

## Acts 087

### How the New Testament Uses the Old, Part 2

Acts 15:13-18a

November 12, 2025

Dr. Andy Woods

Let us take our Bibles this evening and open them to the Book of Acts 15:13. We are continuing our verse-by-verse look through the Book of Acts on Wednesday evenings. Jesus' words recorded by Luke give us an outline of the book:

*"...and you shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem [Acts 1-7], and in all Judea and Samaria [Acts 8-12], and even to the remotest part of the earth [Acts 13-28]" (Acts 1:8).*

We are in that third part. Paul initiated that third part by going into southern Galatia, preaching the gospel along with Barnabas. They had a very effective ministry with much fruit amongst the Gentiles. That ministry lasted probably about two and a half years. He gets back to Antioch of Syria, which is where he was sent from, and now the big question is: What do we do with all these saved Gentiles?

There arose a voice within the church that said, "We need to put them under the Mosaic Law," which is a Jewish perspective. That is how Gentiles who were converts to Judaism always walked with God for the last 1,500 years. "That is what we need to make them do now." A pharisaical voice arose within the church to argue for that.

Paul and Barnabas have to leave Antioch up north and go up to Jerusalem and get this issue resolved. The apostles are going to have to make a decision, because the leadership of the church was still in Jerusalem, and that is where the apostles were, those that were still alive. I think most of them would still be alive at that point.

You have Acts 15, which is a reference to this big meeting they have in Jerusalem to hammer this out. We have studied the occasion for the meeting (Acts 15:1-5). Then here come the declarations (Acts 15:6-21). The meeting is convened, and the decision that is going to be made here is going to affect the church as long as it is on the earth. This decision is still binding on us 2,000 years later. So this is a biggie. Only the apostles could make a decision like this.

The meeting is convened (Acts 15:6). Peter speaks up and he says, "I watched Cornelius get saved without the Law, and he was a Gentile. Why would we put the Gentiles under the Law when us Jews have been terrible at law keeping?"

Then Barnabas and Paul speak up (Acts 15:12), and their basic testimony is, "Look what God did on the first missionary journey that we just returned from. He gave us unusual favor with salvations and signs and wonders. All of these Gentiles were getting

saved there in southern Galatia, and they all got saved without the Law at all. It was just simply by faith alone in Christ alone."

Next, James, the key witness in this meeting, speaks up. His testimony is given in Acts 15:13-21. Here is an outline of his speech:

- D. James' address (13-21)
  - 1. Introduction (13a)
  - 2. Addressees (13b)
  - 3. Peter's address (14)
  - 4. Old Testament citation (15-18)
    - a) Introduction (15)
    - b) Amos 9:11-12 (16-18)
  - 5. Conclusions (19-21)

Notice James beginning to speak up here in Acts 15:13: "After they had stopped speaking." I always like how these guys were polite to each other. You do not see a lot of screaming and cutting people off and canceling people and the kinds of things that we see today in so many meetings. Everyone else had spoken. Then it says, after all of that:

*"After they had stopped speaking, James answered" (Acts 15:13).*

Which James are we talking about here? Because there are four. Did you know that? You might remember in Acts 1:13-14, concerning the ascension of Jesus that it mentions there four Jameses.

*"Peter and John and James and Andrew, Philip and Thomas, Bartholomew and Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, and Simon the Zealot, and Judas the son of James" (Acts 1:13).*

Then it mentions some of Christ's brothers, one of them being James. So which James are we talking about? Are we talking about James the father of Judas? By the way, that is not Judas Iscariot. Judas was a common name in that time period. Who are we dealing with? James the son of Alphaeus? Probably not, because that second James is unknown as well. Are we talking about the son of Zebedee and the brother of John? That James? No, because that James is dead. He was martyred in Acts 12. It is hard to talk at a church meeting if you are dead.

What James are we dealing with here? Most believe that this is James, the half brother of Christ. Contrary to what Roman Catholicism teaches, you know that Mary was a perpetual virgin her whole life. That is not what the Bible says. Certainly, she was a virgin at the time of the miraculous conception in her womb of Jesus and the birth of Jesus, but following the birth of Jesus, she was married to Joseph. She and Joseph had a normal marital sexual relationship following the virgin conception and the virgin birth. Joseph and Mary had other kids. These are Christ's half brothers.

There are a lot of references to them in the Bible. In Matthew 13:55 you will see a reference to them. There are some references to them in John 7:5. Two of them wrote books of the Bible. One of them is named Jude. He wrote the little epistle of Jude. One of them is named James. He wrote the Book of James. We call them the half brothers of Christ, because they shared the same mother as Jesus, but not the same father. Joseph was the legal father of Jesus Christ, but not the biological father, because Jesus was virgin born, virgin conceived.

