

Reconciling Acts & Galatians

Kevin Kay

Table Of Contents

Introduction	1
Who Are The Galatians?	5
<i>The North Galatian Theory</i>	5
<u>Argument #1</u> : The popular use of the terms “Galatia” (Gal. 1:2) and “Galatians” (Gal. 3:1) usually signified the Gauls living in “North Galatia”	5
<u>Argument #2</u> : In Acts Luke describes places according to geographical region rather than political province.....	6
<u>Argument #3</u> : In Acts Luke does not use the terms “Galatia” or “Galatians” when recounting Paul’s evangelistic efforts in “South Galatia” on his First Missionary Journey	6
<u>Argument #4</u> : In Acts Luke indicates that the apostle Paul evangelized in “North Galatia”.....	7
<u>Argument #5</u> : It is unlikely that Paul would use the term “Galatians” (Gal. 3:1) to address Pisidians or Lycaonians (Acts 13:14; 14:6)	11
<u>Argument #6</u> : Paul reminds the Galatians that he initially preached among them “because of physical infirmity” (Gal. 4:13), but Luke says nothing about this in Acts.....	11
<u>Argument #7</u> : Luke reports that Paul was persecuted in “South Galatia” during his First Missionary Journey, but Paul says nothing about this in Galatians	12
<u>Argument #8</u> : The problems addressed in Galatians, involving Gentile Christians, were more likely to have arisen in “North Galatia” than “South Galatia” since there were more Gentiles in this area	13
<u>Argument #9</u> : It is unlikely that Paul would have referred to Barnabas as he does in Galatians (Gal. 2:1, 9, 13) if he were writing to churches in “South Galatia”	14
<u>Argument #10</u> : The character traits of the Gaul’s fit Paul’s description of his readers	14
<u>Argument #11</u> : The “Church Fathers” believed that Paul wrote to churches in “North Galatia”.....	15
<u>Argument #12</u> : Until the 19 th century, most commentators believed that Paul wrote to churches in “North Galatia”	16
<i>The South Galatian Theory</i>	17
<u>Argument #1</u> : Paul preached to the Galatians before his Visit After 14 Years to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1, 4-5).....	17
<u>Argument #2</u> : The terms “Galatia” and “Galatians” were used to refer to the Roman province of Galatia and its inhabitants.....	20
<u>Argument #3</u> : Paul normally describes places according to political province rather than geographical region.....	21
<u>Argument #4</u> : “Galatia” and “Galatians” were the only terms available to include all the people in all the cities that were visited on Paul’s First Missionary Journey	22
<u>Argument #5</u> : It is unlikely that Paul would have established churches in “North Galatia”	23
<u>Argument #6</u> : Luke gives us virtually no information about the alleged churches in “North Galatia”	23
<u>Argument #7</u> : We know of no churches at this early date in “North Galatia” from the NT or other sources.....	24

<u>Argument #8</u> : It seems highly unlikely that Paul would write a letter to virtually unknown churches in “North Galatia” and not write a letter to well-known churches in South Galatia”	25
<u>Argument #9</u> : The Judaizing teachers were more likely to infiltrate churches in “South Galatia” than “North Galatia”	26
<u>Argument #10</u> : The content of Paul’s letter to the Galatians is consistent with Luke’s account of Paul’s work in “South Galatia”	27
<u>Argument #11</u> : Paul’s <i>modus operandi</i> better fits the “South Galatian Hypothesis”	27
<u>Argument #12</u> : The collection delegation contained no representative from North Galatia	27
<u>Argument #13</u> : Paul’s references to Barnabas in Galatians (2:1, 9, 13) suggest that he was already well known to the Galatians	29
<u>Argument #14</u> : The absence of any reference to Timothy is strong circumstantial evidence that Paul wrote Galatians before he became one of Paul’s assistants	30
<u>Argument #15</u> : Paul’s silence in Galatians about the Jerusalem Council decree indicates that Galatians must have been written before the Jerusalem Council; and therefore before Paul could possibly have visited “North Galatia”	30
<u>Argument #16</u> : Paul was charged with practicing circumcision in spite of preaching against it (Gal. 5:11)	31
<u>Argument #17</u> : Paul addresses the Galatians in Greek	31
<u>Argument #18</u> : Paul’s comment that the Galatians had received him as “an angel of God” (Gal. 4:14) could be an indirect allusion to his reception as Hermes at Lystra (Acts 14:11-15)	31
<u>Argument #19</u> : Paul’s comment that “I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus” (Gal. 6:17) could be an allusion to his stoning in Lystra (Acts 14:19)	32
How Should Paul’s Visits To Jerusalem, Mentioned In Acts And Galatians, Be Correlated?	32
Five Visits to Jerusalem in Acts; Two Visits to Jerusalem in Galatians	32
Paul’s Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds with the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30)	34
<u>Argument #1</u> : Paul mentions two visits to Jerusalem after his conversion (Gal. 1:18; 2:1), and according to Luke, Paul’s second visit to Jerusalem after his conversion was the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:29-30; 12:25)	34
<u>Argument #2</u> : Logically, Paul would not omit a reference to any visit to Jerusalem	35
<u>Argument #3</u> : There are similarities between the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) and the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)	37
<u>Argument #4</u> : Peter’s withdrawal from Gentile Christians in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) is more likely to have occurred before, rather than after, the Jerusalem Council	39
<u>Argument #5</u> : The criticism of Paul’s apostolic authority more likely occurred early in his ministry rather than later	39
<u>Argument #6</u> : Paul’s refusal to circumcise Titus (Gal. 2:1-5) more likely occurred before the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15)	40
<u>Argument #7</u> : Paul does not mention any church leaders among the churches of Galatia	40
<u>Objection #1</u> : Paul preached to the Galatians prior to the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:5)	40
<u>Objection #2</u> : When Paul visited Jerusalem the second time, the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10), he was already a missionary to the Gentiles (Gal. 2:2, 7-9); but Paul did not evangelize the	

Galatians until after the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:25-30; 12:25). Therefore, the Visit After 14 Years could not have been the Famine Relief Visit	40
<u>Objection #3</u> : If the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) is the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25), then the question about whether or not Gentile converts had to be circumcised was officially settled long before the Jerusalem Council; thus making it superfluous	41
<u>Objection #4</u> : Identifying the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) with the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25), is chronologically untenable	42
Paul’s Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds with the Jerusalem Council Visit (Acts 15:1-2, 4) and Galatians was written after the Jerusalem Council.....	43
<u>Argument #1</u> : Paul preached to the Galatians prior to the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:5).....	44
<u>Argument #2</u> : The Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) is strikingly similar to the Jerusalem Council Visit (Acts 15:1-2, 4).....	44
<u>Objection #1</u> : If Paul evangelized “South Galatia” prior to the Jerusalem Council, why didn’t he mention that in Gal. 1:21?.....	47
<u>Objection #2</u> : If the letter to the Galatians was written after the Jerusalem Council, why doesn’t Paul settle the question once and for all by referring to the apostolic decrees.....	48
<u>Objection #3</u> : It is inconceivable that Peter would have snubbed his Gentile brethren in Antioch if that had occurred after the Jerusalem Conference	49
<u>Objection #4</u> : Paul’s reference to his rebuke of Peter in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) undercuts his polemical argument if this event occurred after the Jerusalem Council.....	50
<u>Objection #5</u> : How could the problem[s] that Paul addresses in Galatians have arisen at all after the Jerusalem Conference?.....	50
<u>Objection #6</u> : Several things mentioned in Galatians could reasonably have occurred before the Jerusalem Council, but not afterwards	51
Where And When Was Galatians Written?	51
The answers to these questions depends on	51
The North Galatian Hypothesis would require a later date.....	53
<i>North Galatia & 1 Visit</i>	53
<i>North Galatia & 2 Visits</i> (Gal. 4:13).....	54
The South Galatian Hypothesis would allow a much earlier date	56
<i>South Galatia & 1 Visit & VI4Y</i> (Gal. 2:1-10) = <i>FRV</i> (Acts 11:27-30).....	56
<i>South Galatia & 2 Visits</i> (Gal. 4:13) & <i>VI4Y</i> (Gal. 2:1-10) = <i>FRV</i> (Acts 11:27-30)	57
<i>South Galatia & 1 Visit</i> (Gal. 4:13) & <i>VI4Y</i> (Gal. 2:1-10) = <i>JCV</i> (Acts 15:2, 4).....	57
<i>South Galatia & 2 Visits</i> (Gal. 4:13) & <i>VI4Y</i> (Gal. 2:1-10) = <i>JCV</i> (Acts 15:2, 4).....	57
How Do We Harmonize Paul’s Preaching With His Practice Concerning The Law Of Moses?	58
In Galatians, Paul taught that the law of Moses was inadequate	58
In Galatians, Paul preached that the law of Moses has been superseded and/or replaced by the gospel of Christ	59
In Acts, Luke reports that Paul continued to practice various Jewish rituals and customs	59
This apparent contradiction is not really that hard to reconcile.....	60
Conclusion:	60

Reconciling Acts & Galatians

Kevin Kay

Text: Gal. 1:11-2:14

Introduction:

- I. *Mike Willis*: “At the outset of the study of any New Testament book, the **introductory matters** attempt to answer these questions: (1) To **whom** was the book written? (2) **When** was it written? and (3) **Why** was it written? Few books of the New Testament prove to be **as difficult** as Galatians in providing answers to these questions.” (Bold emphasis added, x)
- II. I’ve been asked to **reconcile Acts and Galatians**. In an effort to do that, there are basically **four questions** that we want to consider:
 - A. **Who** are the Galatians to whom Paul writes his letter?
 - B. **How** should **Paul’s visits** to Jerusalem, mentioned in Acts and Galatians, **be correlated**?
 - C. **Where** and **when** was Galatians written?
 - D. **How** do we harmonize Paul’s preaching with his practice concerning the law of Moses?
- III. These are **difficult questions** to answer because “**sticky wickets**” abound
 - A. The first question is hard to answer, because the term “**Galatia**” had **two meanings** in the first century
 1. Sometimes it was used merely to refer to an area in **north and east central** Asia Minor settled by the **Gauls**
 - a. *Donald K. Campbell*: “First, it referred to the area in Asia Minor where the **Gauls** had settled after migrating from western Europe through Italy and Greece. The territory was limited to the **north central** and **east central** areas of **Asia Minor** and its principal cities were **Ancyra, Pessinus, and Tavium**.” (Bold emphasis added, 2:587)
 2. Sometimes it was used to refer to the **Roman province of Galatia** that included:
 - a. The **northern area** settled by the **Gauls** [“North Galatia”]
 - b. Territory to the **south**, including the cities of Pisidian **Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe** [“South Galatia”]¹ (Guthrie, 465)
 - 1) *Donald K. Campbell*: “[I]n 25 B.C. this kingdom was converted to a **Roman province**, and territory was added to **the south**, including the cities of **Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*)
 - 2) *Ben Witherington, III*: “It [the Roman province of Galatia, ksk] bordered on the **Black Sea** in the north and the **Mediterranean Sea** in the south, and in theory when Paul addressed persons as **Galatians**, if he used **Roman provincial designations**, he could be addressing **people anywhere in this region**. **Strabo** in his discussion of Galatia confirms that the province included old **Galatia, Pisidia, Lycaonia**, parts of **Pamphylia**, and **Cilicia Trachea** (12.5.1).” (Bold emphasis added, 3)
 3. The **letter** to the Galatians gives us **no direct clue** as to the **geographic area** of Paul’s evangelism (Cole, 22)

-
4. However, Paul could not have written to churches in both “North Galatia” and “South Galatia” at the **same time**, because the letter of Galatians implies that the “**churches of Galatia**” (Gal. 1:2) were all **established** at about the **same time** (Gal. 4:13-14, 19), and Paul did not **visit** both of these areas at the **same time** (Boice, 10:412)
 - a. The churches in “**South Galatia**” (i.e. Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe) were established by Paul and Barnabas on the **First Missionary Journey** (Acts 13:14, 51; 14:6, 20-23)
 - b. If Paul established churches in “**North Galatia**” at all (and this is disputed), they could not have been established until the **Second Missionary Journey** when he allegedly visited this area (Acts 16:6)
- B. The second question is hard to answer, because the **number of Paul’s visits** to Jerusalem following his conversion **differ** in Acts and Galatians
1. In Acts, Luke mentions **5 visits** that Paul made to Jerusalem after his conversion
 - a. 1st Visit: **The Post-Conversion Visit** (Acts 9:26-30; 22:17-18)
 - b. 2nd Visit: **The Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
 - c. 3rd Visit: **The Jerusalem Conference Visit** (Acts 15:4ff)
 - d. 4th Visit: **The Jewish Feast Visit**, after the Second Missionary Journey (Acts 18:21-22)
 - e. 5th Visit: **The Collection Visit**, after the Third Missionary Journey (Acts 21:15, 17)
 2. In Galatians, Paul mentions only **2 visits** that he made to Jerusalem after his conversion
 - a. 1st Visit: After **3 Years** (Gal. 1:18-19)
 - b. 2nd Visit: After **14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10)
 3. To complicate matters even further, we should at least consider the **possibility** that Paul’s **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) **does not correspond** to any of his visits mentioned by Luke in the book of Acts
 - a. Perhaps **Luke failed to mention this visit** just as he did not mention Paul’s trip to **Arabia** (Gal. 1:17) (Ramsay, *Galatians*, 286)
 - b. Although I think this is **highly unlikely**, I think this possibility should at least be **mentioned**
- C. The third question is hard to answer, because:
1. There is **no indication** in Galatians of its **place of origin** (unlike other Pauline epistles)
 - a. The **place of origin** for one Pauline letter is **explicitly stated**:
 - 1) **1 Corinthians** was written from **Ephesus** (cf. 1 Cor. 16:8-9)
 - b. The **place of origin** for two Pauline letters is **implied**:
 - 1) **Romans** was written from **Corinth**
 - a) Paul commends **Phoebe** who was from **Cenchrea** (Rom. 16:1-2), and Cenchrea was the **port city** for **Corinth** (cf. Rom. 16:1-2 & Acts 18:1, 18)
-

-
- b) Paul sends greetings from **Gaius** (Rom. 16:23) who was baptized in **Corinth** (1 Cor. 1:14)
 - 2) **2 Corinthians** was written from **Macedonia** (Acts 20:1-2)
 - a) When Paul wrote this letter, he was **boasting** [present tense] of the Corinthians to the Macedonians (cf. 2 Cor. 9:2-4)
 - c. The **place of origin** for other Pauline letters may be **deduced** by “connecting the dots”
 - 1) The “**Prison Epistles**” were almost certainly written from **Rome**
 - a) **Four** of Paul’s letters were written from **prison**
 - 1] **Ephesians** (cf. Eph. 3:1; 4:1; 6:20)
 - 2] **Philippians** (cf. Phil. 1:7, 13-14, 16)
 - 3] **Colossians** (cf. Col. 4:3, 10, 18)
 - 4] **Philemon** (cf. Phile. 1, 9-10, 13, 23)
 - b) Although Paul was imprisoned several times in different cities, relevant data suggests that these “**Prison Epistles**” were written from **Rome**
 - 1] Paul was **imprisoned** in **Rome** for two years (Acts 28:16, 30-31)
 - 2] During his imprisonment, Paul continued to **preach** the gospel (Eph. 6:18-20; Phil. 1:12-18; Col 4:2-4)
 - 3] In Philippians, Paul mentions the **Praetorium** and **Caesar’s household** (Phil. 1:13; 4:22)
 - 4] **Aristarchus** accompanied Paul to Rome (Acts 27:2), and he is a **fellow-prisoner** with Paul when he wrote Colossians (Col. 4:14)
 - 5] **Luke** accompanied Paul to Rome (Acts 28:14, 16), and he was **with Paul** when he wrote Colossians (Col. 4:14)
 - 6] **Paul’s companions**, mentioned in the “Prison Epistles” are known to have been with him in **Rome**, but not in **Caesarea**
 - 7] Paul had **liberty** to **preach** the gospel during his imprisonment in Rome (Acts 28:30-31), but it is not known that he had such liberty in **Caesarea**
 - 2) **1 Thessalonians** was written from **Corinth**
 - a) 1 Thessalonians was written not long after Paul **left** Thessalonica (1 Th. 2:17-18)
 - b) It was written while **Silvanus** (Silas) and **Timothy** were with Paul (1 Th. 1:1)
 - c) It was written after Paul sent **Timothy** from Athens to **revisit** the church in Thessalonica (1 Th. 3:1-5)
 - d) It was written after Timothy **rejoined** Paul to report on the condition of the church (1 Th. 3:6-8)
-

-
- e) When Paul left Athens, he went to **Corinth** (Acts 18:1)
 - f) Silas and Timothy **left Macedonia** and **rejoined** Paul in **Corinth** (Acts 18:5)
 - g) Silas is not known to have been with **Paul** and **Timothy** after the initial mission in Corinth (Acts 18:5)
 - h) Therefore, Paul almost certainly wrote 1 Thessalonians from **Corinth**
- 3) **2 Thessalonians** was written from **Corinth**
- a) It must have been written before Paul's **second visit** to Thessalonica (Acts 20:1-3)
 - b) It was written while Paul was accompanied by **Silas** and **Timothy** (2 Th. 1:1), and **Corinth** is the only known place where this was the case in the intervening period
- 4) **1 Timothy** was probably written from **Macedonia** (1 Tim. 1:3)
- 5) **2 Timothy** was probably written from **Rome** during a Second Roman Imprisonment (2 Tim. 1:8, 16; 2:9)
- d. The **place of origin** for Galatians is not **explicitly stated** or **implied**. Furthermore, the letter alone does not give us enough information to even **deduce a conclusion** by "connecting the dots"
- 1) By using a **few clues** contained in Galatians and Luke's account of **Paul's Missionary Journeys**, we may be able to deduce a **probable place of origin**; but that's about all we can do
2. The answer to this question depends on the answers to the **first two questions**
- a. The **identity** of the "Galatians"
 - b. The **correlation** of Paul's visits to Jerusalem
- D. About the time you think you have the **puzzle(s) solved**, another puzzle piece **doesn't seem to fit**
- II. The **good news** is that none of these questions affect the **interpretation** or the **application** of Galatians
- A. *Mike Willis*: "The introductory problems related to Galatians will never be **convincingly settled**. All that a person can do is to **present both sides** of the controverted points and **leave these basic issues unsolved**. Let it be observed, however, that our ignorance of these matters does not preclude the **correct exegesis** of the letter. The main thoughts of the letter stand out quite clearly." (Bold emphasis added, x)
- B. There is **one exception** that I am aware of
- 1. Some institutional brethren have accepted the "**North Galatian Hypothesis**" and have argued from it that **Galatians 6:10** refers to the **benevolent relief** sent by Gentile churches to Jerusalem (cf. Rom. 15:25-26, 31; 1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Cor. 8:1-4; 9:1, 12-13); and therefore this **great collection** was intended for **Christians** and **non-Christians**²
 - a. Analyzing this argument is **outside the scope** of this study, but **Martin Pickup** has written a helpful response³
-

