc. Philip led many Samaritans to belief in the Lord Yeshua, but none of them were baptized in the Holy Spirit *until Peter* and John laid hands on them. Peter (and John) acted as a spiritual bridge between the 'not-so-liked' Samaritans and the Jewish *leaders* of the Church at Jerusalem (Acts 8:1-25). Peter's next divine assignment as a bridge would be with Gentile, God-fearing Cornelius (Acts 10).

*Jews did*—by faith in Yeshua; not by faith in Yeshua *plus* circumcision symbolizing the keeping of Torah for salvation (Acts 15:7-11). Acts 10 was God’s foundation for Peter and he just needed to be *humbly* reminded again, in Antioch, by brother Paul, the humble ‘love Apostle’ (cf. 1st Cor. 13:1f.; Gal. 6:1).<sup>37</sup>

The heretical teaching on circumcision of the Gentiles was the using of the good ‘Works of the Law’ (in this case, specifically circumcision) *as a means to earn a place among the Chosen people of God, salvation and eternal life*,<sup>38</sup> along with faith in Yeshua. The Works of the Law are simply those things that come out of loving God, obedience to Him through His Torah, which includes loving one’s neighbor as himself.

The passage in Galatians cannot be interpreted to mean that Peter was eating unclean meats with the Gentile believers before the Jewish contingent from Jerusalem arrived,<sup>39</sup> as there’s no food mentioned nor that Paul’s rebuke of Peter meant that Peter shouldn’t be instructing the Gentiles to keep Mosaic Law. Yet this is what some Christian commentators teach. The keeping of Mosaic Law is not the issue in Galatians. It’s *the abuse of Mosaic Law* as a means for salvation that Paul warns the Galatians about. An abuse of a law does not negate the law nor does it mean that the law itself is wrong and that it shouldn’t be kept. Paul follows up his thoughts in Galatians by saying in Romans that Mosaic Law is established through faith in Yeshua, that it’s God’s way of determining and understanding what sin is, and that Torah is not wrong or sin, but holy and righteous (Rom. 3:30, 31; 7:12, 14). He most likely didn’t say something like that in his letter to the Galatians because he hadn’t thought to do so, but thinking on it later, presented it in Romans.

God gave His rules to ancient Israel through Moses, and that’s why it’s known as Mosaic Law. God wasn’t short-sighted, but on the contrary, He knew that *believing* Israel would not only need those rules to walk out their faith in Yeshua, but that the rules would be amplified ‘in Messiah’ because now Israel had the Holy Spirit within to walk just as Yeshua had walked.<sup>40</sup> Christians are afraid of Mosaic Law, having been fed a steady diet about its ‘bondage,’ but the Bible calls Mosaic Law the Law of Yahveh 15 times,<sup>41</sup> the word for ‘Law’ literally meaning, the Teaching or Instruction of Yahveh. This instruction from God

---

<sup>37</sup> It’s possible that the incident in Antioch (Gal. 2:11f.; Paul’s rebuke of Peter), took place after Acts 15 (48 AD), but it seems more likely that it took place before that, but after Acts 10 (Cornelius; 39 AD), when Barnabas had gone to get Paul from Tarsus and had brought Paul back to Antioch (Acts 11:22-30). Peter could very well have been there at that time. This may also account for the Pharisaic believers *being sent* there by a James, who at this time might have sided with the Pharisaic believers concerning Gentile circumcision. James certainly wouldn’t have sided with them after Acts 15, especially as he made the ruling against it in Acts 15 (Acts 15:13f.).

<sup>38</sup> Five times in Galatians Paul speaks of the ‘Works of the Law’ (Gal. 2:16 [three times]; 3:2, 10). The ‘Works of the Law’ are the ‘works’ that come out of the keeping of the Law’s commandments to love one’s neighbor (like caring for the poor, and also, Yeshua’s miraculous healings), and the keeping of the commandments (e.g. the Sabbath and dietary laws). None of these ‘good Works’ will cause one to be Born Again and enter the Kingdom, but these are the Works of Mosaic Law that, once a person is Born Again, have been set in place by God for us to do. In Mt. 26:6-13, which speaks of the woman anointing Yeshua for His burial, He calls it a ‘good Work’ (Mt. 26:10, 12). This good Work falls under Torah’s commandment to love your neighbor as yourself (Lev. 19:18c).

<sup>39</sup> No food is mentioned in all the letter, and so it’s pure speculation on the part of Christians to say that Peter was eating unclean meat with the Gentiles, and therefore, they can, too.

<sup>40</sup> See Ezk. 36:24-27, where God says He will give Israel His Spirit *and cause her to obey His statutes and judgments*, and Jer. 31:33, where God speaks of placing Mosaic Law (literally Torah in Hebrew) upon our hearts and in our minds. Hebrews 8:10 and 10:16 confirms that by quoting it twice.