That is who we think this James is that is speaking up here. It would be James, the half brother of Christ. As you look at a lot of the things he says in his talk, he uses the words greetings, visit, listen, turn, being called by God's name. You see the different places in his speech where he says stuff like that. That is the same kind of language that he uses in his epistle that he would write. There is a pretty good chance that that epistle had already been written because it was one of the first and earliest books of the New Testament canon, the Epistle of James. That is the James that we are dealing with here.

This is James the half brother of Christ speaking up. Who was James? Not only was he the half brother of Christ, he was the pastor of the Jerusalem church. He was the author of the epistle or the Book of James. What does James have to say? He has a lot to say. In fact, his testimony here might be the most important.

*"After they had stopped speaking, James answered, saying, 'Brethren, listen to me'" (Acts 15:13).*

When he uses this expression "brethren" it is obviously a dispute that is happening here amongst fellow Christians. Go back to Acts 15:10 and look at what Peter said:

*"Now therefore why do you put God to the test by placing upon the neck of the disciples a yoke which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?" (Acts 15:10).*

These converts are believers, and they have graduated into discipleship. That would be a strange name to attach to an unsaved person. The issue here is what do you do with these saved people? This is not an issue of do they have to come under the Law of Moses to be saved? That issue got fixed in the first Jerusalem Council (Acts 11), because Cornelius got saved, justified before God, by faith alone, without any help from the Mosaic Law whatsoever.

This is not an issue of do you have to come under the Law of Moses to grow as a Christian? Because that issue got fixed in the Book of Galatians, which has already been written. That was written at the end of Acts 14. This is what you call an ecclesiological issue. Do these Gentiles have to come under the Law of Moses to be part of the body of Christ, the church?

We are not dealing with a justification issue here. We are not dealing with a sanctification issue here. What we are dealing with in this whole ruling is an ecclesiological issue. The issue is very simple: To join the church, do you have to come under the Mosaic Law, the way Gentiles came under the Mosaic Law to walk with God going all the way back to proselytes in the Bible? Ruth was the most famous of the proselytes, when she said to her mother-in-law Naomi, "Your God will be my God." Ruth was a Moabitess, you will remember. Moab is basically modern-day Jordan. "Your God will be my God. Your people will be my people" (Ruth 1:16).

If you were a Gentile and you wanted to walk with God in the Old Testament times, you came under the Law of Moses. The Jewish leadership thinks that this is how it is going to work in the Church Age. That is what this big powwow is about. It is not a justification issue; that has been resolved (Acts 11). It is not a sanctification issue; that issue has been resolved in the Book of Galatians. This is an ecclesiological issue.

James, as he is rehearsing this, starts to talk about what Peter just said. Peter's testimony, you will recall, is given in Acts 15:7-11. What does James say about Peter?

*"Simeon has related how God first concerned Himself about taking from among the Gentiles a people for His name" (Acts 15:14).*

You will notice that he refers to Peter as Simeon, which is Peter's Aramaic name. Peter had three names. He had an Aramaic name, he had a Jewish name, and he also had a Greek name. His Hebrew name was Simon. Simeon, a lot of people believe, is an Aramaic form of Simon, his Hebrew name. You will see Peter being called Simon in 2 Peter 1:1, "Simon Peter." You will see Peter being called Simon by Jesus in Luke 22:31, where Jesus says of Peter:

*"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has demanded permission to sift you like wheat" (Luke 22:31).*

You will also see Peter being referred to as Cephas. In 1 Corinthians 9:5, Paul writes:

*"Do we not have a right to take along a believing wife, even as the rest of the apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?" (1 Corinthians 9:5).*

Once again, Roman Catholicism wants you to believe that Peter, in the celibacy of the priesthood—Peter in their minds, being the first pope—was unmarried, but the Bible clearly says he had a believing wife. Cephas had a believing wife.

Jesus went to the home of the mother-in-law of Peter, the gospels tell us. It is hard to have a mother-in-law if you are not married. Who would want that if you are not married? The mother-in-law tension is something you have to navigate your way through. Obviously, the man was married.

Roman Catholicism comes in and they try to define brothers of Christ, saying that they are spiritual brothers. Mother-in-law means that she is his spiritual mother. That is not what the Bible says. The Bible says Peter had a wife and Mary had actual children after the virgin conception, James being one of those.

If all of this were not confusing enough, Jesus gave Peter a new name. He said in Matthew 16:18:

*"I also say to you that you are Peter, and upon this rock [Petra, a different Greek word, different gender] I will build My church and the gates of Hades will not overpower it" (Matthew 16:18).*

Roman Catholicism does not want you to see the distinction between Petra and Petros, because they want you to believe that Peter was the first pope, and that Jesus built the church on Peter. This is a big problem because coming up in Matthew 16, just a few verses later, Jesus is going to say to Peter, *"Get behind me, Satan!" (Matthew 16:23)*. If Peter is the first pope, we are in a lot of trouble, because his mouth was used as an oracle of Satan a few verses later.