- III. However, the questions we will consider are **important** because they do relate to:
- A. The **meaning** of certain Galatian passages
 - B. The **historical accuracy** of the book of Acts
 - C. The **integrity** of the apostle Paul
 - D. The development and shape of **Paul's theology**
 - E. **NT chronology**
 - F. How we as Bible students **rightly divide** the word of truth (2 Tim. 2:15)

Body:

I. **WHO ARE THE GALATIANS?**

A. **The North Galatian Theory:**

1. Explanation:

- a. Galatians was written to **churches** in various cities (e.g. Ancyra, Pessinus, Tavium) in "**North Galatia**" that were established by Paul and Silas on Paul's **Second Missionary Journey**
- b. The "**North Galatian Theory**" is defended by **reputable scholars**: J. B. Lightfoot, James Moffatt, Conybeare & Howson, F. Godet, H.A.W. Meyer, Ellicott, Alford, Findlay, and the greater number of German critics (Willis, xv)

2. Affirmative Arguments:

- a. Argument #1: **The popular use of the terms "Galatia" (Gal. 1:2) and "Galatians" (Gal. 3:1) usually signified the Gauls living in "North Galatia"** (Lightfoot, 19; Carson & Moo, 460)

1) Explanation:

- a) The terms "**Galatia**" and "**Galatians**," as used by Luke (Acts 16:6; 18:23) and Paul (Gal. 1:2; 3:1), refer to "**North Galatia**" and **ethnic Galatians**
- b) The northern area was the **true Galatia**, in **race and language**
- c) This is the **oldest and most obvious meaning** of the word "**Galatia**"
- d) Since the terms **Mysia**, **Phrygia**, and **Pisidia** are all "**geographical expressions**" (Acts 13:14; 14:24; 16:6-8; 18:23) and the term **Galatia** is used in the same contexts (Acts 14:24; 16:6-8; 18:23), it is reasonable to conclude that Galatia is also a "**geographical expression**"⁴
- e) Other parts of the **Roman province** would more truly be designated as **Pisidia** (Acts 13:14; 14:24), or **Phrygia** (Acts 2:10; 16:6; 18:23), or **Lycaonia** (Acts 14:6), as the case might be
- f) The official Roman title for the province was "**the Province of Galatia and...**" listing all these other areas in turn

2) Evaluation:

-
- a) Luke's usage of the term "Galatia" **says nothing** about Paul's usage of this term
 - b) The terms "**Galatia**" and "**Galatians**" were used to refer to the **whole Roman province** by that name and its **inhabitants** (Carson & Moo, 460)
 - 1] *Ben Witherington, III*: "[T]here is clear evidence from the inscriptions of the period that the **entire region** was regularly called **Galatia** in the NT era (cf. *ILS* 9499; *IG* Rom. 3.263, Eutropius 7.10), and not just the Celtic or Gallic part." (Bold emphasis added, 4)
- b. Argument #2: In Acts Luke describes places according to geographical region rather than political province (Wallace, 2; Rapa, 11:551)
- 1) Explanation:
 - a) Luke uses **geographical titles**, not **Roman provincial titles**, to describe the regions that Paul visited
 - 1] **Pamphylia** (Acts 13:13)
 - 2] **Perga** (Acts 13:14)
 - 3] **Pisidia** (Acts 13:14)
 - 4] **Lycaonia** (Acts 14:6)
 - 5] **Phrygia** (Acts 16:6)
 - 6] **Asia** (Acts 16:6)
 - 7] **Bithynia** (Acts 16:7)
 - 8] **Phrygia** (Acts 18:23)
 - b) Therefore, it is certainly reasonable to conclude that when he refers to "**Phrygia** and the region of **Galatia**" (Acts 16:6) and "the region of **Galatia** and **Phrygia**" (Acts 18:23), he refers to **two districts**, not one: **geographic Phrygia** and **geographic Galatia** [i.e. "North Galatia"]⁵ (Carson & Moo, 460; Longenecker, lxxv)
 - c) **Derbe** and **Lystra** were "**cities of Lycaonia**" (Acts 14:6, 11), not **Phrygia**, so "**Phrygia and the region of Galatia**" (Acts 16:6) cannot refer to the area Paul had **already visited** on his First Missionary Journey
 - d) Furthermore, "**Galatia**" cannot refer to the **Roman province** of "Galatia" since it **included a part** of the former district of "**Phrygia**" (Guthrie, 466)
 - 2) Evaluation:
 - a) Ancient Greek and Latin writers consistently used the term "**Galatia**" to refer to "**North Galatia**," but Luke uses **different terminology**. Why would he do that unless he was referring to a **different area** (Ramsay, *Galatians*, 314)
- c. Argument #3: In Acts Luke does not use the terms "Galatia" or "Galatians" when recounting Paul's evangelistic efforts in "South Galatia" on his First Missionary Journey (Rapa, 11: 551)
- 1) Explanation:
-

-
- a) Luke does not refer to Pisidian **Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe** as being a part of the Roman province of “**Galatia**”⁶ (Guthrie, 466)
 - b) He refers to these cities in terms of **geographical districts**
 - 1] “Antioch in **Pisidia**” (Acts 13:14)
 - 2] “Lystra and Derbe, cities of **Lycaonia**” (Acts 14:6)
 - 2) Evaluation:
 - a) Luke’s terminology **says nothing** about Paul’s terminology
 - d. Argument #4: In Acts Luke indicates that the apostle Paul evangelized in “North Galatia”
 - 1) Explanation:
 - a) Luke reports that Paul went through “**Phrygia and the region of Galatia**” on his **Second Missionary Journey** (Acts 16:6)
 - 1] Luke’s terminology indicates that Galatia was **quite distinct** from Phrygia (and presumably other districts such as Lycaonia) (Carson & Moo, 461)
 - 2] Therefore he is using **popular and geographical terms** that denote **two districts**, not one
 - 3] Since Galatia is **distinct** from Phrygia and Phrygia was a **part** of the **Roman province of Galatia**, Luke must be referring to “**North Galatia**” (Longenecker, lxv; Boice, 414)
 - 4] In Acts 16:6 the **aorist participle** κωλυθέντες [“they were forbidden,” ksk] refers to **action antecedent to the time of the main verb**, διήλθον [“when they had gone through,” ksk], in keeping with **normal grammar**
 - a] Thus the verse should read something like this: “Since they **were forbidden** by the Holy Spirit from speaking the word in **Asia**, they went through **the Phrygian and Galatian region.**”⁷
 - b] Since Paul was already in **Lycaonia** (Acts 16:1 & 14:6) when the Holy Spirit **forbade** him to preach the word in **Asia** (Acts 16:6), he had no alternative but to turn **north** (Guthrie, 467)
 - c] If so, then they did indeed travel through “**North Galatia**” and perhaps even **establish churches** there (as διήλθον seems to imply in 18:23) (Wallace, 3, n. 7)
 - b) He also reports that Paul “went over **the region of Galatia and Phrygia** in order, **strengthening all the disciples**” on his **Third Missionary Journey** (Acts 18:23)
 - 1] The fact that Paul **strengthened** “**all the disciples**” indicates that many had been **converted** to Christ and that this had occurred **earlier**

-
- 2] Since Paul apparently **established** the Galatian churches (Gal. 4:13, 19), they could not have been established by **others** before Paul visited “North Galatia”
- 3] Furthermore, if Paul **visited the Galatians twice** before he wrote his letter (cf. Gal. 4:13, 19), then these churches must have been established before Paul visited this area a second time on his **Third Missionary Journey** (Acts 18:23)
- c) When Paul passed through the “**upper regions**” on his way to Ephesus (Acts 19:1), what else could that mean except “**North Galatia**”? (Hendriksen, 12)
- 1] Reply: *F. F. Bruce*: “More or less **any part of inland Asia Minor** could have been called ‘**the upper country**’ in relation to Ephesus....” (Bold emphasis added, 13)
- 2) Evaluation:
- a) *Timothy George*: “The Greek phrasing in both of these texts is **ambiguous** and, taken alone, could **lend support** to either the **North or South Galatia theory**....If indeed they can be read to mean that on these two missionary journeys Paul visited both **Phrygia** (in **Southern Galatia**) and **Galatia** proper (in the **North**), they constitute the **only evidence**, biblical or otherwise, of **Paul’s evangelization** of this region of Asia Minor.” (Bold emphasis added, 30:42)
- b) In Acts 16:6, there are good reasons to conclude that Luke is referring to **one region or district**, not two -- **the Phrygic-Galactic area, inhabited by Phrygians and known as Phrygia in “South Galatia”**
- 1] Luke uses the term “**Phrygia**” as an **adjective**⁸
- a] *F. F. Bruce*: “[I]n fact the **adjective Galatiko’s** (Latin *Galaticus*) is **well attested** for those regions of the province which were **not ethnically Galatian**, and also for **the province** as a whole, but not at this period for **ethnic Galatia**.” (Bold emphasis added, 15)
- b] *Ben Witherington, III*: “[T]here is now very clear evidence for the **adjectival use** of the word **Phrygian** in Greek. This means that the phrase found in Acts 16:6 can indeed refer to **one region**, not two, **the Phrygian part of Galatia (Phrygia Galatica)** would have been the Roman term, like the term **Pontus Galatica**). In other words Luke means that **Paul passed through the territory already covered** (including presumably the city of Pisidian Antioch) and then presumably on into uncharted Phrygian territory on the way to Ephesus.” (Bold emphasis added, 6)
- c] *D. A. Carson & Douglas Moo*: “F. F. Bruce’s careful examination yields the conclusion that the expression can mean only ‘the territory through which Paul and his friends passed after leaving **Lystra**, the territory in which **Iconium** and **Pisidian Antioch** were situated.’ The similar expression in
-

- Acts 18:23 seems to mean much the same.” (Bold emphasis added, 458)⁹
- d] Several English versions reflect this view:
- 1} “...**the region of Phrygia and Galatia**” (ASV; ESV; HCSB; ISV; NET; NIV; NRSV; RSV)
 - 2} “...**the Phrygian and Galatian region**” (LEB; NASB)
 - 3} “...**the Phrygian and Galatian territory**” (NAB)
- e] Therefore, the book of Acts **does not really say** that Paul visited “**North Galatia**”
- 1} Response: No division of Galatia was known with the title “**Phrygian Galatia**” (Guthrie, 468)
 - 2} Reply: F. F. Bruce **refutes this objection** in his commentary on Galatians
- 2] Luke uses **one article** (“the”) to govern both terms (“Phrygia” and “Galatia”)
- a] *Ernest de Witt Burton*: “The joining of the words Φρυγίαν and Γαλατικὴν by καί, with the **article** before the **first one only**, implies that the **region** designated by Χώρα is **one, Phrygian and Galatian**.”¹⁰ (Bold emphasis added, *A Critical And Exegetical Commentary On The Epistle To The Galatians*, xxxii, quoted in Longenecker, lxvii)
 - b] *Note*: The same grammatical construction is used in the phrase “**Iturea and the region of Trachonitis**” (Lk. 3:1) to refer to **one region**, not two
- 3] In Acts 16:6 Κωλυθέντες [“forbidden,” ksk] should be taken as an **aorist participle of subsequent action**
- a] Acts 16:6 would then read: “They went through the **Phrygian-Galatian region**, but were **then forbidden** by the Holy Spirit from **speaking the word in Asia**”
 - b] Although this usage of the participle, is, admittedly, **quite rare**, in recent years **more and more scholars** are recognizing the validity of the **aorist participle of subsequent action**
 - 1} G. M. Lee has produced **several examples** of this phenomenon, in both **Koine Greek** (some even in Acts!) and **classical Greek** (“The Aorist Participle of Subsequent Action (Acts 16,6)?”, *Biblica* 51 [1970] 235-57; “The Past Participle of Subsequent Action,” *NovTest* 17 [1973] 199)
- 4] A prohibition against **preaching** in Asia is not necessarily a prohibition against **traveling** through Asia
- 5] Luke’s narrative (Acts 15:41-16:8) is **more intelligible** if “**Phrygia and the region of Galatia**” (Acts 16:6) refers to **one region**
- a] After passing through the **Phrygian-Galatian district**, Paul and Silas attempted to preach in **Asia**, but were **prohibited**. So

they came close to **Mysia** and attempted to go north into **Bithynia**, but were again **prohibited** (Acts 16:7). So they went to the coast, to **Troas**, and there Paul saw the **vision** of the man from Macedonia who said, “**Come over to Macedonia and help us**” (Acts 16:8-9)¹¹ (Wallace, 3, 7)

- c) In Acts 18:23, there are good reasons to conclude that Luke is referring to “**South Galatia**” once again
- 1] *Ben Witherington, III*: “It may well **mean the same thing** as Acts 16:6, but there is a chance more is meant here because **Phrygia** is used as a **substantive** here rather than as an **adjective**, and the term **region** is only **coupled** with **Galatia**. Furthermore, the term $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\lambda\iota\kappa\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ would seem to point to **the visiting of two regions**, for the term means **in order**, assuming a **sequence** of at least two members.” (Bold emphasis added, 6)
 - 2] *Ben Witherington, III*: “[I]t is likely that here Luke uses the term **Galatia** to refer to the **southern Galatian cities** previously visited, or **the province as a whole** which included these cities, and the term **Phrygia** is used with the awareness that **Phrygia extended beyond the Galatian province into the province of Asia** and that Paul went through both **Phrygian Galatia** and **Phrygian Asia** on his way to **Ephesus**.” (Bold emphasis added, 6)
 - 3] Luke’s reference to “**strengthening all the disciples**” (Acts 18:23) favors the conclusion that Paul retraced his steps through an area already **evangelized** (Witherington, III, 6)
- d) On Paul’s Second Missionary Journey, a trip to “North Galatia” would have been a **detour** from the **most direct route** from Antioch through Syria and Cilicia, Derbe and Lystra to Troas¹² (Acts 15:41; 16:1)
- e) Even if Luke’s references to “**Galatia**” refer to “**North Galatia**,” at most they indicate that Paul **passed through** this area (Acts 16:6) and **strengthened existing converts** (Acts 18:23), not that he **established churches** in the area
- 1] Paul certainly **passed through** other areas **without evangelizing** (cf. Acts 13:4; 14:25; 16:7-8, 11; 17:1; 18:18; 20:14-15; 21:1)
- f) On Paul’s Second Missionary Journey, a trip from “North Galatia” to Troas would have taken Paul and Silas through the areas of **Bithynia** and **Asia** where the Holy Spirit had **forbidden** them to **preach** (Acts 16:6-7)
- g) On Paul’s Third Missionary Journey, a trip to “North Galatia” would have been a **detour** from the **most direct route** from **Antioch** to **Ephesus** (Acts 18:22-23; 19:1)
- 3) Finally, even if it could be conclusively proven that **Paul visited “North Galatia”** on his Second and Third Missionary Journeys (Acts 16:6; 18:23), that would **not prove** that Paul’s letter was **addressed to these churches** (Gal. 1:2) (Herrick, 9, n. 46)

- e. Argument #5: It is unlikely that Paul would use the term “Galatians” (Gal. 3:1) to address Pisidians or Lycaonians (Acts 13:14; 14:6) (Bruce, 14; Carson & Moo, 460)
- 1) Explanation:
 - a) The term “**Galatians**” could properly be given only to the **Gauls**, the Celtic people, who lived in “**North Galatia**” (Berkhof, 180)
 - b) *Robert Rapa*: “[I]t would have been **unusual** for Paul to have referred to Christians of **Phrygia** and **Lycaonia** as **Galatians** when they were not ethnically **Celtic** but were considered ‘**Galatians**’ only **politically**.” (Bold emphasis added, 11:551)
 - c) This **linguistic usage**, *i.e.* referring to Pisidians and Lycaonians as “Galatians,” is **not generally attested**
 - d) Addressing Pisidians and Lycaonians as “**Galatians**” would be **insulting** because it would remind them of their **subjugation** to Rome (Carson & Moo, 460)
 - 2) Evaluation:
 - a) Both Luke and Paul speak elsewhere of **all the inhabitants** of a city or district without making **ethnographical distinctions**:
 - 1] **Corinthians** (2 Cor. 6:11)
 - 2] **Philippians** (Phil. 4:15)
 - 3] **Macedonians** (2 Cor. 9:2, 4; Acts 19:29)
 - 4] **Pontians** (Acts 18:2)
 - 5] **Asians** (Acts 20:4)
 - 6] **Alexandrians** (Acts 18:24)
 - 7] **Romans** (Acts 2:10) (Zahn, 1:175)
 - b) *Ben Witherington, III*: “**Strabo** in his discussion of Galatia confirms that the province included old **Galatia**, **Pisidia**, **Lycaonia**, parts of **Pamphylia**, and **Cilicia Trachea** (12.5.1).” (Bold emphasis added, 3)
 - c) If **Lycaonia** and **Pisidia** were rightfully part of **Roman Galatia**, then Paul’s terminology was **quite appropriate**
 - d) The inhabitants of “South Galatia” would have been **proud** of a title that implied **Roman citizenship**¹³ (Guthrie, 470)
 - 1] Though a **Jew**, and therefore one of **a subjugated people**, Paul proudly referred to himself as a **Roman citizen** (Acts 16:37-38; 22:25-29)
- f. Argument #6: Paul reminds the Galatians that he initially preached among them “because of physical infirmity” (Gal. 4:13-14), but Luke says nothing about this in Acts
- 1) Explanation:

- a) Paul indicates that he initially preached among the Galatians because of some **physical infirmity** (Gal. 4:13-14)
- b) Luke gives **no indication** in Acts that Paul either **began** to preach or **continued** his preaching longer than originally intended in Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe because of **illness** (Boice, 10:416)
- 2) Evaluation:
- a) This is an **argument from silence**, and such an argument is at best a **probability** (Boice, 10:417)
- b) Furthermore, this argument cuts both ways since Luke is equally **silent** about any **illness** during Paul's alleged visits to "**North Galatia**" (Acts 16:6; 18:23) during his **Second** and **Third Missionary Journeys** (Willis, xiv-xv)
- c) The book of Acts is obviously a **selective history**, rather than an exhaustive one
- 1] For example, Luke only mentions a **few** of the **many afflictions** that Paul enumerates (2 Cor. 11:23-33)
- a] Should we conclude that Paul **did not endure** the sufferings which Luke **does not mention**?¹⁴
- d) It is unlikely that Paul would have made the **arduous trip** to "**North Galatia**" while **sick**¹⁵
- 1] Response:
- a] Paul traveled to the mountainous northern region specifically to **convalesce from illness**¹⁶
- 2] Reply:
- a] This is pure **speculation**
- b] Would a **sick man** have deliberately tackled the **rigors** of the **much harsher northern climate**? (Cole, 23)
- e) *William Hendriksen*: "[T]his difference between the two accounts can be removed by a **different interpretation** of Gal. 4:13, according to which it would not read '*because of*' but '*amid*' **physical infirmity**, which would fully harmonize with Acts 13:50; 14:5, 6, 19; cf. 2 Tim. 3:11." (Bold emphasis added, 11)
- g. Argument #7: Luke reports that Paul was persecuted in "South Galatia" during his First Missionary Journey, but Paul says nothing about this in Galatians (Carson & Moo, 460)
- 1) Explanation:
- a) In **Antioch of Pisidia**, the Jews **opposed** Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:44-46), then **persecuted** them, and **expelled** them from their region (Acts 13:50)

- b) In **Iconium**, the unbelieving Jews **stirred up** the Gentiles against the brethren (Acts 14:2), the city was **divided**, and a violent attempt was made to **stone** Paul and Barnabas (Acts 14:4-5)
- c) In **Lystra**, Jews from Antioch and Iconium stirred up the multitude and they **stoned** Paul and left him for dead (Acts 14:19)
- d) Paul mentioned these persecutions in **2 Timothy** (2 Tim. 3:11); yet Paul **says nothing** about this persecution in his letter to the Galatians

2) Evaluation:

- a) Once again this is an **argument from silence**, and such an argument is **notoriously unreliable**
 - 1] If Paul's persecutions were **not germane** to the purpose(s) of his letter, there would be no reason for him to **mention** or **allude** to them
 - b) However Paul did say, "I bear in my body **the marks** of the Lord Jesus" (Gal. 6:17) which certainly could refer to **scars** received in his stoning at Lystra (Acts 14:19)
 - c) His allusion to possible **eye problems** (Gal. 4:13-15) also could have been caused or aggravated by his **stoning**
 - 1] Response:
 - a] **Possibility** is not **probability**, much less **certainty**

h. Argument #8: The problems addressed in Galatians, involving Gentile Christians, were more likely to have arisen in "North Galatia" than "South Galatia" since there were more Gentiles in this area

1) Explanation:

- a) The **churches** of Galatia were predominantly **Gentile**
 - 1] Paul was the **apostle** to the **Gentiles** (Gal. 1:16; 2:2, 9)
 - 2] Some/many of the Galatians had been **idolaters** (Gal. 4:8-11)
 - 3] Some/many of the Galatians were **uncircumcised** (Gal. 5:2-3; 6:12-13)
- b) There were **more Jews** in "**South Galatia**" than in "North Galatia"
- c) There were **more Gentiles** in "**North Galatia**"; therefore the **problems** addressed in Galatians would more likely **exist there**¹⁷
- d) In "**South Galatia**," with its large **Jewish population**, the **problems** Paul addresses in Galatians would have **arisen immediately**, not later after Paul had left the area¹⁸

2) Evaluation:

- a) The **churches** in "South Galatia" were made up of both **Jews** and **Gentiles**

-
- 1] When Paul preached in the **synagogues**, it was to both **Jews** and **Gentiles** (Acts 13:42)
 - 2] Both **Jews** and **Gentiles** became **Christians** (Acts 13:43; 14:1)
 - b) Furthermore, **Paul's use of the OT** in the book of Galatians points to the presence of at least **some Jews** in the **Galatian churches** and of **considerable Jewish influence** even in predominantly **Gentile congregations** (Hendriksen, 11)
 - c) Moreover, since Paul makes "**Jewish arguments**" to convince **Gentiles** not to become **more Jewish**, these Gentiles must have had some **acquaintance** with **Judaism** and the **OT** (Witherington, III, 7)
 - 1] The references to **Abraham** (Gal. 3:6-9, 14, 16, 18, 29)
 - 2] The references to **the covenant** (Gal. 3:17)
 - 3] The allegory of **Hagar** and **Sarah** (Gal. 4:21-31)
 - i. Argument #9: It is unlikely that Paul would have referred to Barnabas as he does in Galatians (Gal. 2:1, 9, 13) if he were writing to churches in "South Galatia"
 - 1) Explanation:
 - a) **Barnabas helped Paul establish** the churches in "South Galatia" (Acts 13:2, 43, 46, 50; 14:12, 14); yet Paul claims in his letter that **he established** "the churches of Galatia" (Gal. 1:8-9; 4:13, 19) (Berkhof, 180)
 - b) Paul would not have **slighted Barnabas** like this if he were writing to the churches that they established in "South Galatia"
 - c) Therefore, Paul must have been writing to churches in "**North Galatia**" (Boice, 10:417)
 - 2) Evaluation:
 - a) Paul does indicate that there was a "**we**" who had preached the gospel to the Galatians (Gal. 1:8)
 - b) Paul speaks of Barnabas as **an equal** in his letter to the Galatians (Gal. 2:1, 9)
 - c) If Paul **could rebuke Peter** to his face (Gal. 2:11-12), and he was **Peter's equal** (Gal. 2:6; 2 Cor. 11:5; 12:11), he could certainly **refer to Barnabas** as he did (Gal. 2:13)
 - j. Argument #10: The character traits of the Gaul's fit Paul's description of his readers (Berkhof, 180)
 - 1) Explanation:
 - a) Various ancient writers described the Gauls as a **fickle** and **superstitious** people (esp. Caesar, *De Bello Gallico* 2.1; 4.5; 6.16; Cicero, *De Divinatione* 1.5; 2.36-37) (Lightfoot, 14-16; Longenecker, 41:lxv)
 - b) The **Galatians** to whom Paul wrote had these **same character traits**
 - 1] They **quickly accepted** the gospel and Paul (Gal. 4:14-15)
-

- 2] Then they **quickly began to depart** from it (Gal. 1:6-10; 3:1-4)
- 3] They were also attracted to **rituals** (Gal. 4:10; 5:1-2)

2) Evaluation:

- a) *James Montgomery Boice*: “[N]o **special traces** of the supposed **fickleness, drunkenness, revelings, superstitions**, or contact with Judaism by the northern Galatians can be **documented**.” (Bold emphasis added, 10:415)
 - b) The **weakness** of this argument is **apparent** when it is stated in the form of a **syllogism**
 - 1] *Major Premise*: The Gauls were **fickle** and **superstitious**.
 - 2] *Minor Premise*: Paul’s **Galatians** were **fickle** and **superstitious**.
 - 3] *Conclusion*: Therefore Paul’s **Galatians** were **Gauls** (Bruce, 8)
 - c) This syllogism is not valid because it contains an **“undistributed middle”**
 - 1] **“Undistributed Middle”**: “a fallacy arising from the failure of the middle term of a syllogism to refer to all the members of a class in at least one premise.”
 - d) The **character traits** of the ethnic Galatians are **possessed by others** as well
 - 1] The **citizens of Lystra** (in “South Galatia”) initially welcomed Paul and Barnabas as **gods** in the likeness of men (Acts 14:11-13) and then later **stoned Paul** nearly to death (Acts 14:19)
 - 2] The **Corinthians** manifest many of the same characteristics as the Galatians (cf. 1 Cor. 1:10-13)
 - e) If we accept the premise that the **Gauls** were fickle and the **recipients** of Galatians were fickle, that does not prove that they were **one and the same**, since **fickleness** can be a characteristic of **many people**
- k. Argument #11: The “Church Fathers” believed that Paul wrote to churches in “North Galatia”

1) Explanation:

- a) The early **Church Fathers** interpreted the terms **“Galatia”** (Acts 16:6; 18:23; 1 Cor. 16:1; Gal. 1:2; 2 Tim. 4:10; 1 Pet. 1:1) and **“Galatians”** (Gal. 3:1) in the older **ethnic sense**
- b) Presumably such a view was based on **local church traditions** now long lost to us

2) Evaluation:

- a) After Paul’s death, the **boundaries** of the Roman province of Galatia were gradually **diminished** over time until its dimensions were roughly equivalent to **“North Galatia”**
 - 1] In AD 74, Vespasian detached almost all of **Pisidia** from Galatia

-
- 2] About AD 137, **Lycaonia Galatica** was removed and added to an enlarged province of **Cilicia**
 - 3] In AD 297, **southern Galatia** was united with surrounding regions to form a new province of **Pisidia** with Antioch as its capital
 - 4] As a result, at this point, the borders of the Roman province of Galatia were **diminished** to virtually its **original ethnological dimensions**, so that it no longer included **“South Galatia”**
(Witherington, III, 5; Longenecker, lxiii)
- b) Evidently the “Church Fathers” were unaware that when Paul wrote his epistle, the terms **“Galatia”** and **“Galatians”** could have included churches in **“South Galatia”**; therefore, they understood these terms in light of the **current meaning** in their own day¹⁹
 - 1] *Note:* There was at least **one dissenting voice** in ancient times. **Asterius**, bishop of Amaseia in Pontus (d. 410), interpreted **“the Galatic region and Phrygia”** of Acts 18:23 as **“Lycaonia and the Cities of Phrygia”** (*Homilia VIII in S. Petrum et Paulum*; Migne PG 40.293) (George, 41, n. 29)
 - c) However, William Ramsay’s **historical research conclusively proved** that in the days of Paul, the term **“Galatia”** included the **southern cities** (Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe) that Paul visited on his **First Missionary Journey**²⁰
1. Argument #12: Until the 19th century, most commentators believed that Paul wrote to churches in “North Galatia”
 - 1) Explanation:
 - a) Until the **eighteenth century**, **no commentator ever seriously disputed** the idea that Paul’s letter was written to **Christians** living in **“North Galatia”**
 - b) It was not until the **nineteenth century** that the **contrary view** began to **make progress** in the English-speaking world
 - 2) Evaluation:
 - a) **Accepted and widespread conclusions** over a **long period of time** are not necessarily **correct**
 - 1] Burning **incense** to the bronze serpent (2 Ki. 18:4)
 - 2] The earth is **flat**
 - 3] Baptism by **sprinkling, pouring, or immersion**
 - 4] Baptism is **not essential to salvation**
 - 5] **Instrumental music** in worship is acceptable
 - 6] **“Once saved always saved”**
 - 7] Etc.
-

- b) Until **William Ramsay** conducted his extensive research in the late 1800's, the earlier commentators were influenced by the **mistaken views** of the "**Church Fathers**"
- c) Mt 15:14: ¹⁴ Let them alone. They are blind leaders of the blind. And if the **blind leads the blind, both will fall into a ditch.**"

B. The South Galatian Theory:

1. Explanation:

- a. Galatians was written to churches in "**South Galatia**" that Paul established on his **First Missionary Journey** (i.e. **Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe**)
- b. The "**South Galatian Theory**" is defended by **reputable scholars**: William Ramsay, Ernest De Witt Burton, James Montgomery Boice, Frederic Rendall, George S. Duncan, R. A. Cole, and many others (Willis, xviii)

2. Affirmative Arguments:

- a. Argument #1: Paul preached to the Galatians before his Visit After 14 Years to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1, 4-5)

1) Explanation:

- a) Paul **preached** the gospel to the Galatians (Gal. 1:8-9; 4:13) and **established** the Galatian churches (Gal. 4:19; cf. 1 Cor. 4:15)
- b) Paul **preached** to the Galatians **prior** to his **Visit After 14 Years** to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1, 4-5)

1] According to Paul, it was during this visit that he refused to yield submission to the **Judaizing teachers** "even for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might **continue** with you" (Gal. 2:4-5)

2] For the gospel to "**continue**," it must have already been **preached**

a] "**Continue**" (*diameno*)

1} *BDAG*: "...gener. 'remain'. 1. **to continue in an activity, state, or condition, remain....** 2. **continue to exist, live on....** 3. **to continue in association with someone, remain continually w. someone** δ. πρὸς τινα **Gal 2:5....**" (233)

2} *Thayer*: "...to stay permanently, remain permanently, continue.... Gal. 2:5...." (140)

3} *Vine*: "**to continue throughout, i.e., without interruption** (No. 3 [*meno*, ksk] with *dia*, 'through'), is said of the dumbness of Zacharias, Luke 1:22, KJV, 'remained'; of the 'continuance' of the disciples with Christ, Luke 22:28; of the permanency of the truth of the gospel with churches, Gal. 2:5; of the unchanged course of things, 2 Pet. 3:4; of the eternal permanency of Christ, Heb. 1:11." (Bold emphasis added, 2:126-127)

-
- b] In Galatians 2:5, our **major English versions** translate the term:
 - 1} **“Continue”** (ASV; KJV; NKJV)
 - 2} **“Remain”** (ISV; NASB; NET; NIV84; NRSV; YLT)
 - 3} **“Remain continually”** (LEB)
 - 4} **“Remain intact”** (NAB)
 - 5} **“Be preserved”** (ESV; HCSB; CSB; NIV; RSV)
 - a} Note: These English versions translate *diameno* with the term **“preserved”** only in Galatians 2:5
 - c] The **NT usage** of *diameno* confirms the translation **“continue”** or **“remain”**
 - d] The **LXX usage** of *diameno* also tends to confirm the translation **“continue”** or **“remain”**
 - 3] Since Paul is writing to the **“churches of Galatia”** (Gal. 1:2) and **addressing them** throughout his letter, the **“you”** (Gal. 2:5) most obviously refers to the **Galatians**²¹
 - 4] Therefore Paul had **already preached** the gospel to the Galatians before his Visit After 14 Years to Jerusalem
 - c) Paul’s Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:5) to Jerusalem **must correspond** to either:
 - 1] The **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
 - 2] The **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15)
 - d) Yet both of these visits to Jerusalem occurred **before** Paul allegedly visited **“North Galatia”** (Acts 16:6; 18:23)
 - e) Therefore, Paul must have written to the **churches** in **“South Galatia”** established on his First Missionary Journey
 - 2) Evaluation:
 - a) Paul’s statement does not necessarily mean that **he already had converts in Galatia** before his Visit After 14 Years²²
 - b) Some English versions translate *diameno* **“be preserved for”** rather than “remain with”
 - 1] **“Remain with you”** (or something equivalent)
 - a] **“Continue with you”** (ASV; KJV; NKJV)
 - b] **“Always remain with you”** (ISV; NRSV)
 - c] **“Remain continually with you”** (LEB)
 - d] **“Remain with you”** (NET; NASB; NIV84)
 - 2] **“Remain for you”** (or something equivalent)
-

-
- a] “**Preserved** for you” (ESV; HCSB; NIV; RSV; CSB)
 - b] “**Remain intact** for you” (NAB)
 - c] “**Remain** to you” (YLT)
- c) The preposition *pros* is used **701x** in the NT, and it has a **wide semantic range** that can include either “**with**” or “**for**”
- 1] [See Appendix A: Definitions of *Pros*]
- d) The most common use of *pros* with the accusative, ‘**toward,**’ gives a **perfectly understandable meaning** in Gal 2:5 (Martyn, 33A:198)
- e) The “**you**” (Gal. 2:5) refers to the **Gentiles** generally, not to the **Galatians** specifically
- 1] Note: While acknowledging that the “**you**” (Gal. 2:5) refers to **Paul’s Galatian converts**, Richard Longenecker asserts, although he doesn’t really argue or defend the point, that Paul’s readers had **responded** to the gospel before Paul **wrote** Galatians, rather than before **his second visit** to Jerusalem²³
- 3) Response:
- a) The English versions that translate *diameno* “**be preserved**” in Galatians 2:5 do so **only in that passage**; therefore this rendering appears to be somewhat **interpretive**
 - b) *Pros* with the accusative means “**with**” elsewhere in Galatians (Gal. 1:18; 4:18, 20)
 - 1] Reply: *Pros* with the accusative also means “**to**” (Gal. 1:17; 6:10) and “**about**” (Gal. 2:14) elsewhere in Galatians
 - c) Paul’s **silence** concerning any trip to Galatia during his time in **Syria & Cilicia** (Gal. 1:21), before his visit to Jerusalem after 14 years (Gal. 2:1), must mean that he had **not previously visited Galatia**²⁴
 - 1] Paul’s visit to Jerusalem after 14 years (Gal. 2:1) must be the **famine relief visit** (Acts 11:27-30) which occurred before Paul established any churches in **South Galatian** on his First Missionary Journey (Acts 13-14)
 - 2] Paul’s visit to Jerusalem after 14 years (Gal. 2:1) is the **Jerusalem Council visit** (Acts 15), and Paul is writing to churches in **North Galatia** that were established on Paul’s Second Missionary Journey (Acts 16:6) and revisited on his Third Missionary Journey (Acts 18:23)
 - 3] Reply:
 - a] This is an **argument from silence**, and arguments from silence are **precarious**
 - b] Mentioning a trip to Galatia was **not germane** to Paul’s argument
-

-
- c] Furthermore, the Galatians would have **already known** about a visit to them during this time period
- d) Since Paul has already mentioned his **habitual preaching to the Gentiles** (Gal. 2:2) in this context, it seems much more likely to me that Paul is saying that he would not yield to the Judaizers that the truth of the gospel might **“continue with you”** rather than be **“preserved for you”**
- e) In Paul’s letter to the Galatians, the second person plural pronoun **“you”** [*hymas*] consistently refers to the **Galatians**
- 1] Sometimes the context indicates that **Gentiles** are in view (cf. Gal. 2:2, 5; 4:8-9, 17; 5:2-6; 6:12-13) and sometimes **Jews** (cf. Gal. 3:13, 23-25, 26-29; 4:3-7, 9-10; 5:1); but nonetheless **Galatians** (cf. Gal. 1:2-3, 11, 20; 2:5; 3:1, 26-29; 4:12-14, 19; 5:13; 6:1, 11)
 - 2] *Greg Herrick*: “The **highly situational and intimate context** of Galatians 2 makes it **improbable** that the ‘you’ is general, referring to the **Gentiles**, but rather is to be understood as specific, referring to the **actual recipients** of the letter. (Bold emphasis added, 13, n. 76)
- f) Although Paul mentions the **Gentiles** in the immediate context (Gal. 2:2, 8-9), why would he use the pronoun **“you,”** if he intended to refer to the Gentiles as a group or a class, since he is addressing this remark (Gal. 2:5) to the **Galatians**?
- 1] If the **“you”** referred specifically to **Gentiles**, Paul would likely have added an **appositional phrase** to indicate such (cf. Eph. 2:11; 3:1) (*Zahn*, 1:178, n. 7)
- g) To what **time period** is Paul referring?
- 1] Is Paul referring to when he **wrote Galatians** or to when he **visited Jerusalem** the second time?
- h) **Why** does Paul make this remark? What is his **purpose**?
- 1] Is Paul saying that he **did not yield** to the Judaizing teachers so that the **truth** of the gospel might **continue** when he **eventually visited** Galatia and **preached** the gospel to the Gentiles there?
 - 2] Is Paul saying that he **did not yield** so that the **truth** of the gospel, which he had **already preached** to the Gentiles in Galatia, might **continue/remain** with them?
- b. Argument #2: **The terms “Galatia” and “Galatians” were used to refer to the Roman province of Galatia and its inhabitants**
- 1) Explanation:
 - a) *William Ramsay*: “It seems clearly proved that so early as the **second century B.C.** the **Phrygian origin** of the larger half of the Galatian population was **forgotten** by ordinary people of the surrounding countries; and the **whole state** was thought of as **Galatia** and its **people** as **Galatians**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Galatians*, 84)
-