<sup>41</sup> Some of Mosaic Law’s specific biblical designations, aside from just Torah (Mosaic Law) are, *Your (God’s) Law* (29x); the Book of the Law (22x); the Law of Moses (19x); *the Law of Yahveh* (15x); *My (God’s) Law* (12x); *His (God’s) Law* (10x); the Book of the Law of Moses (5x); *the Book of the Law of God* (5x); *the Book of the Law of Yahveh* (4x); *the Law of God* (3x); the Law is Light (2x). See [Mosaic Law and the Ten](#) for all the Scriptures that these counts pertain to, and also, how many times the words ‘Law’ and Commandments’ are found in both the Old and the New Testaments and how they speak of Mosaic Law, not just the Ten Commandments.

stands in direct contrast to Christianity’s pagan days and pagan ways (i.e. Sunday, Easter, Christmas, and all the practices surrounding those days, and the eating of unclean meats, etc.). It shouldn’t be too hard for Christians to discern God’s will in this—He wants us to walk in His Ways, not pagan days and ways.

The proper interpretation of Gal. 2:11f. torpedoed Machen and all Christian theologians who say that Paul had a ‘special revelation’—that Mosaic Law didn’t apply to Gentile Christians because there *aren’t* two different Gospels—one for the Jews and one for the Gentiles. James and the Apostles in Jerusalem would not have extended ‘the right hand of fellowship’ to Paul if he was teaching Gentiles that Mosaic Law didn’t apply to them.<sup>42</sup>

Paul had the exact same Gospel as the other Jewish Apostles. It’s *inconceivable* that ‘only Paul’ knew that Mosaic Law wasn’t valid for Christians, but this is teaching that pervades Christianity. As Paul never once pronounces a curse against Peter or John for proclaiming a false or perverse Gospel, the Apostolic and Pauline Gospel was identical, complete with the keeping Mosaic Law, not for salvation, but for a godly lifestyle (2nd Tim. 3:10-17). Therefore, it’s a biblical certainty that Paul taught his Gentile converts to walk out their faith in Messiah through all the rules, laws, commandments, testimonies, judgments and statutes of Mosaic Law that applied to them—just as Yeshua, James, Peter, Thomas, Matthew and John had done (1st John 2:6).

## *The Anti-Law Church*

Paul’s letter to the Galatians is the Church’s bastion against Mosaic Law being valid for Christians. Anti-Law theology has gone uncontested for more than a millennia, even though the Law was God’s blessing, wisdom and understanding to Israel,<sup>43</sup> and was valid for Israel for at least 1,400 years—from the time of Moses until Yeshua. Messiah Yeshua not only kept all Mosaic Law that applied to Him, it was Mosaic Law that judged Him sinless.<sup>44</sup> Shouldn’t it do that for Christians, too?

Christianity teaches that the Lord’s death nullified Mosaic Law for them, or as many Christians like to say, set them “free from the bondage of the Law.” This teaching is a theological pillar of the Church and the Apostle Paul is their ‘No Law!’ champion, or so they think. With biblical phrases such as, “We’re no longer under the Law,”<sup>45</sup> and “Christ fulfilled the Law so Christians don’t have to keep it,”<sup>46</sup> and all a Christian has to do is “love because love is the fulfillment of the Law,”<sup>47</sup> anyone who has been a Christian for more than 15 minutes realizes that the Law isn’t for them. Interpreting those phrases, though, as being anti-Law, goes against not only how Yeshua lived His life, but Who Yeshua is—the Living Word of God.

Christians have their Scriptures they point to in supporting their unLawful position, but the Pharisees also had Scripture that supported their perverse understanding of God’s Word. It comes down to what is the correct interpretation of God’s Word, and here is where every Christian must judge which interpretation is of God and which isn’t. The death of Messiah Yeshua didn’t cancel Mosaic Law—it brought the prophe-

---

<sup>42</sup> Gal. 2:1-2, 6-10, cf. Acts 15:21; 1st Cor. 5:6-8; 7:19; 2nd Peter 3:15-16.

<sup>43</sup> Deuteronomy 4:5-8; Psalm 119, etc.

<sup>44</sup> Romans 3:20; 7:7 (cf. John 8:46; 2nd Corinthians 5:21; Hebrews 4:15; 1st Peter 2:22; 1st John 3:5).

<sup>45</sup> Gal. 4:4, 21; 5:18; cf. Rom. 3:19; 1st Cor. 9:20 (see [No Longer Under the Law?](#)).

<sup>46</sup> Matthew 5:17-18; Luke 24:44 and also [Seven Ways Yeshua Fulfilled the Law](#).