The truth of the matter is that Jesus never built the church on Peter. He gave Peter this new name, Petros, which means "little stone." In other words, "Peter, I am going to turn you into a man of stability," which is tremendous, because Peter was not that when the Lord found him, he was anything but that.

I call him the apostle with the foot-shaped mouth. He put his foot in his mouth all the time and would walk on the water, and then he would get his eyes off of Jesus and start to sink. He is the one that denied the Lord three times. He would actually take Jesus aside, if you can imagine this, and start to rebuke Him in Matthew 16, because Jesus started talking about how he had to go to the cross and die and be betrayed and placed in Gentile hands.

Peter's mouth was used as an instrument of God. Jesus asked, "Who do men say that I am?" Peter said, "You are the Son of God, you are the Christ" (Matthew 16:16). That is when Jesus gave Peter this name and gave him the keys of the kingdom (Matthew 16:19). Then right after this, Jesus started talking about how He had to go to the cross and die. Peter, this guy right here, took Jesus aside and began to rebuke Him (Matthew 16:22). Can you imagine that? "Come here, Son of God." He started to correct Jesus Christ, whom he just identified as the Son of the living God. That is when Jesus says, get behind me, Satan.

When Jesus called this man a rock, he was not giving him a name based on what he was. He was giving him a name based on what he would become. Peter would become a rock. We are reading about it all the way through the Book of Acts. Peter is the star act all the way through the Book of Acts. According to church tradition, Peter is the apostle that would be crucified and he would ask to be crucified upside down. He did not want to be crucified like Jesus was, because he saw himself as unworthy.

It is an amazing story about how Jesus gave him a name not based on what he was, but what he would become. I love how the Lord sees us that way, because that means I can apply for the job, and so can you. God does not look at us how we are. Thank God for that. He looks at what we have the potential of becoming under His power.

That is why Jesus gave him this name, Petros, which means "little stone." Then Jesus says, "Upon this rock," and you will notice it is a different word that means "large stone." The gender is different. It is "petra." "I will build this church, I will build My church."

This is why you need to go to Israel, because when you are in Israel, you will start to connect the dots. This took place in Caesarea Philippi up north. When you sit there, it is an amazing sight. You will see that it is a giant cliff, and on the ground are all these little rocks.

When Jesus says, "Peter, your name is Petros, little stone," He was referring to the little rocks. When He said, "I will build My church upon this rock." Obviously, what Jesus did is He turned towards this giant cliff, which is a giant rock, and said, "I will build My church on this giant cliff." It is one of those things where you can understand the Bible, but do you want to watch the movie in black and white, or do you want to watch it in color?

When you are in Israel and you see where this happened and the Bible gives us the geographical area, it makes perfect sense why Jesus would make these statements here at Caesarea Philippi amongst these little stones. In contradistinction to this giant rock cliff.

What is the giant rock cliff? It is not Peter. Peter is the little stone. The giant rock cliff is Peter's confession. He had it right. "Who do men say that I am?" "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." "Upon this rock—the veracity of your confession—I will build My church." "Peter, your confession is the cliff. You are the little stone."

When you study this in the original language—the New Testament was written in Greek—you see that there are two different Greek words here "petros" and "petra." That is how Peter got his Greek name, Petros. It is not to be confused with "petra," which is a statement of his confession.

His Aramaic name was Cephas, and his original Hebrew name was Simon. When James calls him Simeon, it is probably an Aramaic form of the Hebrew word Simon. This is what most people believe. It is hard for us as Americans to get this because we know English and that is it, but in biblical times, they could have spoken up to four languages.

There was Latin, which was the language of Rome, Rome being the occupying power over the land of Israel going all the way back to 63 BC. There was the language of the

synagogue for the Jews, which was Hebrew. There was Greek, the common language. There was also Aramaic mixed in there.

As you travel through the Gospels, it has the signs over Christ, put there to mock Him: "The King of the Jews." You will notice one gospel writer says it was an Aramaic sign. Another gospel writer says it was written in Hebrew, and another gospel writer says it was written in Greek. Yet another gospel writer says it was written in Latin. What is the deal? There were probably four signs put up. Each gospel writer points to one sign, but there were probably four of these signs put over Christ's head, to mock Him in these four languages.