- b) When “**Galatia**” was expanded and became a **Roman province** in **25 BC**, the terms “Galatia” and “Galatians” were used to refer to the **whole Roman province** by that name and its **inhabitants** (Carson & Moo, 460; Longenecker, lxvi)
- 1] *Ben Witherington, III*: “[T]here is clear evidence from the inscriptions of the period that the **entire region** was regularly called **Galatia** in the NT era (cf. *ILS* 9499; *IG* Rom. 3.263, Eutropius 7.10), and not just the Celtic or Gallic part.” (Bold emphasis added, 4)
- 2) Evaluation:
- a) The popular use of the terms “**Galatia**” (Gal. 1:2) and “**Galatians**” (Gal. 3:1) usually signified the **Gauls** living in “**North Galatia**”
- c. Argument #3: Paul normally describes places according to political province rather than geographical region (Carson & Moo, 459; Rapa, 11:551)
- 1) Explanation:
 - a) Paul normally used **provincial, not ethnic, terms** to identify locale²⁵ (Willis, xiv)
 - 1] **Achaia** (Rom. 15:26; 16:5; 1 Cor. 16:15; 2 Cor. 1:1; 9:2; 11:10; 1 Th. 1:7-8)
 - 2] **Arabia** (Gal. 1:17)
 - 3] **Asia** (Acts 20:18; 24:18; 1 Cor. 16:19; 2 Cor. 1:8; 2 Tim. 1:15)
 - 4] **Dalmatia** (2 Tim. 4:10)
 - 5] **Illyricum** (Rom. 15:19)
 - 6] **Judea** (Acts 26:20; Rom. 15:31; 2 Cor. 1:16; Gal. 1:22; 1 Th. 2:14)
 - 7] **Macedonia** (Rom. 15:26; 1 Cor. 16:5; 2 Cor. 1:16; 2:13; 7:5; 8:1; 11:9; Phil. 4:15; 1 Th. 1:7-8; 4:10; 1 Tim. 1:3) (Wuest, 13)
 - b) *F. F. Bruce*: “[H]e [Paul, ksk] repeatedly refers to **Achaia** in the **Roman sense**, as including **Corinth**, and not in the **traditional Greek sense**, of a territory in the North-Western Peloponnese, to which Corinth did not belong....” (Bold emphasis added, 10)
 - c) *H. Wayne House*: “In 1 Corinthians Paul alluded to the churches of **Galatia** (16:1); in that same context, he referred to other regions by their provincial names: **Macedonia** (16:5), **Achaia** (16:15), and **Asia** (16:19). Thus Paul most likely used ‘**Galatia**’ as a **provincial title** also.” (Bold emphasis added, 138; Wallace, 4)
 - d) *Theodor Zahn*: “Paul **never designates** any part of the Roman Empire by any other name than that of the **Province** to which it belonged; and he **never uses** any of the **old names of countries**, except in so far as these had become names of Provinces (*Einleitung in das N. T.*, p. 124).” (Bold emphasis added, quoted in Ramsay, *Galatians*, 278)
 - e) *Note*: **Peter** evidently used **similar terminology**²⁶ (1 Pet. 1:1)
 - 2) Evaluation:

-
- a) Paul does not **invariably** use Roman provincial titles
- 1] Paul used both **regional** (Rom. 15:31; 2 Cor. 1:16; Gal. 1:17, 21; 1 Thess. 2:14) and **provincial** names (1 Cor. 16:1, 5, 15, 19). (Hughes & Laney, 577)
 - 2] It cannot be proven that Paul used **political terminology** when he speaks of **Cilicia** (Gal. 1:21), **Judea** (Gal. 1:22) and **Arabia** (Gal. 4:25) (Hendriksen, 11)²⁷
 - a] Response:
 - 1} Paul's references to **Cilicia** (Gal. 1:21) and **Judea** (Gal. 1:22) are **not an exception**, because they were **quasi-provinces** governed independently by imperial procurators (Rendall, 126)
 - 3] Paul refers to the geographical regions of **Syria** and **Cilicia** (Gal. 1:21), which together formed **one Roman province**
 - a] Response:
 - 1} There is a **distinction** here, because Paul is describing **his own movements**, not the location of churches (Guthrie, 469)
 - 2} *Donald Guthrie*: "It seems probable that he followed Luke's practice when tracing **itineraries**, but considered it more appropriate to group his **churches** under their respective **provincial areas**." (Bold emphasis added, 469-470)
 - 4] Paul's reference to the "churches of God which are in **Judea**" (1 Th. 2:14) does not exclude **Galilee**
 - a] Reply:
 - 1} Perhaps this is the case; but Paul could have been thinking specifically of **Judea**. He mentions the **killing of Jesus** in the very next verse (1 Th. 2:15)
 - 2} Even if Paul did **depart** from his **customary usage here**, that does not cast **much doubt** on a practice he almost **invariably seems to follow** elsewhere
 - 3} *F. F. Bruce*: "[A] number of terms occurring in Paul could be used either in the **technical Roman sense or more generally and traditionally** (e. g. Macedonia, Asia), but this argues neither **for** nor **against** the technical Roman sense in other instances." (Bold emphasis added, 15, n. 67)
- b) If Paul customarily used **Roman provincial titles**, then the term "**Galatians**" would have included all within the Roman province of "**Galatia**," including **ethnic Galatians** in "North Galatia" (Bruce, 9)
- c) So this argument is certainly **not conclusive**
- d. Argument #4: "**Galatia**" and "**Galatians**" were the only terms available to include all the people in all the cities that were visited on Paul's First Missionary Journey (Boice, 10:415)
-

1) Explanation:

- a) Since the **Roman province of Galatia** included many different **tribes** and **peoples**, not just the descendants of the Celts or Gauls, the **only term** that could **encompass all of them** in Paul's day would have been **"Galatians"** (Witherington, III, 4; Berkhof, 181)²⁸

1] *D. A. Carson & Douglas Moo*: "[I]n modern times an audience of **Welsh, Scots, and English** people would be addressed as **British**, with none of them **objecting** -- that is the only term that covers them all. So with ancient Galatia." (Bold emphasis added, 460)

- b) Since the Roman province of **"Galatia"** was organized as early as **25 BC**, and therefore had been in existence for **75 years** when Paul wrote Galatians, it is hard to see why Paul could not have addressed its inhabitants as **"Galatians"** (Berkhof, 180; Guthrie, 466, n. 2)

2) Evaluation:

- a) This does not exclude the possibility that the term could refer to the **ethnic Galatians** in **"North Galatia"** (Carson & Moo, 459)

e. Argument #5: It is unlikely that Paul would have established churches in "North Galatia"1) Explanation:

- a) Paul's *modus operandi* was to concentrate his efforts on **heavily-populated areas**
- b) "North Galatia" was more **geographically isolated** than "South Galatia"
- 1] In his commentary on Galatians, William Ramsay describes "North Galatia" as a **rugged, remote, and isolated area**²⁹
- c) The people of "North Galatia" were **culturally more impoverished** and **religiously less open** to Paul's message than the people of "South Galatia" (Longenecker, lxix)

2) Evaluation:

- a) This argument disregards the **Roman road system**
- 1] It would be a problem only if Paul were a **tourist** and not an **evangelist** (Longenecker, lxix)
- b) This argument also disregards the **mixing of populations, cultures, and religions** in both areas (Longenecker, lxix)

f. Argument #6: Luke gives us virtually no information about the alleged churches in "North Galatia"1) Explanation:

- a) Luke tells us about Paul's **evangelistic labors** in **"South Galatia"** (Acts 13-14)
- b) He tells us in **some detail** about **Paul's labors** among the churches to whom he writes

-
- 1] Paul visited **Philippi** (Acts 16:11-40; 20:1-3) and wrote **Philippians**
 - 2] Paul visited **Thessalonica** (Acts 17:1-10) and wrote **1 & 2 Thessalonians**
 - 3] Paul visited **Corinth** (Acts 18:1-17; 20:2) and wrote **1 & 2 Corinthians** and **other letters** that are no longer extant
 - 4] Paul visited **Ephesus** (Acts 19:1-20:1) and wrote **Ephesians**
 - 5] Paul wanted to visit **Rome** (Acts 19:21; 23:11), wrote **Romans**, and eventually visited Rome (Acts 28:14ff)
- c) Yet Luke says **almost nothing** about Paul's alleged work in "North Galatia"
- 1] If Luke's references to "**Galatia**" actually refer to "**North Galatia**," all that he actually says is that Paul **passed through** this region (Acts 16:6) on his Second Missionary Journey and then **strengthened disciples** there on his Third Journey (Acts 18:23). He does not say that Paul **established any churches** in this area; nor does he give us **any other details**
 - 2] It seems highly unlikely that Luke would say virtually **nothing** about **Paul's work** in **North Galatia** (Acts 16:6; 18:23) if the **controversy** mentioned in **Galatians** occurred in those churches
- d) **J. B. Lightfoot**, who along with other older commentators held the "North Galatian Hypothesis," acknowledged the **puzzling nature of this silence**³⁰
- 2) Evaluation:
- a) This argument **begs the question**, assuming what must be proven, *i.e.* that Luke does not refer to "**North Galatia**" (Acts 16:6; 18:23)
 - b) There are **exceptions**. Paul wrote to the **Romans** (Rom. 1:7) and the **Colossians** (Col. 1:2), yet Luke gives us **no information** about the **establishment** of these churches
 - c) Therefore Paul could have written to **churches in "North Galatia"** even though we **know very little** about them
 - 1] Response:
 - a] There is an **important difference**. While Paul had **heard** of the Colossian's faith (Col. 1:4, 9), he had **not visited** Colosse (Col. 2:1).
 - b] However, he did **visit** "Galatia" (Acts 16:6; 18:23)
 - c] If Luke is referring to "**North Galatia**" in these passages, then he gives us **no information** about **Paul's evangelism** in this area or any of the **churches**
- g. Argument #7: **We know of no churches at this early date in "North Galatia" from the NT or other sources**
-

1) Explanation:

- a) *James Montgomery Boice*: “We know of **no churches** at all in the **north** at this **early date**, either as mentioned in the New Testament or outside it, and what information we do have seems to point to the establishing of churches (which, moreover, remained relatively weak) **fairly late** in early church history. By contrast, we do have a record of the founding of the **strong, important churches** of the **southern region**, into which all that Paul tells us about his initial preaching to the Galatians fits nicely.” (Bold emphasis added, 10:415)
- b) *William Ramsay*: “**Ancyra** and the Bithynian city **Juliopolis** (which was attached to Galatia about 297) are the **only Galatian bishoprics** mentioned **earlier than 325**: they alone appear at the **Ancyran Council** held about **314**. The **Ancyran Church** is first mentioned about **A.D. 192** as having been affected by **Montanism**, but saved by the writer of an anti-Montanist treatise quoted by Eusebius.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 165-166)

2) Evaluation:

- h. Argument #8: **It seems highly unlikely that Paul would write a letter to virtually unknown churches in “North Galatia” and not write a letter to well-known churches in “South Galatia”** (Hendriksen, 14)

1) Explanation:

- a) *R. Alan Cole*: “[I]t would be **strange** if we had a Pauline letter addressed to a group of otherwise **unknown Christians** in the **north** of the province, where Paul could have **spent little time** and about whom the book of **Acts** is **strangely silent**, but **no letter** to a **familiar group** in the **south**, of which we know **much**.” (Bold emphasis added, 9:26)
- b) In his letters, Paul characteristically demonstrated his **love** and **concern** for his converts
- 1] He had a **special love** for the saints in **Philippi** (Phil. 1:3-5, 7-8; 4:1) and **Thessalonica** (1 Th. 1:2-4; 2:7-8, 11, 17-20; 3:1-6, 8-10; 2 Th. 1:3-4)
- c) Paul’s **concern** for the saints in “**South Galatia**” is evidenced by at least **two visits** (Acts 13-14; 16:1, 6), if not **three** (Acts 18:23); yet according to the **North Galatian Hypothesis**, **Paul wrote not one word** to these churches, referring only once to the **persecutions** he suffered in their midst (2 Tim. 3:11) (Ramsay, *The Church*, 102)
- d) **How can it be** that Paul would **write** a letter to the churches in “**North Galatia**” and **not write** a letter to the churches in “**South Galatia**”?
- e) *James Moffatt* [North Galatian Advocate]: “Luke devotes far more attention to **South Galatian churches**, and [therefore] Galatians is **more likely** to have been **addressed to them** than to Christians in an **out-of-the-way, unimportant district like North Galatia**.” (Bold emphasis added, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 96, quoted in Wallace, 4)

2) Evaluation:

-
- i. Argument #9: The Judaizing teachers were more likely to infiltrate churches in “South Galatia” than “North Galatia”
- 1) Explanation:
- a) Paul’s letter to the **Galatians** indicates that they were being troubled by **Judaizing teachers** who were trying to bind **circumcision** and **Torah observance on Gentile converts** (Gal. 3:1-5; 4:21; 5:1-10; 6:12-13)
 - b) The **heresy** that Paul addresses in his letter to the Galatians is certainly **consistent** with Luke’s account of Paul’s **First Missionary Journey** in “South Galatia” and its **aftermath**
 - 1] Paul and Barnabas **preached** to both **Jews** and **Gentiles** (Acts 13:14-16, 42)
 - 2] **Jews** and **Gentiles** became **Christians** (Acts 13:43, 46-48; 14:1)
 - 3] Unbelieving Jews **opposed** the gospel (Acts 13:45, 50; 14:2, 4-5, 19)
 - 4] Certain men from Judea came up to Antioch insisting that Gentile converts be **circumcised** and **keep the law** of Moses (Acts 15:1)
 - 5] On the Second Missionary Journey, Paul **circumcised Timothy** at Derbe, to placate the Jews in that region (Acts 16:3-4)
 - 6] Paul and Silas delivered **the decrees** from the Jerusalem Conference in this area (Acts 16:4), which suggests that these churches were already being **troubled by Judaizing teachers**³¹ (Willis, xvi)
 - c) While there were certainly **Jews** in “North Galatia,” the **rugged terrain** in this area made **travel difficult**; therefore these Jews were not as **closely linked** with **Jerusalem** and the mainstream of **Jewish life** as were the **Jews** in “South Galatia” (Cole, 23)
 - d) *H. Wayne House*: “The **Judaizers**, the enemies of Paul, would have invaded the densely populated area of **southern Galatia**, below the Taurus Mountains, where **Jews** and **synagogues** were located rather than the **sparsely settled** and **inaccessible northern sections**.”³² (Bold emphasis added, 138; Cole, 23; Guthrie, 472)
- 2) Evaluation:
- a) The references in Galatians that could refer to **Jewish Christians** (Gal. 3:2-3, 13-14, 23-25; 4:1-5; 5:1) are really general statements to **Christians**. The Galatians were **Gentiles** (Gal. 4:8; 5:2-3; 6:12-13)
- 1] Response:
- a] The churches of Galatia were composed of both **Gentiles** (cf. Gal. 4:8, 17; 5:2; 6:12-13) and **Jews** (cf. Gal. 3:23-25, 26-29; 4:3-7, 9-10; 5:1)
 - b) The Judaizing teachers were **so fanatical** that they might have **pursued Paul wherever** he established a **church** (Bruce, 9; Carson & Moo, 459)
-

- c) *H. Wayne House*: “Nothing is **known** about these **envoys** from Jerusalem. They could have gone into the territory of **Galatia** without there being **any knowledge** of it.” (Bold emphasis added, 138)
- j. Argument #10: **The content of Paul’s letter to the Galatians is consistent with Luke’s account of Paul’s work in “South Galatia”** (George, 30:44)
- 1) Explanation:
- Justification by faith** (Gal. 2:16; 3:8, 11, 24 & Acts 13:38-39)
 - Predominantly Gentile churches** (Gal. 1:14; 4:8-11; 5:2; 6:12 & Acts 13:42, 46, 48; 14:1-2, 27)
 - A Jewish element** (Acts 13:43; 14:1-2; Gal. 3:23-25, 28)
 - Miracles, signs, and wonders** (Gal. 3:5 & Acts 14:3, 8-10)
 - Reception as if an angel** (Gal. 4:14 & Acts 14:11-15)
 - Persecution** (Gal. 6:17 & Acts 13:45, 50; 14:2, 4-6, 19) (George, 30:44-45)
- 2) Evaluation:
- k. Argument #11: **Paul’s *modus operandi* better fits the “South Galatian Hypothesis”**
- 1) Explanation:
- Paul’s *modus operandi* was to visit the **main cities** on the **main roads** in the Roman provinces he visited (Bruce, 9)
 - In Paul’s day, “South Galatia” was **more accessible** and **more important** than “North Galatia”³³
 - Antioch** (Pisidian), **Iconium**, **Derbe**, and **Lystra** were situated along the **Sabastian Way**, a **major imperial highway** linking Ephesus in the west to the provinces of Syria and Cilicia in the east (George, 30:44)
 - Roman roads** in “North Galatia” were **not constructed** until the **70’s** and **80’s AD** (Witherington, III, 4)
- 2) Evaluation:
- This argument ignores the **insignificance** of **Lystra** and **Derbe** in the south compared to **Ancrya** and **Pessinus** in the north (Longenecker, lxix; Bruce, 10)
- l. Argument #12: **The collection delegation contained no representative from North Galatia** (Guthrie, 466; Campbell, 2:588)
- 1) Explanation:
- Paul ordered the **churches in Galatia** to **collect funds** for the needy saints in Jerusalem (1 Cor. 16:1-2)
 - Paul authorized the **contributing churches** to select their own **representatives** to deliver their relief funds to the needy saints in Jerusalem (1 Cor. 16:3-4)

