The Name of God Dishonored by the People of God.
Rom. 2:17-24

Introduction:
A. Jews were once God's people.
   1. Gave them the law — truth (vv. 17-20; 3:1,2)
   2. Should have caused God’s name to be honored among the gentiles.
   3. Instead, they caused it to be blasphemed. (v. 24).
B. Christians are now God's people. (cf. 1 Pet. 2:9)
   2. Should cause Christ’s name to be honored in the world.
   3. Instead, we often His name and cause to be blasphemed.
C. Our text reveals three ways that the people of God may dishonor the name of God.

Discussion:
I. By Becoming Haughty In Attitude.
   B. Christians should be neither bashful nor boastful:
      1. About being Christians. (1 Pet. 4:16; 1 Cor. 15:9,10).
      2. About preaching gospel. (Rom. 1:15,16; 1 Cor. 9:16).
      4. About obeying gospel. (Lk. 17:10).
II. By Becoming Inconsistent In Application.
    1. Jewish inconsistencies.
       a. Applied God’s judgment to gentiles, but not themselves. (vs. 1-11).
       b. Taught the God’s truth to gentiles, but not themselves. (vv. 17-24).
    2. Christian's inconsistencies.
       a. Rightly judge denominations, but emulate their practices.
       b. Rightly teach against error, but encouraging it by our practice.
          (1) McGarvey and instrumental music. (Search for Ancient Order. P. 442.)
          (2) Brethren and church-supported institutions.
III. By Becoming Formalistic In Accentuation.
    A. Jews accentuated outward form but neglected inward purity. (vv. 25-29; Cf. Matt. 23).
    B. Christians can reduce Christianity to a mere form.
       1. Outwardly Scriptural in name, without inward purity implied by name.
          b. "Church OF CHRIST" without really being of Christ.
       2. Outwardly Scriptural in worship, very little from heart. (cf. Matt. 15:8).
       3. Outwardly Scriptural in work and organization, very little real involvement.

Conclusion:
A. Let us let our light of truth shine brightly before men. (Matt. 5:14-16).
B. Let us not dim our light of truth with baskets of haughtiness, inconsistency and formalism.
Jesse P Sewell:

Professor McGarvey may speak out against the use of instrumental music in the worship, as he does, and say things against it that those who refuse to use it would hardly say; but what do the people who want the instrumental music care about this thing so long as he gives his influence almost entirely (except in his home congregation) to those who use it? Brother McGarvey believes that instrumental music is wrong, and so teaches, still he gives his name and influence to a paper that advocates its use and associates with churches that use it (except at home and possibly a few other occasions.) So, while he believes and teaches that the thing is wrong, there is not a church in the land that uses it that will not today point to Brother McGarvey as “one of the strong men on our side.” His influence goes with his fellowship, not with his faith and teaching.”