You will see Paul, in the Book of Acts, shifting from Hebrew to Aramaic and that kind of thing. Peter had three names, and here he is probably using an Aramaic form of his Hebrew name, Simon. Jesus will switch back to Peter's old name when Peter is acting like his old self. He gave him a new name, Petros, but when he acts like his old self, He talks to him as Simon again.

*"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has demanded permission to sift you like wheat" (Luke 22:31).*

The naming of people in the Bible, particularly by God, is huge. Do you remember Abraham? His name was changed to Abraham, the father of many nations. God gave Abraham a new name, based on what he would become. The same happened with Sarai. Her name was changed to Sarah. It really is fascinating to study how God names people. The most encouraging thing to me in all of that is that God names us based on who we have the potential of becoming in Him, not who we are currently.

The Book of Revelation talks about how we are going to be given a new name. I think it is revelation three. We are going to have all kinds of new names written on us—the name of His holy city, which comes down from heaven, which is our citizenship. He gives us a new name, and it just goes on and on like this. If you ever want to dig down and really get into something, study the different namings in Scripture and study that out.

Simeon is used here by James. What does James say?

*"Simeon has related how God first concerned Himself about taking from among the Gentiles a people for His name" (Acts 15:14).*

He is referring back to Peter's testimony in Acts 10:11, related to how he led Cornelius to Christ. How did Cornelius, the first full-fledged Gentile convert in the Church Age, get saved? It had zero to do with the Mosaic Law. It had everything to do with faith alone, under the power of the Holy Spirit alone. James is taking that, and he is going to go somewhere with it.

He says, "That is the way we ought to operate right now. If these Gentiles – Listen to what Simeon or Petros just said – If Cornelius, the first Gentile convert, got saved with no help of the Mosaic Law, it does not make any sense for us in terms of an ecclesiological matter to put all of these Gentile converts under the Mosaic Law."

*"Simeon has related how God first concerned Himself about taking from the Gentiles a people for His name" (Acts 15:14).*

This is something that Paul is going to develop in Romans 11, which has not been written yet as far as our chronology goes. In Romans 11, Paul talks about how the natural branch, which would be the Jews, has been temporarily put out of the tree, which is a reference to the Abrahamic Covenant, the New Covenant. As the natural branch has been taken out of the tree, God has put into the tree these weird branches that do not belong.

It is an olive tree, and the olive branch has been taken out of the tree for a season. In its place are weird branches, like apple branches, orange branches, lemon branches, cherry branches. Who ever heard of such a thing in an olive tree? Do you know who those weird branches are? I am looking at them right now. You guys look weird out there. You guys are weird branches. I am a weird branch. What is an apple branch or a lemon branch doing in an olive tree? Yet God did that. That is an agricultural miracle that He has done.

Then he says, "You weird branches do not become arrogant about everything, because if God can stick you into a tree where you do not really belong, do you think it is hard for God to reach out and put the branches that do belong there, the separated olive branches, and stick them back into the tree?"

You should not look at unbelieving Jews as if they are never going to get saved. They are going to get saved. They are going to get saved as a nation. That is actually pretty easy for God to do. He took the weird branches and inserted them into a tree where we do not belong. How easy is it for God to take the branches that belong there and reinsert them into the tree as well? This is Paul's point in Romans 11:25-26.

Israel is in the condition that it is in because of unbelief, but it is not going to be there forever because their hardening is partial.

*"For I do not want you, brethren, to be uninformed of this mystery—so that you will not be wise in your own estimation—that a partial hardening has happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in" (Romans 11:25).*

You say, "What is the fullness of the Gentiles?" The fullness of the Gentiles is the last Gentile convert that is destined to be converted in the Church Age. Apparently there is a number. You say, "What is that number?" I have no idea. You can ask God about that.



He does not tell us what the number is, but there is a full number that has to come in. It is in God's mind.

Once that full number comes in the Church Age will be over. The church will be translated to heaven, and then God will work in history to grab the branches that are supposed to be in the tree and stick them back in the tree. Those are the events of the Tribulation Period and leading to the Millennial Kingdom.

*"And so as Israel will be saved; just as it is written,  
'The Deliverer will come from Zion,  
He will remove all ungodliness from Jacob'" (Romans 11:26).*

We are waiting, and God is waiting on the last Gentile to get saved in the Church Age, so that He can start this work of reinserting a separated branch that has been separated for 2,000 years, back into a tree to which they belong.

Maybe the person that God has put on your heart to witness to—your neighbor, the person that sits next to you, your coworker—maybe they are the last one. Maybe that is why Satan is filling your mind with all kinds of doubt, because God knows they are the last one to come in, and they are the last person that needs to get saved to get this show on the road.

That explains the spiritual warfare in personal evangelism, does it not? Satan hates personal evangelism because every time personal evangelism occurs, Satan is thinking, "Uh oh, they are getting close to the number." He does not know what the number is either, but he knows we are getting close because God to me looks like He is putting on the roof of the temple, which is a metaphor for the church.