- c) In the list of men who accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, the only “Galatians” mentioned are men from “South Galatia”: **Gaius** of Derbe and **Timothy** of Lystra (Acts 16:1; 20:4)³⁴
- d) **No representatives** from any church in “North Galatia” are mentioned
- 2) Evaluation:
- a) This is an **argument from silence**, and arguments from silence are **precarious**
- b) Luke does not actually say that the men mentioned in Acts 20:4 were “**church representatives**” bearing the **benevolent relief funds** to the needy saints in Jerusalem (Carson & Moo, 459)
- 1] Response:
- a] Paul wrote **Romans** toward the end of his **Third Missionary Journey**, probably from **Corinth** (Acts 19:21; 20:3)
- b] When Paul wrote **Romans**, he was going to **Jerusalem** to minister to the needy saints there (Rom. 15:25)
- c] The churches in **Macedonia** (Philippi, Thessalonica, & Berea) and **Achaia** (Corinth) had collected **benevolent relief funds** for the needy saints in Jerusalem (Rom. 15:26)
- d] Paul instructed the Gentile churches making the benevolent contribution to assist the needy saints in Jerusalem to **select their own messengers** to accompany their gift (1 Cor. 16:1-4)
- e] **The men** mentioned in Acts 20:4 accompanied Paul as he journeyed to Jerusalem with the **benevolent relief funds**
- f] Therefore, it is **probable**, if not **certain**, that these men were **representatives** of the Gentile churches sending **benevolent relief funds** to the needy saints in Jerusalem
- c) No mention is made of any delegates from **Corinth** or **Philippi**
- 1] Response:
- a] It is certainly possible that **Titus**, although not mentioned in Acts, represented the **Corinthian church** (1 Cor. 16:1-9)
- 1} He is **associated** with the church in **Corinth** (2 Cor. 2:12-13; 7:6-7, 13-16) and involved in **the collection** for the needy saints in Jerusalem (2 Cor. 8:6, 16-24)
- b] It is also possible that **Luke** was a delegate from **Philippi**
- 1} A “**we**” **section** begins after Paul leaves **Philippi** (Acts 20:5-6) (Guthrie, 471)
- c] **Gaius** may have been a **Macedonian** (Acts 19:29; 20:4, Codex D [?])
- d] Therefore **the list** of “church representatives” (Acts 20:4) could be **incomplete** (Boice, 10:415)

m. Argument #13: Paul's references to Barnabas in Galatians (2:1, 9, 13) suggest that he was already well known to the Galatians (Carson & Moo, 460)

1) Explanation:

- a) Paul refers to **Barnabas** in Galatians without any kind of **introduction** or **explanation** (Gal. 2:1, 9, 13), presumably because he was **already well known** by the Galatians³⁵
- b) This would have been the case only for the **churches in "South Galatia"** (Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe) since Barnabas traveled with Paul only on his **First Missionary Journey** (Acts 13:1-3)
- c) If Paul were writing to churches in **North Galatia**, the churches in that area would have had **no known occasion** to be **acquainted with Barnabas** (Willis, xvi)
- d) It is highly unlikely that Paul would have mentioned **Barnabas**, without any kind of **introduction** or **explanation**, if Barnabas were **unknown** to those Christians

2) Evaluation:

- a) Paul refers to **Barnabas** in connection with events in **Jerusalem** and **Antioch**, not **Galatia** (Longenecker, 41:lxix)
- b) Paul mentions **Titus** in Galatians (Gal. 2:1), and he would have been **unknown** to the saints in **"South Galatia"**

1] Response:

- a] Paul has a **special reason** for mentioning Titus in the context of Galatians (Campbell, 9:25)
- c) Paul also mentions **Barnabas** in letters to the **Corinthians** and the **Colossians** without explaining who he is (1 Cor. 9:6; Col. 4:10), and there is no indication in the book of Acts that **Barnabas visited Corinth or Colosse**

1] Response:

- a] In both of these cases, there were **special reasons** for Paul to mention Barnabas
 - 1} In 1 Cor. 9:6, Paul wants to emphasize that he **followed the principle** under discussion from the **beginning** of his ministry when he was associated with **Barnabas**
 - 2} In Col. 4:10, in **commending Mark**, who was unknown in Colosse, it was helpful to mention his **kinship** with **Barnabas** (Zahn, 1:179)
- b] *James Montgomery Boice*: "The Corinthian letter does not imply that the believers in Corinth **knew Barnabas personally**, while at least one of the references in Galatians suggests that the Galatians did (**'even [such a man as] Barnabas,'** 2:13). Besides, we cannot even be sure that Barnabas did not **visit Corinth** sometime after having

separated from Paul, in which case the Corinthians would have **known him.**” (Bold emphasis added, 10:416)

- d) Paul also mentions **Peter** (Gal. 2:7-8), although there is no evidence that he visited “**North Galatia**”; so this argument **cuts both ways** and is of **little weight** (Carson & Moo, 460)
- n. Argument #14: The absence of any reference to Timothy is strong circumstantial evidence that Paul wrote Galatians before he became one of Paul’s assistants (Longenecker, lxxi)
- 1) Explanation:
- a) Timothy was more or less a **constant companion** of Paul from his visit to **Lystra** near the beginning of his Second Missionary Journey (Acts 16:1-4) through his **final trip to Jerusalem** (Acts 20:4)
 - b) Paul’s **letters** indicate that Timothy was actively involved in **Paul’s evangelistic activities** (1 Th. 1:1; 3:1-2, 6; 2 Th. 1:1; 1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10; 2 Cor. 1:1, 19; Rom. 16:21;) and with Paul during his **imprisonment** (Phil. 1:1; 2:19; Col. 1:1; Phile. 1)
 - c) Timothy is mentioned in all of Paul’s epistles except **Galatians, Ephesians, and Titus**
 - d) If Galatians was written to churches in “**North Galatia,**” it must be assumed that **Timothy** was **as involved** in their evangelization as he was in the establishment of churches in **Asia, Macedonia, and Achaia**
 - e) Yet Paul **does not mention Timothy** anywhere in Galatians
 - f) This **omission** argues strongly against:
 - 1] The “**North Galatian**” Hypothesis
 - 2] The **classic form** of the “**South Galatian**” Hypothesis -- *i.e.* Galatians was written after Paul’s Second Missionary Journey (Acts 16:6)
 - a] *Richard Longenecker:* “[I]t is virtually **unthinkable** that Paul would have addressed a letter to Christians in an area that included **Lystra** without **sending news** or making any mention of their **native son.**” (Bold emphasis added, 41:lxxi)
 - g) Therefore, Paul most probably **wrote Galatians before Timothy became his assistant**, and he wrote to the **churches** in “**South Galatia**” established on his First Missionary Journey
 - h) This is an indication that Paul wrote Galatians sometime **before** he **revisited “South Galatia”** on his Second Missionary Journey (Acts 16:1-5)
- 2) Evaluation:
- o. Argument #15: Paul’s silence in Galatians about the Jerusalem Council decree indicates that Galatians must have been written before the Jerusalem Council; and therefore before Paul could possibly have visited “North Galatia”

1) Explanation:

- a) Paul does not mention **the decree** of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:23-29) in his letter to the Galatians
- b) It is **inconceivable** that Paul would **not mention** this decree, since it **settled the issue** under discussion and it was **written before** Paul allegedly visited “**North Galatia**” and **wrote his letter** to the Galatians (Coad, 1415)
- c) Therefore, Galatians must have been **written before the Jerusalem Council** to the churches that he visited in “**South Galatia**” on his First Missionary Journey

2) Evaluation:

- a) Paul does not **mention the decree** from the Jerusalem Council in **any of his letters** – even letters obviously written **afterwards** and in letters dealing, to some extent, with **Jew-Gentile relationships** (House, 139; Carson & Moo, 462)
 - 1] **Romans** (Rom. 1:16; 2:9-10; 3:9, 29; 9:24; 10:12)
 - 2] **1 Corinthians** (1 Cor. 1:22-24; 10:32; 12:13)
 - 3] **Colossians** (Col. 3:11)

b. Argument #16: Paul was charged with practicing circumcision in spite of preaching against it (Gal. 5:11)3) Explanation:

- a) This charge may have arisen because **Paul circumcised Timothy** in Derbe (Acts 16:3) in “South Galatia”

4) Evaluation:p. Argument #17: Paul wrote to the Galatians in Greek1) Explanation:

- a) *R.C.H. Lenski*: “If Paul had worked in **Upper Galatia**, he would have encountered **language difficulties** since **Greek culture** and **Greek speech** were **not dominant** in these regions.” (Bold emphasis added, 12)

2) Evaluation:

- a) **Greek** would also have been **familiar** in the cities of **Ancyra** and **Pessinus** in “North Galatia” (Bruce, 8)

q. Argument #18: The Galatians received Paul as “an angel of God” (Gal. 4:14)
(Cole, 9:25; Carson & Moo, 459; Guthrie, 471)1) Explanation:

- a) Barnabas and Paul were received in Lystra as **Zeus** and **Hermes** (Acts 14:11-15)
- b) Paul may be **alluding to this incident** when he says that the Galatians received him as “**an angel of God**” (Gal. 4:14)

2) Evaluation:

- a) **Possibility** is not **probability**, much less **certainty**
- b) Why would Paul's language be **alluding to this incident** when he **rebuked** the inhabitants of Lystra for trying to **worship** him and Barnabas (Acts 14:14-15)
- c) Receiving Paul as an "**angel of God**" (Gal. 4:14) is a very different thing from hailing him as **Hermes** (Acts 14:12) (Longenecker, lxxv)
- d) Any coincidence is spoiled by the Lystrans' later attempt to **stone Paul** (Acts 14:19) (Bruce, 9; Carson & Moo, 459)

r. Argument #19: Paul bore in his body the marks of Jesus (Gal. 6:17)1) Explanation:

- a) Paul was **stoned** in Lystra (Acts 14:19)
- b) Paul may be alluding to this incident when he says: "I bear in my body the **marks of the Lord Jesus**" (Gal. 6:17)

2) Evaluation:

- a) **Possibility** is not **probability**, much less **certainty**

C. Conclusion:

1. *D. A. Carson & Douglas Moo*: "From all this it appears that there is **no final proof** for either the North Galatian or the South Galatian theory. But it surely seems that, while the **South Galatian theory** comes **short of complete demonstration**, the arguments in its favor are considerably **more compelling** than those for North Galatia." (Bold emphasis added, 461)
2. Personally, I am **quite confident** that **Galatians** was written to the churches in "**South Galatia**" that Paul established on his First Missionary Journey

II. **HOW SHOULD PAUL'S VISITS TO JERUSALEM, MENTIONED IN ACTS AND GALATIANS, BE CORRELATED?**A. As mentioned in the introduction, Luke mentions **five visits** to Jerusalem in the book of Acts and Paul mentions **two visits** in Galatians1. Five visits to Jerusalem in Acts:

- a. 1st Visit: **The Post-Conversion Visit** (Acts 9:26-30; 22:17-18)
- b. 2nd Visit: **The Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
- c. 3rd Visit: **The Jerusalem Conference Visit** (Acts 15:4ff)
- d. 4th Visit: **The Jewish Feast Visit**, after The Second Missionary Journey (Acts 18:21-22)
- e. 5th Visit: **The Collection Visit**, after The Third Missionary Journey (Acts 21:15, 17)

2. Two visits to Jerusalem in Galatians:

- a. 1st Visit: After **3 Years** (Gal. 1:18-19)

b. 2nd Visit: After **14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10)

B. There is virtually unanimous agreement that the **first visits** to Jerusalem, mentioned by both Paul and Luke, **correspond**

Acts 9:23-30	Gal. 1:18-22
After many days (23)	After 3 years (18)
Saul had come to Jerusalem (26)	I went up to Jerusalem (18)
Apostles (27)	Peter & James (18-19)
With them at Jerusalem, coming in and going out (28)	Remained 15 days (18)
	Unknown by face to churches of Judea (22)
Caesarea & Tarsus (30)	Regions of Syria & Cilicia (21)

C. There is also widespread agreement that although Luke and Paul's accounts of his **subsequent travels** (after his post-conversion visit to Jerusalem) **differ**, they are **not contradictory**

1. When Paul **left Jerusalem** after his **post-conversion visit**:

a. **Luke** says that Paul went to **Caesarea** and **Tarsus** (Acts 9:30) and later **Antioch** (Acts 11:25-26; 13:1)

1) Evidently Paul **sailed** from **Caesarea** to **Tarsus**

b. **Paul** says he went "into the regions of **Syria** and **Cilicia**" (Gal. 1:21)

1) **Antioch** was in **Syria** (Acts 15:23)

2) **Tarsus** was in **Cilicia** (Acts 21:39; 22:3)

2. The **differences** in these two different accounts can be **plausibly harmonized** in different ways:

a. Paul did not **go directly to Tarsus** but **visited Syria** on the way [?]

1) This explanation would require Paul to **visit Syria** (unmentioned by Luke), then **return to Caesarea** before **going on to Tarsus**

2) While this is **possible**, it does not appear to be the **best explanation**

b. Paul went to **Tarsus** and then **later visited Syria** from Tarsus (unmentioned by Luke) and **returned to Tarsus** [?]

c. Paul mentions these areas in terms of **geography** or **prominence** rather than **chronology**

1) Syria was **closer** to Jerusalem than Cilicia

2) Syria was **more important** than Cilicia³⁶

3) Also **Cilicia** had a **greater affinity** with **Syria** geographically than with Asia Minor

d. It is also possible, if not probable, that "**Syria and Cilicia**" refer to **one district** instead of two³⁷ (Lightfoot, 85)

3. Paul's time in Syria and Cilicia resulted in **conversions** and **new churches** (cf. Acts 15:23, 41)

-
- D. There is also general agreement that the **last two visits** mentioned by Luke, the Jewish Feast Visit (Acts 18:21-22) and the Collection Visit (Acts 21:15, 17), are **too late**
- E. Therefore, only **two possibilities** have much claim to **viability**:³⁸
1. Paul's Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds to the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
 2. Paul's Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds to the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15:2-4)
- F. Paul's **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds with the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:28-30; 12:25) and Galatians was **written before** the Jerusalem Council
1. This is a **minority view** that is defended by **several able commentators**, and a view that appears to be **gaining in popularity**
 2. Argument #1: Paul mentions **two visits** to Jerusalem after his conversion (Gal. 1:18; 2:1), and according to Luke, Paul's **second visit** to Jerusalem after his conversion was the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:29-30; 12:25)
 - a. Explanation:
 - 1) The **natural reading** of Galatians suggests that Paul is giving an account of his **successive visits** to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18; 2:1)
 - 2) *William Ramsay*: "Apart from the desire to **harmonise** Luke with Paul, no one would ever have **inferred** from these words that Paul's intention was to give an account only of **interviews with Apostles**, and that he **omits visits to Jerusalem** on which he **did not see Apostles**." (Bold emphasis added, *Galatians*, 281)
 - b. Evaluation:
 - 1) The **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) does not have to be Paul's **second visit** to Jerusalem
 - a) Paul's statement, "I went up **again** [*palin*] to Jerusalem" (Gal. 2:1) does not necessarily mean that this trip was only his **second trip** to Jerusalem after his conversion
 - 1] John says: "Peter then denied **again** [*palin*]; and immediately a rooster crowed" (Jn. 18:27); but this was **Peter's third denial** (cf. Jn. 18:17, 25, 26-27)
 - 2) Based on **Paul's letter alone**, there would be no reason to believe that an **intervening visit** to Jerusalem had been **omitted**. However, we do not have **Paul's letter alone**; we also have **Luke's account** in Acts
 - a) Either these two documents are **contradictory**, or they can be **reasonably harmonized**
 - b) If they are to be **reasonably harmonized**, **all the puzzle pieces must fit together** without being **forced**
 - 3) Furthermore, the same thing that Mr. Ramsay says about **Galatians** could also be said about **the Gospels**

-
- a) Each Gospel routinely **omits details** that are included in other Gospels, and there would be **no reason** for us to **conclude such** were it not for these **other accounts** of Jesus' life
- 1] The healing of the **centurion's servant** (Mt. 8:5-13; Lk. 7:1-10)
 - 2] The healing of **Bartimaeus** and **his companion** (Mt. 20:29-34; Mk. 10:46-52; Lk. 18:35-43)
 - 3] The **superscription** on the cross (Mt. 27:37; Mk. 15:26; Lk. 23:38; Jn. 19:19)
 - 4] Etc.
3. Argument #2: Logically, Paul would not **omit a reference** to any visit to Jerusalem, e.g. the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25), because that would **defeat his argument** that he had not received his gospel from men because there was **no opportunity** for him to do so
- a. Explanation:
- 1) Paul is trying to prove that on **none of his post-conversion trips to Jerusalem** could he have **received his gospel from men**, especially from the leaders of the Jerusalem church
 - a) He argues that he began to **preach immediately after his conversion** before he **visited Jerusalem** where the apostles were (Gal. 1:15-17; cf. Acts 9:18-22)
 - b) He argues that although he had **visited Jerusalem** on one occasion after his conversion, he was there for just a **short time** and only saw **Peter** and **James**, the Lord's brother (Gal. 1:18-20)
 - 2) If Paul **omitted the Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) in his account in Galatians, then his critics could argue that he **received his gospel from the apostles on that visit to Jerusalem**³⁹
 - 3) *Richard Longenecker*: "The adverb $\square\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha$ ('then,' 'next') stands over all that Paul recounts in 2:1-10, identifying this as **the third enumerated event** following his time at Damascus (cf. 1:18ff. and 1:21ff. for the first two) and assuring his readers that there are **no gaps** in his narrative." (Bold emphasis added, 41:44)
 - 4) *Wilfred L. Knox*: "The visit referred to **can only be** that of Ac 11:30." (Bold emphasis added, 3:532)
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) First, sometimes Paul **omits details** in his accounts (as we all do), even details that arguably would have **bolstered** his argument
 - 2) Second, because of **the circumstances** in Jerusalem at the time, the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) would have been an **unlikely time** to discuss the **Jew-Gentile issues** that were discussed during the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10)
 - a) The time of the Famine Relief Visit was a time of **political agitation** against the apostles
-