<sup>47</sup> Romans 13:8, 10; Gal. 5:4; 6:2. See [The Lifting of the Veil—Acts 15:20-21](#), p. 170, at the bottom of the page, starting with, “One of the places that the Church points to, to prove their theological position on the Law being nullified is Mt. 5:17-18.” This section deals with how the concept that ‘love is the fulfillment of the Law’ doesn’t do away with Mosaic Law, and reveals that Paul wasn’t the first Jew to coin that phrase, and also, that it doesn’t mean that someone’s nebulous understanding of ‘love’ is all that God requires.

sied *redemption* of Israel,<sup>48</sup> and it heightened and amplified Mosaic Law for every Christian. Paul said:

*“Be diligent to present yourself **approved unto God**, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, **rightly dividing the Word of Truth.**”* (2nd Timothy 2:15)

Doctrine is divisive because there’s a lot of false doctrine ‘out there,’ but biblical doctrine is very important, especially when it deals with an issue of this magnitude because as we believe, so we walk. Yeshua said that He didn’t come to bring peace, but a sword:

“Do not think that I came to bring peace on Earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to set a man against his father; a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man’s enemies will be those of his own household. He who loves father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me. And he who loves son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me.” (Mt. 10:34-37)

A little further on the Apostle to the Gentiles encourages Timothy about Torah, telling them that *God’s wisdom for salvation* was inherent in it and that without it the man of God could not be complete:

“But you (Timothy) have carefully followed my doctrine, *manner of life*, purpose, faith, longsuffering, love, perseverance, persecutions and afflictions, which happened to me at Antioch, at Iconium, at Lystra—what persecutions I endured! And out of them all the Lord delivered me! Yes, *and all who desire to live godly in Messiah Yeshua will suffer persecution*, but evil men and impostors will grow worse and worse, *deceiving* and being deceived, but you must continue in the things which you have learned and been assured of, knowing from whom you have learned them, and that from *childhood* you have *known the Holy Scriptures, which are able to make you wise for salvation through faith which is in Messiah Yeshua*. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God *may be complete, thoroughly equipped for every good Work.*” (2nd Tim. 3:10-17)

The ‘Holy Scriptures’ that Paul speaks of, that makes one wise unto salvation, is the Old Testament, with Torah as its godly foundation. When Paul speaks of, ‘All Scripture,’ he certainly is including Torah that is ‘profitable for doctrine’ and ‘instruction in righteousness,’ that the ‘man of God may be complete’ and ‘thoroughly equipped *for every good Work*.’ These are the Works of the Law that Paul is writing about. Every good Work comes from the Law, whether it’s keeping the Sabbath day holy or loving and helping one’s fellow man, etc.

Christians are terribly deceived about Mosaic Law. Paul’s Gentiles kept the 7th day Sabbath, the Feasts of Israel and the Mosaic dietary laws, to name three pillars of Mosaic Law. This is realized from true biblical interpretations of New Testament texts dealing with Mosaic Law, and also, from Church history.<sup>49</sup> Christians need to reevaluate their position on Mosaic Law so they can walk out their faith in their Savior the

---

<sup>48</sup> Gen. 3:15; Job 19:25-26; Ps. 49:15; 130:7-8; Is. 25:7-8; 52:9–53:12; 61:1-4f.; Dan. 9:24-27.

<sup>49</sup> Acts 18:18; 21:20, 24; 24:14; 25:8; Rom. 3:31; 7:7, 12, 14; 1st Cor. 4:16-17; 5:6-8; 7:17-19; 11:1; 1st Jn. 2:6; Rev. 14:12, etc. For why Christianity is wrong about Mosaic Law, see:

1. [Take the Quiz! Five Quick Questions about the New Testament](#)
2. [The Feasts of Israel and the Church](#)
3. [A Snapshot of Church History and Mosaic Law](#)
4. [Have You Ever Wondered?](#)
5. [Seven Reasons Why The Church is Wrong](#)
6. [Law 102](#)
7. [No Longer Under the Law?](#)

way He wants them to walk. We know from the Lord Yeshua that there aren't two different Flocks, one for the Jew (who keeps the Law) and one for the Gentile (who doesn't have to keep it; John 10:16). We also know from Paul that his Gospel was identical to that of the other Apostles in Jerusalem, and we know that all the Jews and the other Apostles kept Mosaic Law (e.g. Acts 21:20; cf. 1st Cor. 5:6-8; 7:19), with Paul observing the Law's Nazarite Vow to let everyone know that he kept Mosaic Law. Also, we know from Acts 21:21 that Torah was intended for the Gentiles to learn so that they could walk out their new found faith in the Jewish Messiah God's way.