Here is what the whole thing looks like pictorially. Israel nationally is that. I am not saying a Jew cannot get saved. Do not get me wrong, Jews do get saved. Hebrews do get saved. The early church was all Hebrew, but the bulk of the nation remains in unbelief even as I speak. So Israel, nationally, with its leadership, is this separated branch. see those weird strange colored branches? That is us.

We have been brought into Israel's New Covenant, and one of these days that work will be complete. Then the church will be translated to heaven via the Rapture. God will work in history to grab the branch that is supposed to be there and reinsert it, and it will bring them to faith in the events of the Tribulation Period.

Acts 15:14 is a tremendous reference to what God is doing in the present age of the church. James says:

*"Simeon has related how God first concerned Himself about taking from among the Gentiles a people for His name" (Acts 15:14).*

Cornelius was the first one to get saved (Acts 10). Now the pattern of God, as we can see through the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, the pattern of God is, yes, Jews do trickle in, and praise the Lord for that, but we are in the Gentile age now. The majority of people getting saved are not Jews. The majority of people getting saved are Gentiles. In fact, it is the Hebrews that are giving Paul a hard time in every synagogue he goes to as he travels about in his missionary journeys. It is the Gentiles that are open to the gospel. James says, "This is the pattern of God."

Thomas Ice does a great job summarizing Acts 15:14. In the Tim LaHaye Study Bible, he writes:

"James explains how the decision of the council at Jerusalem was an outworking of God's purpose for this age. God's plan for history relates to the past ages with Israel and to Israel's role in the coming age (the Millennium), but the current Church Age will center around the Gentiles. After the Church Age is concluded—"1

It began on the Day of Pentecost, and it will end with the Rapture, this 2,000-year insertion into Israel's program. We are so weird. I hate to keep using that expression, but I do not know what other word to use. Our insertion into God's program is so different than anything He has ever done.

Israel was a nation; we are not a nation. Israel had a calendar system; we do not have a calendar system. Israel had a priesthood; we do not have priests in the Church Age because we are all priests. Israel had a sacrificial system. We do not have an animal sacrificial system. Israel had borders and a taxation system. We do not have anything like that in the Church Age.

That is why this description of branches that are foreign is so apropos. Lewis Sperry Chafer called our existence in the program of God an intercalation. These guys in the 20s used real vocabulary words. He uses this word intercalation. I had to look that up. What in the world is that? Intercalation is an abnormal calendar insertion into a calendar system that is very different. That is who we are. That is what God has been doing for 2,000 years. That is why they have a big powwow to figure this out, because this is different.

James explains how the decision of the council at Jerusalem was an outworking of God's purposes for this age. God's plan of history relates to the past ages with Israel and to Israel's role in the coming age or the Millennial Kingdom, but the current Church Age will center around the Gentiles.

"After the Church Age is concluded, the Lord will return, and 'rebuild the tabernacle of David' (verse 16), i.e., the nation of Israel. This Old Testament reference is from Amos 9:11-12. During the Tribulation the

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Ice, *Tim LaHaye Prophecy Study Bible*, p. 1304.

Lord will work to convert the nation of Israel to Himself, ending with the second coming and the millennial reign of Christ. God's plan for history will come to pass just as He ordained."<sup>2</sup>

This part here, where "God is working to convert the nation of Israel to Himself, culminating in the second coming and the millennial reign of Christ," you are going to be watching from heaven. You will have great seats. You will not be on the earth when this happens.

That is what James is getting at here in Acts 15:14 where he talks about how *"Simeon has related how God first concerned Himself about taking from among the Gentiles a people for His name"* (Acts 15:14). If we are an abnormal calendar insertion, why in the world would you put these Gentiles under Israel's law? This is the point that James is driving towards.

Now James goes Old Testament. He starts quoting the Old Testament to prove his point. Notice Acts 15:15-18. We have an introduction to what he is going to say (Acts 15:15). Then he is going to quote Amos 9:11-12. What does he say here in Acts 15:15?

*"With this the words of the Prophets agree, just as it is written"* (Acts 15:15).

Notice that word 'agree.' That is a big deal. Here is the Greek word for that, and tell me what English word comes out of this: "[συμφωνέω], symphoneo." Symphony. When you listen to a symphony, all the musicians have to be playing from the same song sheet. You cannot have rogue musicians. It is not going to make much of a happy noise if everybody is doing their own thing, independent of everyone else. James is saying, "The prophets are having a symphony here, and they all agree with what I am going to say."