-
- 1] **James** the son of Zebedee was executed by Herod Agrippa I (Acts 12:1-2)
 - 2] **Peter** was imprisoned (Acts 12:3-4)
 - b) As a result, the other church leaders may have **fled Jerusalem**
 - 1] **The apostles** are **not mentioned** in Luke's account of the Famine Relief Visit
 - 2] Luke says that the funds for famine relief were delivered to the "**elders**" (Acts 11:30)
 - 3] There is **no mention** of **any contact** with the **apostles** during the **Famine Relief Visit**, only contact with the **elders** in the churches of Judea (Acts 11:30)
 - c) Therefore, the **Famine Relief Visit** would appear to be an **inauspicious**, if not **impossible**, time for a **full scale discussion** of the **Gentiles** and the **law of Moses** (Boice, 419)
 - 3) Third, Paul is not attempting to give a **full account** of **all his activities** during the **early years of his ministry**. Rather, he is attempting to answer **specific criticisms** directed against him by the Judaizing teachers
 - a) Objection #1: Paul got his gospel (and got it imperfectly) from **others**
 - 1] Paul answers this objection by showing that in the early years of his ministry, he was **not influenced** by any of the apostles at all either before or after his conversion (Gal. 1:11-24)
 - 2] To prove his case (*i.e.* that he did not receive his gospel from men), Paul only needed to refer to visits to Jerusalem where that **might have occurred**
 - 3] Since Paul **did not meet** with any of the apostles during the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25), there was **no reason** for him to **mention it**⁴⁰
 - b) Objection #2: Paul was preaching a **different gospel** than the other apostles
 - 1] Paul responds to this objection by arguing that he was preaching **the same gospel** as the other apostles, and they **endorsed** what he preached among the Gentiles without any **correction** or **addition** (Gal. 2:1-10) (Hendriksen, 71, n. 45; Willis, 46-47)
 - 4) Fourth, when Paul mentions his Visit After 14 Years to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1-10), he has moved on to his **second argument**
 - a) He is no longer defending **the source** of his gospel (*i.e.* it was from **God**, not men)
 - b) He is defending **the content** of his gospel (*i.e.* his gospel was exactly **the same** as the other apostles')
 - c) Since the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) was **not germane** to his second argument, Paul **does not mention it**⁴¹
-

d) Response:

1] *Daniel Wallace*: “If Gal. 2:1 could be **stripped of its context**, this argument might have **some validity**. But the entire narrative, from 1:11 to 2:14, has the feel of a **legal defense** (cf. 1:20) in which the apostle would be careful *especially* about **how many visits** he had made to Jerusalem and **when he had visited**. (Bold emphasis added, 5, n. 14)

5) Fifth, I believe this objection ignores or overlooks four **important factors**:

- a) The **elapsed time** between Paul’s conversion and the visit to Jerusalem after 14 years (i.e. 14-17 years) (Gal. 1:15-18; 2:1)
- b) Paul’s **preaching** of the gospel in Syria and Cilicia
- c) The **knowledge** of this preaching by the churches of Judea (Gal. 1:21-24)
- d) Paul’s **work with Barnabas** in Antioch for a year (Acts 11:26)
- e) Three questions:
 - 1] **How much time** would have to elapse to establish Paul’s point?
 - 2] Would the churches of Judea have **“glorified God”** if they believed that he had received his gospel from men?
 - 3] Would Barnabas have **brought Paul to Antioch** if he believed that Paul had received his gospel from men?

4. Argument #3: There are **similarities** between the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) and the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)

a. Explanation:

The Similarities	
The Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10)	The Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30)
2nd Visit to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18; 2:1)	2nd Visit to Jerusalem (Acts 9:26; 11:27-30; 12:25)
Paul, Barnabas, & Titus (Gal. 2:1)	Paul & Barnabas (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
Visit because of revelation (Gal. 2:2)	Agabas’ prophecy of famine (Acts 11:27-28)
Private meeting (Gal. 2:2)	Appropriate setting for private meeting though not mentioned
Remember poor (Gal. 2:10)	Relief to elders (Acts 11:30)
Jerusalem decree not mentioned	Before Jerusalem decree (Acts 15:22-29)
Eating with Gentiles in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-12)	Eating with Gentiles in Caesarea (Acts 10:48; 11:1-3)
Peter shuns Gentiles (Gal. 2:11-14)	Before Peter defends Gentiles at J.C. (Acts 15:7-11)

b. Evaluation:

- 1) There are **significant differences** between the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) and the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25), and these **differences far outweigh** any similarities

The Differences	
Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10)	Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30)
Paul leads (Gal. 2:1, 6, 8-9)	Barnabas leads (Acts 11:30; 12:25)
Titus (Gal. 2:1, 3)	
Apostles (Gal. 2:6-9)	Elders (Acts 11:30)
Circumcision for Gentiles (Gal. 2:3)	Relief for Christians (Acts 11:29)
Paul preached to Galatians earlier (Gal. 2:5)	Paul didn't preach to Galatians earlier (Acts 13-14)
From James (Gal. 2:12)	Not from us (Acts 15:24)

a) Response to Contrast #1:

- 1] *Richard Longenecker*: “But it is also to be expected—at a time after the missionary party’s return from southern Galatia when Paul was not only the **chief speaker** but also **the leader de facto**—that Paul would **recount earlier events from such a perspective**, particularly when, as he saw it, **Barnabas had vacillated** on the issue at hand (cf. Gal 2:13).” (Bold emphasis added, 41:46)
- 2] How can **leadership** be determined by **the order** in which names are mentioned, when this is **not consistent** in Acts 15?
 - a] **Paul** and **Barnabas** (Acts 15:2, 22, 35)
 - b] **Barnabas** and **Paul** (Acts 15:12, 25) (Dvorak, 11)

b) Response to Contrast #3:

- 1] This is an incredible **argument from silence**
- 2] Luke’s silence does not mean that a **private meeting** with the apostles **did not occur**
- 3] It assumes that “**elders**” **cannot include** “**apostles**” in its referent. However, this is almost surely not the case. In Acts 16:4, **one article** governs “the **apostles** and **elders** at Jerusalem” and means “**apostles and other elders**” (Wallace, 5, n. 14)

a] Reply:

- 1} **Paul** would have been among “the **apostles** and **elders** at Jerusalem” (Acts 15:2, 12, 22, 25)
- 2} Elders must be **married** (1 Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:6)
- 3} Paul was an **apostle**, but he was **not married** (1 Cor. 9:5, 12)

-
- 4} Therefore, he could not have been **an elder**
- 4] Some North Galatianists argue that Acts 11:30 is unhistorical
- a] Reply:
- 1} Luke has a **proven track record** as a historian (Wallace, 5, n. 14)
5. Argument #4: Peter's **withdrawal** from **Gentile Christians** in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) is more likely to have occurred **before**, rather than after, the Jerusalem Council (Carson & Moo, 462)
- a. Explanation:
- 1) In light of what Peter said at the **Jerusalem Conference** (Acts 15:7-11), it seems **highly unlikely** that he would have engaged in this kind of **hypocrisy after** the Jerusalem Conference⁴²
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) During the Personal Ministry of Jesus, **Peter's impetuosity** was demonstrated time and time again
- a) Would it seem likely that Peter would vehemently declare his **unwavering loyalty** to Jesus (Mt. 26:33) only to **deny Him** three times in just a few hours? (Mt. 26:74-75)
- 2) *R.C.H. Lenski*: "Do not ask how a man like Peter **could have done what he did**. Just ask yourself how you at times **can and do sin even against better knowledge**." (Bold emphasis added, 94)
- 3) *James Montgomery Boice*: "[T]his overlooks both **the reality of human inconsistency** (even among the best people) and the fact that **the Antioch incident reflects an entirely new situation**. There was: (1) a **new issue**--foods rather than circumcision; (2) a **new area of the faith**--Christian living rather than the basis of salvation; and (3) a **new subject**-- Jewish liberty rather than the liberty of Gentile Christians. This dispute could have followed naturally upon the compromise reached at the council." (Bold emphasis added, 10:446)
6. Argument #5: The **criticism** of Paul's apostolic authority more likely occurred **early** in his ministry rather than later
- a. Explanation:
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) If Paul were still defending **the source** of his apostleship (Gal. 2:1-10), the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) would have **no real bearing** on that:
- a) By that time, Paul had been **an apostle** for about **ten years**
- b) He had been **preaching the gospel** in:
- 1] **Damascus** (Acts 9:19-22; Gal. 1:15-17)
- 2] **Jerusalem** (Acts 9:26-30)
- 3] **Tarsus** of Cilicia (Gal. 1:21; Acts 11:25)
-

-
- 4] **Antioch** of Syria (Gal. 1:21; Acts 11:25-26)
- a] Since the Jerusalem Council decree was addressed “to the **brethren** who are of the **Gentiles** in **Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia**” (Acts 15:23), Paul must have been **preaching the gospel** in these areas **earlier**
- c) The churches in Judea **kept hearing** that Paul was **preaching the faith** he once tried to destroy, and they **glorified God** as a result (Gal. 1:22-24)⁴³ (Willis, 49)
7. Argument #6: Paul’s refusal to **circumcise Titus** (Gal. 2:1-5) more likely occurred before the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15) (Utley, 7:2)
- a. Explanation:
- b. Evaluation:
8. Argument #7: Paul does not mention any **church leaders** among the churches of Galatia
- a. Explanation:
- 1) It seems **highly unlikely** that Paul would have **failed to mention church leaders** if they had been **in place** when he wrote Galatians, and this suggests an **early stage of development** in these churches (Witherington, III, 10)
- 2) The Galatians were **departing** from the faith relatively **soon** after their conversion (Gal. 1:6-10)
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) The Galatian churches were predominantly **Gentile**; therefore **more time** may have been required for **qualified men** to be appointed to leadership positions
9. Objection #1: Paul **preached** to the **Galatians prior** to the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:5)
- a. Explanation:
- 1) Since I have **already made this argument**, I will merely **restate** it here briefly (see pp. 17-18)
- 2) Paul **preached** the gospel to the Galatians (Gal. 1:8-9; 4:13) and **established** the Galatian churches (Gal. 4:19; cf. 1 Cor. 4:15)
- 3) Paul **preached** to the Galatians **prior** to his **Visit After 14 Years** to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1, 4-5)
- 4) Paul **did not preach** in “South Galatia” until his **First Missionary Journey** which occurred **after** the Famine Relief Visit to Jerusalem (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
- 5) Therefore, Paul’s Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) **could not have been** the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
- 6) *Sherlock Holmes*: “How often have I said to you that when you have eliminated the **impossible**, whatever remains, **however improbable**, must be the **truth**?” (Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Sign Of Four*, Chap. 6, p. 111)
-

- b. Evaluation:
- 1) See the evaluation already provided (see pp. 18-20)
10. Objection #2: When Paul visited Jerusalem the **second time**, the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10), he was already a **missionary to the Gentiles** (Gal. 2:2, 7-9); but Paul did not evangelize Gentiles until **after the Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:25-30; 12:25). Therefore, the **Visit After 14 Years** could not have been the **Famine Relief Visit** (Longenecker, lxxxii)
- a. Explanation:
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) Paul was called to preach to the Gentiles at his **conversion** (Acts 9:15; 22:12-16, 21; 26:14-18; Gal. 1:15-16)
 - 2) Since the **decree** of the Jerusalem Council was addressed “To the brethren who are of the **Gentiles** in **Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia**” (Acts 15:23), **Gentile churches existed** in these areas **before** the Jerusalem Council
 - 3) Since the “**churches of Judea**” were **hearing** [present tense] that Paul was **preaching the faith** [present tense] that he once tried to destroy (Gal. 1:22-24), he must have been **evangelizing** in **Syria and Cilicia** before the Jerusalem Council (Acts 11:25-26)
 - 4) Paul began his **Second Missionary Journey** going through **Syria and Cilicia, strengthening the churches** (Acts 15:41); therefore these **churches existed** even though **Luke does not report** their establishment
 - 5) So Paul could have described himself as a **missionary** to the **Gentiles** on the basis of his work with Gentiles in **Syria and Cilicia** even before His **First Missionary Journey** in “South Galatia” (Acts 13-14)
11. Objection #3: If the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) is the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25), then the **question** about whether or not Gentile converts had to be circumcised was **officially settled** long before the Jerusalem Council; thus making it **superfluous**
- a. Explanation:
- 1) *James G. D. Dunn:* “[I]f the issue of circumcision was **resolved** as **decisively** as Gal. 2:1-10 indicates, with the **full and formal approval** of the **Jerusalem leadership** (2:3, 6-9) in the face of strong internal pressure to the contrary (2:4-5), it is difficult to see how it could have **become an issue once again in Acts 15.**” (Bold emphasis added, 88)
 - 2) Is it reasonable to conclude that there were **two separate conferences** over the same issue with a **similar outcome?**
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) The admission of **Gentile converts** was a **serious and recurring problem**, not just in **Antioch and Galatia** but in **other cities** as well
 - a) **Rome** (Rom. 2:25-29; 3:1, 20; 4:9-12; 15:8)
 - b) **Philippi** (Phil. 3:3-5)

-
- c) **Corinth** (1 Cor. 7:18-20)
 - d) **Colosse** (Col. 2:9-15; 3:10-11)
- 2) Therefore, it is not **impossible**, or even **improbable**, that this subject would be **discussed on more than one occasion** (George, 30:137, n. 91)
12. **Objection #4:** Identifying the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) with the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25), is **chronologically untenable** (Lenski, 67)
- a. Explanation:
 - 1) The **Famine Relief Visit** took place **before** the death of **Herod Agrippa I** (Acts 11:26-30; 12:20-25), and secular sources indicate that he died in **AD 44** (cf. Josephus, *Antiquities Of The Jews*, 19:8:2)
 - 2) Paul's **Visit After 14 Years** to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1-10) took place either:
 - a) **Seventeen years** after his conversion
 - 1] Fourteen years after his **Post-Conversion Visit**, which was three years after his **conversion** (Gal. 1:18) [$14 + 3 = 17$]
 - b) **Fourteen years** after his **conversion**
 - 1] Many commentators believe that **both of Paul's visits to Jerusalem**, the one after 3 years (Gal. 1:18) and the one after 14 years (Gal. 2:1), should be calculated from the same **starting point – his conversion**
 - a] The apparent **contrast** between “I did not **immediately** confer with flesh and blood” (Gal. 1:16) with “**after three years** I went up to Jerusalem....” (Gal. 1:18) suggests that this visit to Jerusalem occurred three years after **Paul's conversion**⁴⁴ (Lightfoot, 84)
 - 2] However, this is not a conclusion **accepted by all**
 - a] *R.C.H. Lenski*: “Some interpreters count the fourteen years from the time of **Paul's conversion** on the plea that this is the **dominating date** for the reckoning of time. It is; but it **dominates** just as strongly when the fourteen years follow the three as when they include the three. If they include the three, the conversion of Paul is moved forward three years, which **upsets the entire chronology**. The date of Herod's frightful death (Acts 12:23) is known independently of the Scriptures: **the summer of the year 44**. Paul is speaking of the time of **the convention** (Acts 15).” (Bold emphasis added, 68)
- 3) Therefore, **Paul's conversion** occurred in:
 - a) **AD 30** ($44 - 14 = 30$) or
 - b) **AD 27** ($44 - 17 = 27$)
 - 4) But Jesus was **crucified** ~AD 30
 - 5) Since **this chronology** does not allow **enough time** between Jesus' crucifixion and Paul's conversion, it **cannot be correct**
-

-
- a) *Everett Harrison*: “Even if the **fourteen years** of Gal 2:1 refer to the **conversion** rather than to the **first visit** to Jerusalem, the dating of the **conversion** is still **too early**; it leaves **no interval** between the **resurrection** of Christ and the **conversion** of Paul.” (Bold emphasis added, 1287)
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) The chronology of Paul’s two visits to Jerusalem (Gal. 1:18; 2:1) is difficult, if not impossible, to **calculate precisely** because of at least some uncertainty about the **beginning point**
 - a) Should **Paul’s visit to Jerusalem after 14 years** (Gal. 2:1) be calculated from:
 - 1] His years in **Syria & Cilicia** (Gal. 1:21)
 - 2] His post-conversion visit to **Jerusalem** (Gal. 1:18)
 - 3] His **conversion** (Gal. 1:15-16)
 - b) Should **Paul’s post-conversion visit to Jerusalem after 3 years** (Gal. 1:18) be calculated from:
 - 1] His return to **Damascus** from Arabia
 - 2] His **conversion**
 - 2) Equating the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1) with the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30) is not impossible chronologically if **two of three assumptions** are correct:
 - a) The **Visit After 3 Years** (Gal. 1:18) and the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) are both measured from Paul’s **conversion**⁴⁵ (Gal. 1:15-16)
 - b) Paul used an **inclusive method** of time reckoning⁴⁶
 - c) Jesus was **crucified in AD 30** (Longenecker, lxxxiii)
 - 3) If the **Visit After 14 years** occurred 14 years after **Paul’s conversion**, rather than his Post-Conversion Visit to Jerusalem, and if Paul is using an **inclusive method of time reckoning**, then Paul’s second visit to Jerusalem occurred **~AD 44-46**, and he was converted **~AD 32-33**. This means that the Visit After 14 years could be the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) (George, 30:136)
 - 4) Josephus indicates that **the famine** recorded in Acts 11:28-30 took place during Roman governorships **later** than the **death of Herod Agrippa I** (*Antiquities* 20:5:2)
 - a) Luke’s account of the **persecution** in Jerusalem (Acts 12:1-17) and the **death of Herod Agrippa I** (Acts 12:20-23) is a **flashback**, corresponding with earlier events (cf. Acts 11:19-26)
 - 5) So the alleged chronological difficulties are **not insurmountable** after all
- G. Paul’s **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds with the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15:1-2, 4) and Galatians was **written after** the Jerusalem Council
-

-
1. This is the **traditional** and **majority view** that is defended by **several able commentators**, that was virtually **unchallenged** until the early 20th century
 - a. Until recently only **John Calvin** identified the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) with the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30) (Longenecker, 41:lxiv)
 2. Argument #1: Paul **preached** to the **Galatians prior** to the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:5)
 - a. Explanation:
 - 1) Since I have **already made this argument**, I will merely **restate** it here briefly (see pp. 17-18)
 - 2) Paul **preached** the gospel to the Galatians (Gal. 1:8-9; 4:13) and **established** the Galatian churches (Gal. 4:19; cf. 1 Cor. 4:15)
 - 3) Paul **preached** to the Galatians **prior** to his **Visit After 14 Years** to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:1, 4-5)
 - 4) Paul **did not preach** in “South Galatia” until his **First Missionary Journey** which occurred **after** the Famine Relief Visit to Jerusalem (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
 - 5) Therefore, Paul’s Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) **could not have been** the Famine Relief Visit (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
 - 6) *Sherlock Holmes*: “How often have I said to you that when you have eliminated the **impossible**, whatever remains, **however improbable**, must be the **truth**?” (Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, *The Sign Of Four*, Chap. 6, p. 111)
 - b. Evaluation:
 - 1) See the evaluation already provided (see pp. 18-20)
 3. Argument #2: The Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) is **strikingly similar** to the Jerusalem Council Visit (Acts 15:1-2, 4)
 - a. Explanation:
 - 1) The striking similarities:
 - a) Same Geography: **Antioch to Jerusalem** (Gal. 1:21; 2:1; Acts 14:26-28; 15:2, 4)
 - b) Same Participants: **Paul & Barnabas** (Gal. 2:1; Acts 15:2)
 - c) Same Companions: **Titus** (Gal. 2:1) & **Others**, who could have included Titus (Acts 15:2)
 - d) Same Opponents: **False brethren** (Gal. 2:4) = **Believing Pharisees** (Acts 15:5)
 - e) Same Disputed Issue: **Circumcision** for Gentile converts (Gal. 2:3; Acts 15:1, 5)
 - f) Same Church Leaders: **Those of reputation** (Gal. 2:2) = **Those who seemed to be something** (Gal. 2:6) = **James, Cephas, & John** (Gal. 2:9) = **Apostles & Elders** (Acts 15:6); **Peter** (Acts 15:7-11); **James** (Acts 15:13-18)
-