Justification is by faith in Yeshua, even for the Jews who are circumcised, not by the good Works of Mosaic Law, symbolized in circumcision. No flesh will be justified or saved because they keep Mosaic Law, but once in the Kingdom of Messiah's Israel, Mosaic Law was designed by God to be a Christian's godly lifestyle, just as it was for Peter and Paul. As Yeshua Himself said, concerning Mosaic Law:

*“Whoever, therefore, breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of Heaven, but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the Kingdom of Heaven.”* (Matthew 5:19)

Yeshua's Kingdom didn't officially begin until Acts Two, *after* His resurrection. The Church says Mosaic Law was nullified at His death, but Yeshua speaks of Christians in His Kingdom being least or greater by their keeping of Mosaic Law. When Christianity and Messiah part ways, it's easy to see that we need to believe the Messiah over Christianity.

If the Gentile needs to keep Torah, though, why doesn't he or his baby son need to be circumcised? The answer to that honest question is because circumcision was the *sign of the Old Covenant*. Gentiles who get circumcised *place themselves under the Old Covenant* and *negate their place in the New Covenant*. They take themselves out of the New and align themselves with sinful, not-Born-Again, not justified Israel 'after the flesh.' This is why Titus didn't need to be circumcised, but Jewish baby boys, sons of a Jewish believer, do because they are literally still part of the Covenant that God made with Father Abraham (Gen. 17:10-14). The Gentile was never part of that Covenant. That's why Paul sums up his teaching in Galatians, against circumcision for the Gentile, by saying:

*‘You have been severed from Christ! You who are seeking to be justified by Law! You have fallen from grace!’* (Gal. 5:4)

Some misguided Gentiles, seeking 'to obey God' (from His words to Father Abraham) try and distinguish between being circumcised for justification and for obedience to Torah, because they know Gal. 5:4. So they say that Gentiles should be circumcised, not for justification, but in order to obey what God said in Gen. 17:10-14 and Ex. 12:43-49. The problem with their position is that *nowhere in the New Testament does anyone teach that*. With New Testament writings, *after* the resurrection, spanning a period of at least 65 years (30-95 AD), and with Gentile believers having sons born to them during that time, *but no one in the New Testament writing of 'obedience to God' or to Mosaic Law* as a reason for either them or their sons to be circumcised, *circumcision for 'obedience to God' is also against God's will for the Gentile*. With an issue of this magnitude not being written about over a period of at least two generations, it's a biblical certainty that Gentiles should not be physically covenantally circumcised nor should they have it done to their baby boys because it's against God's will.

Colossians 1:18 speaks of Yeshua being the *Head* of the Body (of believers), and Hebrews 13:8 says that Yeshua is the *same*, yesterday, today and forever, and 1st John 2:6 commands us to walk as Yeshua *walked*. If Yeshua is our Head, and we're to walk as He did, how is it the Body eats things that are unclean and sin for Him, even today? Yeshua is the same today as He was when He walked with Peter and

John, and if it was sin for Him to eat bacon or keep Sunday instead of the 7th day Sabbath, it's still sin for Him, and therefore, it's sin for His Body (Christians) to eat bacon and keep Sunday over the Sabbath, etc. If we're supposed to walk like Yeshua walked, how is it that the Church teaches Sunday, Easter and Christmas, when Yeshua kept the 7th day Sabbath and the Feasts of Israel? Easter<sup>50</sup> and Xmas aren't even mentioned in the New Testament, let alone commanded for Christians. Shouldn't Christians follow Christ when Christianity deviates 180° the other way?

The correct understanding of the Letter to the Galatians reveals the stark difference between Christianity and Messiah Yeshua. Papa God wants all Christians to follow His Son, and to leave their anti-Law (and many times, anti-Semitic) Christian denominations and fellowships behind them. This becomes crystal clear in the last book of Scripture:

“And I heard another Voice from Heaven saying, ‘Come out of her, My people! Lest you share in her sins, and lest you receive of her plagues!’” (Revelation 18:4)

The days are ending where God ‘has winked’ (cf. Acts 17:29-31) at the perversion that is Christianity. Choose you this day whom you will serve! (Josh. 24:15) The God of Israel or the god of this world.<sup>51</sup> It wasn't the God of Israel who gave Sunday, Easter, Xmas and anti-Mosaic Law doctrine to Christianity.

---

<sup>50</sup> ‘Easter’ is seen in Acts 12:4 of the KJV, but the Greek word is *paska*, which is Passover.

<sup>51</sup> One of the things that Christian theologians say that negates Mosaic Law for Christians is when Paul speaks of the Galatians observing ‘days and months and seasons and years’ (Gal. 4:11). The problem with their interpretation is that Paul speaks of them *returning* to the ‘weak and beggarly elements’ to which they had formerly been ‘in bondage’ to (Gal. 4:9). Paul never calls the Law ‘weak and beggarly elements’ and the Galatian Gentiles had never walked in Mosaic Law before coming to Messiah. For more on why the ‘days and months’ weren't Mosaic Law's days and months, see [Slavery to the Law? Galatians 4:8-11](#).

This article was revised on August 1st, 2018.