You will notice, and this is a big deal, that James does not say the Amos passage is fulfilled. He does not say fulfilled. He says they agree. The Greek word for fulfilled is "pleroo." It is used in Acts 1:16 where I think it is Peter speaking concerning the replacing of Matthias with Judas, who had committed suicide:

*"Brethren, the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas, who became a guide to those who arrested Jesus"* (Acts 1:16).

He is saying that Judas' suicide was a fulfillment of Bible prophecy. The Book of Acts knows how to use the word "fulfilled." Acts 15:15 does not use the word "fulfilled." It uses the word "agree." You say, "Who cares?" Here is why you should care. Those who teach that we are in the Millennial Kingdom now, sometimes called amillennialists, do not believe in a future kingdom because we are in the kingdom now, in spirit, in a

---

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

spiritual form. They think that Jesus set up an invisible form of the kingdom when He was here 2,000 years ago, and we are in it now. They teach that there is no future kingdom.

We believe in a future kingdom of a thousand years. They do not believe that. They think the thousand years is happening now over the last 2,000 years. That right there should tell you we have a mathematical problem. But they say, "You are taking the number 1,000 too literally. Forget all this stuff about a future for Israel. It is all about Jesus reigning in our hearts right now. That is the kingdom."

That is why James quoted the Book of Amos to show that 2,000 years ago Jesus took the fallen tabernacle of David and restored it. They think that the citation from Amos 9 is somehow being spiritually fulfilled right now. When the word "fulfilled" is not even used. James never says the Scripture is fulfilled. He says, "On the point I am going to make, all of the prophets agree." The word "pleroo" is not even used.

Everybody is emailing me or texting me or putting notifications on my social media. "What is wrong with Tucker Carlson? What is wrong with Candace Owens? What is wrong with these people? They claim to be Christians and yet they are anti-Israel. What's the problem? Do they not understand that there is a future for Israel?" The answer is what I am talking about right here. They are involved. I do not know if they are saved or not. I do not have any idea. I would have to have a conversation with them to figure that out.

But this much I know. Tucker Carlson, Episcopalian, Candace Owens, now Roman Catholic. She was trying to argue that Charlie Kirk, who was just assassinated and martyred, was a Catholic. She said that Charlie was way too smart to be a Protestant. That is what she said. Look it up. What is wrong with her? What is wrong with him?

When they put their things on their X accounts, why do they keep putting the moniker "Christ is King"? Why does Candace Owens keep tweeting "Christ is King. Christ is King." What is she doing? I am explaining to you why she thinks the way she does as a Roman Catholic, and why Tucker Carlson thinks the way he thinks as a Episcopalian, they are amillennialists, or perhaps its kissing cousin postmillennialists.

They believe that Jesus set up 2,000 years ago an invisible spiritual kingdom that we are in now. They say that all of Israel's promises have been redefined, and they are now spiritually available to us in the church. If all of Israel's Old Testament promises have been redefined, then there is no future for the national Israel because we are the new Israel. That is called Replacement Theology, and it comes from using texts like this, trying to make James say something that he is not saying.

If James wanted to say what Candace Owens is teaching and what Tucker Carlson is teaching, he could have said "fulfilled," but he does not say that. He says, "The prophets are in symphony. They are in agreement with the point that I am about to make here."

As you go down to Acts 15:16-18, you see James quoting the passage:

*""After these things I will return,  
And I will rebuild the tabernacle of David which has fallen,  
I will rebuild its ruins,  
I will restore it,  
So that the rest of mankind may seek the Lord,  
And all the Gentiles who are called by My name"" (Acts 15:16-17).*

This is an eighth-century prophecy. This goes back to about 755 BC, where Amos said that: "All the Gentiles who are called by My name."

*""Says the Lord, who makes these things known from long ago"" (Acts 15:18).*

What is James doing here? He is using an Old Testament passage about the coming Millennial Kingdom to explain a pattern of God. That is what he is doing. Candace Owens and Tucker Carlson are saying, "No, James is taking Amos' prophecy and changing it to make it sound like the fallen tabernacle of David—which we understand as millennial yet future—is happening now. When I sign my name on my X account, I am going to put 'Christ is King.'"

What she means by that, and what they mean by that is that Christ is ruling as King now. But He is not ruling as King now. Christ has three offices: prophet, priest, and king. Prophet, First Coming; King, Second Coming after you have a repentant Israel. Right now He is not functioning as King. He is functioning as High Priest after the order of Melchizedek. He is doing some cool stuff, by the way, but He is not functioning as King, although He is heir to the throne of David. He cannot be functioning as King. If he is functioning as King now, He is not doing much of a job because the devil is still running the show. He will continue to run the show until the Second Advent.