- g) Same Result: **Gentiles are not obligated to be circumcised** (Gal. 2:3; Acts 15:19-21, 23-29) (Lightfoot, 123-124)

Visit After 14 Years Is The Jerusalem Council Visit	
Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10)	Jerusalem Council Visit (Acts 15:4-29)
Syria & Cilicia (1:21)	Antioch (14:26-28)
Go up to Jerusalem (2:1)	Went up to Jerusalem (15:2)
Paul & Barnabas (2:1)	Paul & Barnabas (15:2)
Titus (2:1)	Certain Others (15:2)
Communicated Gospel (2:2)	Reported all God had done with them (15:4)
Those of Reputation (2:2)	Apostles & elders (15:4)
False brethren (2:4)	Believing Pharisees (15:5)
Secretly brought in to spy out liberty & bring us into bondage (2:4)	“It is necessary to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses ” (15:5)
We did not yield that the truth of the gospel might continue (2:5)	Peter recounted the conversion of Cornelius (15:7-11)
	Barnabas & Paul recounted the miracles God had worked among the Gentiles (15:12)
	James argued that the conversion of the Gentiles fulfilled OT Scripture (15:13-18)
Those who seemed to be something added nothing to me (2:6)	James proposed a letter stipulating a few restrictions for the Gentiles (15:19-21)
	Apostles, elders, & church decided to send chosen men with Paul & Barnabas to Antioch (15:22)

- 2) *James Montgomery Boice*: “[A] **combination of circumstances** so striking is **not likely to have occurred** twice within the space of just a few years.” (Bold emphasis added, 418)
- 3) *James Montgomery Boice*: “[T]here is absolutely **no correspondence** between what Paul tells us of his visit and what Luke writes of the so-called ‘**famine visit**,’ which is the only other option....” (Bold emphasis added, 418)

b. Evaluation:

- 1) While there are **several similarities** between the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10) and the Jerusalem Council Visit (Acts 15:1-2, 4), there are also **significant differences**

The Visit After 14 Years Is Not The Jerusalem Council Visit	
Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10)	Jerusalem Council Visit (Acts 15:4-29)
2nd Visit (Gal. 2:1; cf. 1:18)	3rd Visit (Acts 15:2-4; cf. 9:26-30; 11:27-30)
Paul, Barnabas, Titus (Gal. 2:1)	Paul, Barnabas, & Others (Acts 15:2)
Divine Revelation (Gal. 2:2)	Church Decision (Acts 15:2)
Issue In Jerusalem (Gal. 2:3-5)	Issue In Antioch (Acts 15:1-2)
Private Meeting (Gal. 2:2, 7-9)	Public Meeting (Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 12, 22)

The Visit After 14 Years Is Not The Jerusalem Council Visit	
Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10)	Jerusalem Council Visit (Acts 15:4-29)
Titus not circumcised (Gal. 2:3)	
Major Role For Paul: Key Figure (Gal. 2:2)	Minor Role For Paul: Witness (Acts 15:12)
Church Leaders Added Nothing (Gal. 2:6)	Decree From Apostles, Elders, & Church (Acts 15:22-29)
No Regulations For Gentiles	Regulations For Gentiles (Acts 15:20, 29)

- a) Response To Contrast #1:
- 1] “I went up **again** to Jerusalem” (Gal. 2:1) does not necessarily mean that this was only Paul’s **second trip** to Jerusalem
- b) Response To Contrast #2:
- 1] Luke **does not mention Titus at all** in Acts even though he was **Paul’s assistant** on his Third Missionary Journey (2 Cor. 2:13; 7:6, 13-14; 8:6, 16, 23; 12:18)
- 2] “**Certain others**” accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem (Acts 15:2), and **Titus** could have been among those individuals
- c) Response To Contrast #3:
- 1] The **reasons** stated by Luke and Paul are not **mutually exclusive**
- a] **Peter’s visit to Caesarea to see Cornelius** was the result of a **vision** from the Lord (Acts 10:9-16), **instructions** from the Holy Spirit (Acts 10:19-20), and a **summons** by Cornelius’ servants (Acts 10:17-18, 21-22)
- b] **Paul’s flight from Jerusalem** because of persecution involved both **assistance** from his brethren in Jerusalem (Acts 9:28-30) and **instruction**, while in a trance, from the Lord (Acts 22:17-18)
- c] **Paul’s First Missionary Journey** involved both **instruction** from the Holy Spirit (Acts 13:1-2) and **involvement** by the brethren in Antioch (Acts 13:3)
- d] Perhaps Paul was **reluctant to accept the assignment** of the church in Antioch and a **divine revelation** was needed to spur him on
- d) Response To Contrast #4:
- 1] Although Paul **does not mention any dispute in Antioch**, he went to Jerusalem from **Antioch** (Gal. 1:21), and a **dispute in Antioch** that precipitated this journey is certainly **not impossible**
- e) Response To Contrast #5:
- 1] Acts 15 may refer to both a **private** (Acts 15:5-6) and a **public** meeting (Acts 15:7-22)

-
- a] The term “**them**” may refer to the **whole church** (Gal. 2:2) [?] (Harrison, n.p.)
 - 2] A **private meeting** certainly could have occurred on this occasion, and Luke simply did not **mention** it⁴⁷
 - 3] Galatians 2 leaves room for both: a **public conference** (2:2a) and a **private meeting** (2:2b)⁴⁸
 - f) Response To Contrast #6:
 - 1] Luke’s omission of any reference to **Titus and circumcision** is no different than his omission of any reference to **Paul’s visit to Arabia** (Gal. 1:17)
 - 2] Whether or not **Gentiles** had to be **circumcised** was **the issue** in the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:5)
 - g) Response To Contrast #7:
 - 1] Paul could have played **different roles** in private and public meetings
 - h) Response To Contrast #8:
 - 1] Paul says that the church leaders in Jerusalem **added nothing to him personally**. That statement does not necessarily **preclude a decree** sent to Gentile churches
 - i) Response To Contrast #9:
 - 1] These regulations do not touch the **main issue** discussed in Galatians 2
 - 2] Galatians 2 may contain a **veiled reference** to these regulations (Gal. 2: 6) [?]
 - j) *Note:* Many of these alleged differences are a matter of **perspective**, and **plausible explanations** can be offered for others
4. Objection #1: If Paul **evangelized** “South Galatia” **prior** to the **Jerusalem Council**, why didn’t he **mention that** in Gal. 1:21?
- a. Explanation:
 - 1) Between Paul’s two visits to Jerusalem, the Visit After 3 Years (Gal. 1:18) and the Visit After 14 Years (Gal. 2:1-10), he spent time in **Syria** [Antioch (Acts 11:25-26)] and **Cilicia** [Tarsus (Acts 9:30; 11:25)] (Gal. 1:21).⁴⁹
 - 2) This implies that he **did not evangelize** the **Galatians** until **after** his **second visit** to Jerusalem
 - 3) However, Paul’s **First Missionary Journey** in “South Galatia” occurred **before** the **Jerusalem Council** (Acts 13-14)
 - 4) Therefore, the **Visit After 14 years** (Gal. 2:1-10) could not be the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Longenecker, lxxxii)
 - b. Evaluation:
-

- 1) Paul's reference to his time in **Syria and Cilicia** (Gal. 1:21) is to make the point that he did not have an opportunity to have **contact with the apostles or receive his gospel from them**
 - 2) It does not **preclude** his **First Missionary Journey** in "South Galatia"
 - 3) Furthermore, Paul indicates that he had **preached the gospel** to the Galatians **before his second visit** to Jerusalem (Gal. 2:5)
 - 4) Finally, if Paul wrote to the churches in "South Galatia," they would have **known** that he had **spent time among them** during this period without Paul **mentioning it** (Ramsay, *The Church*, 106-108)
5. Objection #2: If the letter to the Galatians was **written after** the Jerusalem Council, why doesn't Paul **settle the question** once and for all by referring to the **apostolic decrees**?
- a. Explanation:
 - 1) Paul does not mention the **Jerusalem Council decree** (Acts 15:23-29)
 - 2) It is inconceivable that Paul **would not mention** this decree since it **settled the issue** under discussion in Galatians
 - 3) Therefore, Galatians must have been **written before the Jerusalem Council**⁵⁰
 - b. Evaluation:
 - 1) Paul does not mention the Jerusalem Council decree because his purpose was to show the Galatians his own **independent apostolic authority** without relying on **any decree** from the other apostles or the church in Jerusalem (Boice, 419; Hahne, 6)
 - a) *Donald Guthrie*: "To him the enunciation of **theological principles** was of much greater value than **ecclesiastical pronouncements**." (Bold emphasis added, 476)
 - b) Response:
 - 1] The Jerusalem **decree**, inspired by the **Holy Spirit** (Acts 15:28), would have **supported Paul's claim** that his gospel was not his own (Dvorak, 7)
 - 2) If Paul **wrote Galatians** after the **decrees** of the Jerusalem Council were **delivered** to the Galatian churches on his Second Missionary Journey (Acts 16:4), there would have been **no need to refer** to those decrees, because the Galatians were **already familiar** with them, and they had **not convinced or silenced the Judaizing teachers** (Hendriksen, 71, n. 45)
 - 3) *Everett Harrison*: "[S]ince Paul was concerned with **the Gospel** in this whole passage, and since **the decree did not bear directly on the Gospel** but simply provided for **harmonious relations** between Jewish and Gentile believers, he was **not under obligation to include the decree in his argument**." (Bold emphasis added, 1288)
 - 4) *Jamieson, Fausset, & Brown*: "The Galatians were **Judaizing**, not because the **Jewish law was imposed by authority of the Church as necessary to Christianity**, but because they thought it necessary to be observed by those

who **aspired to higher perfection** (Ga 3:3; 4:21). The decree would not at all **disprove their view**, and therefore would have been **useless to quote**.” (Bold emphasis added, 2:326)

- 5) The Jerusalem Council decrees were not so significant as this objection implies. They were addressed to “the **Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia**” (Acts 15:23), not to **Gentiles** throughout the whole Roman world
 - a) Response:
 - 1] That may be, but the **decrees** were for **all Gentile churches** (Acts 21:25), including the churches in “South Galatia” (Acts 16:1-4)
 - 2] After all, the **NT epistles** are for us today even though they were addressed to **churches and individuals** in the first century
- 6) Paul **does not mention** the Jerusalem Council decree in **any of his letters** – even letters obviously written afterwards and in letters dealing, to some extent, with Jew-Gentile relationships (House, 139; Carson & Moo, 462)
 - a) **Romans** (Rom. 1:16; 2:9-10; 3:9, 29; 9:24; 10:12)
 - b) **1 Corinthians** (1 Cor. 1:22-24; 10:32; 12:13)
 - c) **Colossians** (Col. 3:11)
- 7) The Jerusalem Council decrees were **a compromise** that Paul **initially agreed** with but later viewed as **a dangerous concession** likely to be **misunderstood**
 - a) They freed the Gentiles from adherence to the law, but they added certain **restrictions for conscience’ sake** (Acts 15:28-29)
 - 1] Response:
 - a] I **do not agree** with this explanation at all, but mention it here, because **some offer it**
 - b] This explanation **assumes** that the Jerusalem Council decrees were merely **restrictions for conscience sake** as opposed to **universal principles**
6. Objection #3: It is **inconceivable** that Peter would have **snubbed his Gentile brethren** in Antioch if that had occurred **after the Jerusalem Conference**
 - a. Explanation:
 - 1) In light of what **Peter said** at the Jerusalem Conference (Acts 15:7-11), it is **inconceivable** that Peter would have **snubbed** his Gentile brethren in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) if that had occurred **after the Jerusalem Conference**
 - b. Evaluation:
 - 1) **Inconsistency and momentary fear** constituted the weak strain in Peter’s character (Hendriksen, 93)
 - a) *R.C.H. Lenski*: “Do not ask how a man like Peter **could have done what he did**. Just ask yourself how you at times **can and do sin even against better knowledge**.” (Bold emphasis added, 94)

-
- 2) There were **two issues** involved: (1) On what basis should Gentiles be allowed to become **Christians**; (2) How should Jewish believers **relate** to believing Gentiles (Moo, 147)
 - a) The Jerusalem Council **settled the first issue**, but not the second
 - 3) Why should **the decree** of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:22-29) be **more compelling** against a defection than the **Holy Spirit baptism** at Cornelius' house a few years before (Acts 10:44-48)? (House, 139)
 - 4) Paul may be reporting Peter's hypocrisy **out of chronological order** (Hahne, 6)
 - a) This seems **highly unlikely** to me
 - b) *Douglas Moo*: "Every other occurrence of the phrase $\square\tau\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in the NT **introduces something that follows what comes before it**: Matt. 9:25; 13:26; 21:34; Luke 15:30; Acts 8:12, 39; 11:2; 12:6; 21:5, 35; 27:39; 28:16; Gal. 1:15; 2:12; 4:4; Titus 3:4. It is unlikely, however, that Paul uses $\square\tau\epsilon\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ here as a conscious pickup of the same phrase in 1:15 (contra Ramsay 1900: 304)." (145, n. 2)
7. Objection #4: Paul's reference to his **rebuke of Peter** in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) **undercuts his polemical argument** if this event occurred **after** the Jerusalem Council⁵¹
- a. Explanation:
 - 1) Paul's reference to his rebuke of Peter in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14) **undercuts his polemical argument** if this event occurred after the Jerusalem Council
 - 2) It indicates that **a chasm** still existed between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles (Longenecker, lxxx)
 - b. Evaluation:
 - 1) This reference **fits** Paul's polemical argument because his rebuke of Peter, one of the leading apostles, demonstrates that he was "not at all **inferior** to the **most eminent apostles**" (2 Cor. 11:5; cf. 12:11)
8. Objection #5: How could **the problem[s]** that Paul addresses in Galatians have **arisen** at all **after** the **Jerusalem Conference**?
- a. Explanation:
 - b. Evaluation:
 - 1) The Jerusalem Council dealt with **Gentile acceptance** in the church without circumcision or law-observance; it did not explicitly deal with "**table fellowship**" between Jewish and Gentile Christians
 - a) *Jamieson, Fausset, & Brown*: "**The question** at Antioch was not whether **the Gentiles were admissible to the Christian covenant without becoming circumcised**—that was the question settled at the Jerusalem council just before—but whether **the Gentile Christians were to be admitted to social intercourse with the Jewish Christians** without conforming to the Jewish institution." (Bold emphasis added, 2:327)
 - 2) Response:
-

- a) Peter **knew what was right** with respect to “table fellowship” before he played the hypocrite in Antioch (cf. Acts 10:48; 11:2), he just **didn’t practice it**
9. Objection #6: Several things mentioned in Galatians could reasonably have **occurred before** the Jerusalem Council, but **not afterwards**
- a. Explanation:
- 1) Jewish Christians’ claim of **James’ support** (Gal. 2:11-12)
 - 2) Jewish Christians’ claim that **Paul’s gospel was inadequate** for Gentile acceptance
 - 3) Paul’s **polemical approach**
 - 4) Peter and Barnabas’ **hypocrisy** (Gal. 2:11-14) (Witherington, III, 16; Longenecker, 41:lxix)
- b. Evaluation:
- 1) I am **leery** of **objections** based upon what **finite and fallible men** think “woulda,” “coulda,” or “shoulda” happened (or not) because:
 - a) Sometimes **truth really is stranger than fiction**
 - b) God’s ways are **higher** than man’s (Isa. 55:8-9)

H. Conclusion:

1. Personally, I am **fairly confident** that the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds to the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15:4-29)

III. **WHERE AND WHEN WAS GALATIANS WRITTEN?**

- A. *Richard Longenecker*: “Without a doubt, the date of Galatians is one of the most **knotty problems** in Pauline studies. It is not, however, an **incidental problem** or one that can be **ignored**. Because the letter deals with such important matters as the **salvation of Gentiles apart from the Jewish law** and **relationships between Paul and the Jerusalem church**, one’s view as to date has **wide-ranging implications** for one’s understanding of **Paul’s theology** and the **reconstruction of the history of early Christianity**.” (Bold emphasis added, 41:lxixiii)
- B. Any attempt to **establish a chronology for Paul** and a **date for Galatians** must begin with **Paul’s statements in Galatians** (Gal. 1:18-2:14)
1. **Priority** must be given to **primary sources** [Paul’s letter(s)] over **secondary sources** [Luke’s account in Acts]
 2. Paul writes Galatians under **oath** (Gal. 1:20)
 3. Any **mistake** or **dissimulation** by Paul would have played into the hands of his **opponents** (Longenecker, 41:lxixiii)
- C. Since Paul does not explicitly or implicitly identify **where** or **when** he wrote Galatians, deducing a probable **location** and **date** depends upon:
1. The **identification** of the “Galatians”: North or South
 2. The **completion** of all the **events** mentioned in the letter. Obviously Paul wrote Galatians **after these events** occurred