Amillennialism and Postmillennialism are teaching that we are in an invisible form of the kingdom now. That is why Candace Owens can trash the nation of Israel with one breath and then with her other hand, sign her X account with the moniker "Christ is King." She is an Amillennialist. She is a Replacement Theologian. She is getting that from her Roman Catholicism that Charlie Kirk obviously believed in, because Charlie was just way too smart to be a Protestant. He had to be a Catholic. Do you see how this little game is played?

I am trying to explain to you what is happening as the Right, the leaders of MAGA, are moving in this anti-Israel direction because that is what everybody is trying to figure out today. Anti-Semitism, we expect it from the Left. I expect it from Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. I expect it from Rashida Tlaib. I expect it from Ilhan Omar. I expect all kinds of anti-Semitism from them. I do not expect it from the Right, which has been the great shock of the last six months or less.

What is going on on the Right? What is going on with Tucker Carlson? Why is he platforming all of these Israel haters and Holocaust deniers? Did you know that he just platformed Nick Fuentes who compared Jews in ovens to baking cookies? It is just sick and twisted. He calls Hitler a cool guy. Who is platforming him? It is Tucker Carlson, who claims to be a Christian. Why would you do something like that? Because he does not believe what we believe, that there is a future for Israel. He believes that God is through with the Jew, and we are the new Israel, because James said the fallen tent of David has been restored.

What is James actually doing here with this passage? You have to understand that in a book where there are constant visions and words from God to the church, you do not have that in Acts 15. God did not speak. In Acts 8:29, why did Philip evangelize the Ethiopian eunuch? Easy. The Spirit said to Philip, "Go up and join his chariot." Why did Paul and Barnabas go out on the first missionary journey? Easy. God spoke (Acts 13:2).

*"While they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, 'Set apart for Me Barnabas and Saul, for the work to which I have called them'" (Acts 13:2).*

We have not gotten there yet, but it is coming in the next chapter. Why did Paul on missionary journey two go into Macedonia? He got a vision.

*"A vision appeared to Paul in the night: a man of Macedonia was standing and appealing to him, and saying, 'Come over to Macedonia and help us'" (Acts 16:9).*

In the Book of Acts you have these examples where the Holy Spirit says, or the Holy Spirit shows. You do not have anything like that in Acts 15. For whatever reason, God did not say a word—no vision, no dream, no prompting of the Holy Spirit, no liver quiver, nothing. How do you make a big decision like this? You have to go to the Bible that you had called Hebrew Bible.

Why not go to the New Testament? It does not exist yet. The only book on the docket at this point would be Galatians and maybe Matthew and James. You have an incomplete New Testament. To make a big decision like this where God is not talking, they have to go to the Bible that they had, which is Hebrew Bible, which we call Tanakh.

Jesus constantly appealed to Hebrew Bible.

*"Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, He explained to them the things concerning Himself in the Scriptures" (Luke 24:27).*

What Scriptures? Old Testament.

*"...that all things which are written about Me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled" (Acts 24:44).*

What is He talking about here? Not the New Testament, but the Old Testament.

Jesus said to the Pharisees,

*"You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; it is these that testify about Me" (John 5:39).*

*For if you believed Moses, you would believe Me, for he wrote about Me" (John 5:46).*

This is a reference to Hebrew Bible.

*"Now when they had traveled through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where there was a synagogue of the Jews. And according to Paul's custom, he went to them, and for three Sabbaths reasoned with them from the Scriptures" (Acts 17:1-2).*

What Scriptures would those be? Hebrew Bible.

*"Now these [Bereans] were more noble than those in Thessalonica, for they received the word with great eagerness, examining the Scriptures daily to see whether these things were so" (Acts 17:11).*

What Scriptures? Hebrew Bible.

*"For I delivered to you as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He was raised on the third day according to the Scriptures" (1 Corinthians 15:3-4).*

What scriptures? Hebrew Bible, Tanakh. Torah, Nevi'im, and Ketuvim were the three major divisions of Hebrew Bible, hence the name Tanakh.

If God is not going to talk, and we do not have a New Testament yet, and we have a big decision to make—do the Gentiles have to come under the Law of Moses to join the church?—let us go to Hebrew Bible to get this figured out. That is why James quotes Amos 9:11-12. He also makes a statement about the Millennial Kingdom, which is yet future.

Now listen to me very carefully, because this is the whole debate between our way of thinking and the Candace Owens way of thinking. James, when he quotes Amos, does not change the meaning of Amos. Candace Owens and Tucker Carlson want you to believe that James came in here and changed the meaning to make it sound like the Davidic tent had been restored 2,000 years ago. That cannot be true for a lot of

reasons, not the least of which is that Acts 15:15 says that the prophets agree, but it does not say they were fulfilled. That is why I brought that up.

They think the Davidic kingdom went through problems in the Exile, and God restored it with the coming of Christ 2,000 years ago. That is not what we believe here. We believe that this is a statement of the future Millennial Kingdom. James is not changing Amos 9 at all. He is stating Amos 9:11-12 in context, but he is applying the stable meaning you follow.

What is his point? His point is, "God is not speaking, so we have to reason analogically. When the Millennial Kingdom comes, the Gentiles are going to be full citizens." That is what James is saying here. That is why he is quoting Amos 9. When the thousand-year kingdom comes one day—which all the Jews believed in, James being Jewish—the Gentiles are going to be full fledged citizens. He says that is the pattern of God.

Therefore, reasoning analogically, backward to the Church Age, let us let the Gentiles in. Now that is all he is saying. He is not arguing here that the Millennial Kingdom started in spiritual form. He is just reaching into the future when the Millennial Kingdom will be restored and Jesus will take His rightful seat on David's throne.

He basically says, "During that time period, the Gentiles are going to be full-fledged citizens. If that is the way God works yet future, then all of these Gentiles that are being saved right now, let us let them into the church. Let us not put them under the yoke of the Law of Moses. They are not going to have that in the Millennial Kingdom. Let us not do it to them now."

Why does he have to think that way? Because he does not have a New Testament yet. God is not speaking. There is no vision, so he is reasoning analogically. I will have more to say about it next time, but he is respecting the original context of the Amos passage, which Candace Owens and Tucker Carlson and R.C. Sproul and the rest of them are not doing. They all think James changed Amos. No. He respected the original intent and context of Amos 9. He just used it by way of analogy.

If he was doing something different here, he would have said "fulfilled," which he does not say. In fact, all the prophets indicate this, that the Gentiles are going to be full-fledged citizens in the Millennial Kingdom. Let us let them in now without making them submit to the Law of Moses.

Do you guys believe in global warming?

*"But the day of the Lord will come like a thief, in which the heavens will pass away with a roar and the elements will be destroyed with intense heat, and the earth and its works will be burned up" (2 Peter 3:10).*

That is an eschatological statement, is it not? What does Peter say after 2 Peter 3:10?



*"Since all these things are to be destroyed in this way, what sort of people ought you to be in holy conduct and godliness" (2 Peter 3:11).*

In other words, your view of the future (2 Peter 3:10) impacts your behavior in the present (2 Peter 3:11). James is doing the exact same thing. He is talking about a future time period when the Davidic tabernacle will be restored. It is not restored right now. The only way you could get it to be restored is if you want to change the meaning. There is a future time when the Davidic Tabernacle will be restored in the Millennial Kingdom, which we should be praying for to come.

When Jesus taught us to pray, He said, pray this way: *""Your kingdom come""* (Matthew 6:10). That is what we are praying for, the coming of the Millennial Kingdom one day. When that kingdom is brought to the earth, the Gentiles are going to be full-fledged citizens in it, just like the Jews. There is no special hurdle that the Gentiles have to jump through that the Jews will not have to jump through. The Amos 9 passage quoted in its original context proves that, so let us let the Gentiles in.

The next time I am with you, I am going to show you that what I just taught is completely consistent with the way Dispensationalists, which is our camp, have approached this passage, from the Scofield Reference Bible to statements that Dr. J. Dwight Pentecost makes. After I expose you to the right view, which I have tried to do tonight, by the way, I will show you the wrong view. I will give you a quote from Kim Riddleberger's "A Case for Amillennialism," where he comes in here and he says, that James gave Amos a new meaning; everything you read about Israel's promises in the Old Testament get your erasers out, get your white out out and erase all that."

I will show you how that mindset actually goes back to John Calvin. Then once I teach you that, I will show you the monkey business that is going on at Dallas Seminary, my alma mater, where they are trying to find a mediating position between the two because you have people like Darrell Bock, the progenitor of so-called Progressive Dispensationalism, which is taking the Amillennial argument in about 50% and saying, 'This text has two meanings.' There are two thrones of David. There is the earthly one, and there is the heavenly one. Already not yet. This is like being a little bit pregnant. You are in the kingdom or you are not. You are either pregnant or you are not.

They have had this mediating position of already not yet. They say, "Yes, there is going to be a future fulfillment." This is what they call a complementary hermeneutic, which is a deviation from standard hermeneutical practices. There are two meanings to the text. There is the Amos meaning, and then there is the new meaning in addition to the old meaning that James is giving to the passage.

The Amillennialists say this passage wipes out Israel's promises. Darrell Bock and his crew are trying to argue that there are two thrones of David. There is one in heaven now. Jesus is not functioning as High Priest now; He is functioning on a heavenly Davidic throne, but He will function on an earthly Davidic throne later. Already not yet. I will walk you through that next time.