-
- a. Paul's **persecution** of the church (Gal. 1:13-14)
 - b. Paul's **conversion** (Gal. 1:15-16)
 - c. Paul's visit to **Arabia** and return to **Damascus** (Gal. 1:17)
 - d. Paul's visit to **Jerusalem** after 3 years (Gal. 1:18)
 - e. Paul's visit to **Syria** and **Cilicia** (Gal. 1:21)
 - f. Paul's visit to **Jerusalem** after 14 years (Gal. 2:1-10)
 - g. Paul's **rebuke of Peter** in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14)⁵²
 - h. Paul's **preaching** to the Galatians (Gal. 2:5)
 - i. Paul's **establishing churches** among the Galatians (Gal. 4:19)
 - 1) Since he **preached** the gospel to the Galatians (Gal. 1:8-9; 4:13) and **established** the Galatian churches (Gal. 4:19; cf. 1 Cor. 4:15), he could not have **written** his letter **before his initial visit** -- unlike his letters to **Rome** (Rom. 1:7) and **Colosse** (Col. 1:2)
 - j. The Galatians' **rapid departure** from the gospel following their conversion (Gal. 1:6)⁵³
3. The **number of visits** Paul made to "Galatia" before he wrote his letter: **1** or **2** (Gal. 4:13)
 - a. Some scholars argue that Paul's statement: "You know that because of physical infirmity I preached the gospel to you at **the first**." (Gal. 4:13) implies **two visits** to Galatia before he wrote Galatians
 - 1) **Proteros**:
 - a) *BDAG*: "1. **pert. to a period of time preceding another period of time, earlier** a. adj. (Hom. et al.) *former, earlier*.... b. the neut. πρότερον as adv. *earlier, formerly, in former times*.... β. w. art. and functioning as an adj. *former*....—W. the art. simply adverbially τὸ πρότερον *before, once, formerly*....*The first time* Hv 3, 12, 1; Hs 9, 1, 3. So prob. also **Gal 4:13**. Naturally the transl. *once* is also prob., but from a linguistic point of view it is not poss. to establish the thesis that Paul wished to differentiate betw. a later visit and an earlier one...." (888-889)
 - b) *Thayer*: "[fr. Hom. down], *before, prior*; of time, *former*....Neut. adverbially, *before* (something else is or was done).... opp. to πρῆτα, Heb. 7:27; *before* i. e. *aforetime, in time past*....i. q. our *the first time*, Gal. 4:13...." (552)
 - 2) **Proteros** is found **11x** in the NT, and it is **variously translated** in the NKJV
 - a) **"Before"** (Jn. 6:62; 7:51; 2 Cor. 1:15)
 - b) **"Previously"** (Jn. 9:8)
 - c) **"First"** (Gal. 4:13; Heb. 4:6; 7:27)
 - d) **"Former[ly]"** (Eph. 4:22; 1 Tim. 1:13; Heb. 10:32; 1 Pet. 1:14)
 - 3) In Gal. 4:13, our English versions **variously translate proteros**:

-
- a) “The **first** time” (ASV; ISV; LEB)
 - b) “At the **first**” (KJV; NKJV; NRSV; YLT)
 - c) “At **first**” (ESV; RSV)
 - d) “**Previously**” (HCSB)
 - e) “**First**” (NET; NIV)
 - f) “**Originally**” (NAB; NASB)
- b. Whether this statement requires more than one visit to Galatia is **debatable**
 - 1) Some scholars say “**Yes**”⁵⁴
 - 2) Some scholars say “**Maybe**”⁵⁵
 - 3) Some scholars say “**No**” or “**Probably not**”⁵⁶
 - c. The contrast in Galatians 4:13-16 is likely between the **Galatians’ reception** of Paul when he **first preached** the gospel to them and their **response** to him now after the Judaizer’s intrusion; therefore it is **unlikely** that Gal. 4:13 implies that Paul had already made **two trips** to Galatia (Witherington, III, 13)
 - d. Even if Gal. 4:13 definitely indicates **two visits**, they could be the **outbound and return** visits during the First Missionary Journey (Carson & Moo, 463)
- 4. The correlation of **Paul’s Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10)
 - a. Was this the **Famine Relief Visit**? (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25)
 - b. Was this the **Jerusalem Council Visit**? (Acts 15)
 - 1) *Note:* This is **not a pertinent factor** for the **North Galatian Hypothesis** since Paul could not have visited “North Galatia” until his **Second Missionary Journey** (Acts 16:6) which followed the **Jerusalem Council**
- 5. **How quickly** the necessary antecedent conditions developed
 - a. The **infiltration** by the Judaizing teachers after Paul left Galatia (Gal. 1:7; 3:1; 4:17; 5:7, 10, 12; 6:12-13)
 - b. The **turning away** by the Galatians to another gospel (Gal. 1:6-9)
 - c. The **news** of this departure reaching Paul
 - d. The **writing** of Galatians (presumably soon afterwards)
 - 1) Unfortunately we **cannot know** with any certainty the **timeframe** involved in these developments
- D. The **North Galatian Hypothesis** would require a **later date**
 - 1. *North Galatia & 1 Visit:*
 - a. Paul allegedly **visited** “North Galatia” the **first time** not long after he began his Second Missionary Journey (Acts 16:6)
 - b. Paul probably **wrote Galatians** during his **18 month stay** in **Corinth** (Acts 18:1ff, 11) sometime between **AD 49/50-52**⁵⁷
-

-
- 1) **Enough time** would have elapsed for the necessary **antecedent conditions** to develop
 - 2) Lenski argues that Paul wrote Galatians from **Corinth** because:
 - a) Although Paul usually dictated his letters to an **amanuensis**, he wrote Galatians with **his own hand** (Gal. 6:11)
 - b) He sends **no greetings** from a **church**
 - c) He sends **no greetings** from **Timothy** or **Silas** or any of his **other assistants**
 - 1] It is **inconceivable** that Paul would have **failed to include Timothy** and **Silas** in his greetings, since they would have been well-known to the Galatians
 - 2] Therefore, they must have been **absent** when he wrote Galatians (Berkhof, 186)
 - a] They had not yet **arrived** from **Macedonia** (Acts 18:5)
 - b] Paul sent them **elsewhere** on some mission [?]
 - d) **Corinth** fits these criteria (Lenski, 15)
 - e) Paul implies that he was **some distance** from the Galatian churches (Gal. 4:20)
 - c. *Note:* It seems **unlikely** that Paul could have written to the “North Galatians” from anywhere other than **Corinth** because of **time constraints**
2. *North Galatia & 2 Visits (Gal. 4:13):*
- a. Paul allegedly **visited** “North Galatia” the **second time** not long after he began his Third Missionary Journey (Acts 18:23)
 - b. Paul probably **wrote Galatians** during his **3 year stay** in **Ephesus** sometime between **AD 52/53 – 55/56**⁵⁸ (Acts 19:1ff, 8, 10, 22; 20:31)
 - 1) The Galatians were **quickly turning away** from the gospel (Gal. 1:6) after Paul’s visit, and he **wrote Galatians soon after** he heard about their departure
 - a) Response:
 - 1] *Tacheos* probably refers to their **conversion** rather than Paul’s visit; therefore the term has a **relative significance** (Guthrie, 473)
 - 2] If Paul wrote Galatians from **Ephesus**, why didn’t he just **visit** the Galatians rather than **write** to them, since he wanted to **be with them?** (Gal. 4:20) (Berkhof, 186; Zahn, 1:194)
 - 3] A trip from **Ephesus** to “**North Galatia**” could have been made at any time of year
 - 4] Furthermore, Paul made a trip to **Corinth** from Ephesus during this same period. He **wrote 1 Corinthians** from **Ephesus** (1 Cor. 15:32; 16:8), and from Ephesus he made a “**painful visit**” to Corinth (2 Cor. 1:15; 2:1; 13:1)
-

b) Reply:

- 1] Perhaps Paul couldn't have made a trip to Galatia because he made **the painful visit** to Corinth
- 2) The **style** and **subject matter** of Galatians, Romans, and the Corinthian letters are **so similar**, they must have been written about **the same time period** (Longenecker, 41:lxiv, lxix; Rapa, 551)

a) Explanation:

- 1] During his **Third Missionary Journey**, Paul wrote:
 - a] **1 Corinthians** while he evangelized in **Ephesus** for 3 years (cf. 1 Cor. 16:9; Acts 19:1, 8, 10; 20, 22; 20:31)
 - b] **2 Corinthians** from **Macedonia** (Acts 20:1-2)
 - 1} When Paul wrote this letter, he was **boasting** [present tense] of the Corinthians to the Macedonians (cf. 2 Cor. 9:2-4)
 - c] **Romans** from **Corinth** (Acts 20:2-3)
 - 1} Paul commends **Phoebe** who was from **Cenchrea** (Rom. 16:1-2), and Cenchrea was the **port city** for **Corinth** (cf. Rom. 16:1-2 & Acts 18:1, 18)
 - 2} Paul sends greetings from **Gaius** (Rom. 16:23) who was baptized in **Corinth** (1 Cor. 1:14)
 - 3} Paul wrote Romans after 1 & 2 Corinthians while he was on his way to **Jerusalem** with **the collection** for the needy saints there (Rom. 15:25-26; 1 Cor. 16:1-4; 2 Cor. 8-9)
- 2] Lightfoot argues that **Galatians** and **2 Corinthians** are strikingly similar, not only in **words** and **argument** but also in **tone** and **feeling**, and that there is even a **closer resemblance** between **Romans** and **Galatians**⁵⁹ (George, 30:46)
- 3] All scholars date **Galatians earlier than Romans** (Cole, 9:34)
 - a] *Timothy George*: "The **doctrine** Paul set forth in the **white-hot polemics of Galatians** he **developed** in a more **formal** and **comprehensive** way in **Romans**." (Bold emphasis added, 30:47)
- 4] Some scholars arrange these books in the following order: **1 & 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans**
- 5] Others arrange them: **Galatians, 1 & 2 Corinthians, and Romans**
 - a] A good case can be made for the view that, in the **Corinthian letters**, Paul is **carefully qualifying** some of the **general statements** that he has already made in **Galatians** (cf. Gal. 3:28 with 1 Cor. 11:1-16) (Cole, 9:34)

b) Evaluation:

- 1] This argument is **denied** by many North Galatian advocates

-
- 2] These affinities can certainly be **explained in other ways**
 - a] **Subject matter** could **dictate style** to a great extent regardless of the **time period**
 - b] The doctrine of **justification by faith** was a **major concern** for Paul throughout his ministry
 - 3] The **differences** between Galatians and Romans are as striking as their **similarities** (George, 30:42)
 - 4] All of Paul's letters were written within a relatively **short period of time** (12-15 years) (George, 30:42)
- c. Paul might possibly have written Galatians during his **3 month stay** in **Corinth** (Acts 20:1-3) during the winter months of **AD 56/57**⁶⁰ (Willis, xxiv)
- 1) Galatians must have been **written after 1 & 2 Corinthians**, since those letters do not mention the **Jewish controversy**, but before Romans, since Romans presents a **more mature approach** to the same problems
 - 2) Therefore Galatians was probably written from **Corinth** toward the end of Paul's Third Missionary Journey (Guthrie, 473)
 - a) Response:
 - 1] If so, then Paul wrote both **Galatians** and **Romans** during his **3 month stay** in **Corinth** near the end of his Third Missionary Journey, and there would be **no time** for Paul to formulate this so-called "**more mature approach**"

E. The **South Galatian Hypothesis** would allow a **much earlier date**

1. **South Galatia & 1 Visit & VIAY** (Gal. 2:1-10) = **FRV** (Acts 11:27-30):
 - a. Paul made the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) = the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10)
 - b. Paul returned to **Antioch** (Acts 13:1)
 - c. Paul **visited** "South Galatia" on his First Missionary Journey (Acts 13-14)
 - d. Paul returned to **Antioch** (Acts 14:26-28)
 - e. Paul **confronted Peter** in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14)
 - 1) Assumption: Peter would not have **withdrawn** himself from Gentile Christians **after** the Jerusalem Council; therefore this must have occurred **earlier**
 - a) *Note*: The conclusion that **Paul confronted Peter in Antioch before the Jerusalem Council** is driven by this **assumption**, not by any **compelling contextual evidence**
 - f. Paul **wrote Galatians** from **Antioch** between his First Missionary Journey and the Jerusalem Council in **~AD 49/50** (Acts 14:26-28; 15:1-2)
 - 1) Assumption: Paul must have written Galatians **before** the Jerusalem Council; otherwise he would have mentioned the **Jerusalem Council decree** in his letter

-
- g. Paul **wrote Galatians** from **Jerusalem** on the eve of the Jerusalem Council in ~**AD 49/50** (Acts 15:4)
 - 1) *Note*: This seems **highly unlikely** to me because of **time constraints**
 - h. *Note*: Paul does not mention the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15:4-29) in Galatians
2. **South Galatia & 2 Visits** (Gal. 4:13) & **VI4Y** (Gal. 2:1-10) = **FRV** (Acts 11:27-30):
- a. *Note*: This scenario is basically **the same** as the previous scenario except the First Missionary Journey is divided into **two visits**:
 - 1) 1st Visit: The **outbound journey** (Acts 13:14; 14:1, 6, 8, 20)
 - 2) 2nd Visit: The **return journey** (Acts 14:21-23)
3. **South Galatia & 1 Visit** (Gal. 4:13) & **VI4Y** (Gal. 2:1-10) = **JCV** (Acts 15:2, 4):
- a. *Note*: Paul does not mention the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) in Galatians
 - b. Paul **visited** “South Galatia” during his First Missionary Journey [**1st Visit**] (Acts 13-14)
 - c. Paul returned to **Antioch** (Acts 14:26-28)
 - d. Paul made the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15:2, 4) = the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10)
 - e. Paul returned to **Antioch** (Acts 15:30-35)
 - f. Paul **confronted Peter** in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14)
 - 1) Problem: Peter **withdraws** from Gentile Christians **after** the Jerusalem Council
 - g. Paul **wrote Galatians** from **Antioch** (Acts 15:30-35)
 - 1) Problem: Paul does not mention the Jerusalem Council **decree** in Galatians
4. **South Galatia & 2 Visits** (Gal. 4:13) & **VI4Y** (Gal. 2:1-10) = **JCV** (Acts 15:2, 4):
- a. *Note*: Paul does not mention the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30; 12:25) in Galatians
 - b. Paul **visited** “South Galatia” during his First Missionary Journey [**1st Visit**] (Acts 13-14)
 - c. Paul returned to **Antioch** (Acts 14:26-28)
 - d. Paul made the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15:2, 4) = the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10)
 - e. Paul returned to **Antioch** (Acts 15:22, 30, 35)
 - f. Paul **confronted Peter** in Antioch (Gal. 2:11-14)
 - g. Paul **revisited** “South Galatia” during his Second Missionary Journey [**2nd Visit**] (Acts 16:1-6)
 - h. Paul **wrote Galatians** during his 18 month stay in **Corinth** (Acts 18:1ff, 11)
-

-
- i. Paul **revisited** “South Galatia” during his Third Missionary Journey [**3rd Visit**] (Acts 18:23)
 - j. Paul **wrote Galatians** during his 3 year stay in **Ephesus** (Acts 19:1ff, 8, 10, 22; 20:31)
 - 1) This seems **highly unlikely** to me because the **interval** between the Galatians departure and Paul’s writing would probably be **too long** (Gal. 1:6-7)
 - 2) However, this assumes that the Judaizing teachers began to **influence** the Galatians soon after **Paul’s First Missionary Journey**. If this did not occur until **later**, then **this interval** would not necessarily be **too long**
 - 5. *Note:* Since Paul seems to be a **liberty** when he wrote **Galatians**, it must have been written sometime before **his arrest in Jerusalem** at the conclusion of his **Third Missionary Journey** (Acts 21)
 - 6. The hypothesis that Paul wrote Galatians while imprisoned in **Rome** is quite **untenable**
 - a. When Paul wrote as a **prisoner**, he indicated such in his epistles:
 - 1) **Ephesians** (Eph. 3:1; 4:1; 6:20)
 - 2) **Philippians** (Phil. 1:7, 13-14, 16)
 - 3) **Colossians** (Col. 4:3, 10, 18)
 - 4) **Philemon** (Phile. 1, 9, 10, 13, 23)
 - 5) **2 Timothy** (2 Tim. 1:8, 16; 2:9)
 - b. There is **no such indication** in **Galatians** (Zahn, 1:195)
 - c. When Paul wrote Galatians, he was **still preaching** the gospel among the **Gentiles** (Gal. 5:11)
 - d. *Mike Willis:* “The designation at the end of the book in some copies of the Authorized Version that the book was **written from Rome** is altogether **incorrect.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Truth Commentaries: Galatians*, xxvi)

F. Conclusion:

- 1. Personally, I am **not confident** about a definitive **provenance** for Galatians
 - a. There are so many **variables** and some factors that cannot be **known with certainty**; therefore, I don’t think anyone can do more than offer **an educated guess**
 - b. If the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds to the **Famine Relief Visit** (Acts 11:27-30), Galatians would be the **earliest** Pauline epistle
 - c. If the **Visit After 14 Years** (Gal. 2:1-10) corresponds to the **Jerusalem Council Visit** (Acts 15:4-29), Galatians could still be the **earliest** Pauline epistle, but then again, it may have been written **after 1 & 2 Thessalonians**

IV. **HOW DO WE HARMONIZE PAUL’S PREACHING WITH HIS PRACTICE CONCERNING THE LAW OF MOSES?**

- A. In Galatians, Paul taught that the **law of Moses** was **inadequate**
 - 1. It could not **justify** (Gal. 2:16; 3:11-12)

-
2. It required **perfect obedience** (Gal. 3:10-12; cf. Lev. 18:5; Dt. 27:26; Ezek. 20:11, 13, 21)
 3. It brought a **curse** to those who didn't keep it (Gal. 3:10)
 4. It could not **give life** (Gal. 3:21)
 5. It brought **bondage** (Gal. 4:1-5, 9, 24-25; 5:1-4)
- B. In Galatians, Paul taught that the **law of Moses** has been **superseded** and/or **replaced** by the **gospel of Christ**
1. Man is **not justified** by works of [the] law but by faith in Christ (Gal. 2:16, 21; 3:10-14; 5:18)
 2. We are no longer under a **"tutor"** (Gal. 3:15ff, 23-25)
 3. We are no longer slaves, but **sons** (Gal. 4:1-7)
 4. Like Ishmael, the old covenant is **cast out** (Gal. 4:21-31)
 5. Circumcision **profits nothing** and **avails nothing** (Gal. 5:1-3, 6; 6:15)
 - a. Paul **refused to circumcise** Titus, a Gentile Christian (Gal. 2:)
 - b. He did not **preach circumcision** and was **persecuted** as a result (Gal. 5:11)
 6. Those who attempt to be justified by law are **fallen from grace** (Gal. 5:4)
- C. Yet in Acts, Luke reports that Paul continued to **practice** various **Jewish rituals** and **customs**
1. He routinely went to the **synagogues** to teach and preach
 - a. **Salamis** [Crete] (Acts 13:5)
 - b. **Antioch** [Pisidia] (Acts 13:14ff)
 - c. **Iconium** [Pisidia] (Acts 14:1)
 - d. **Thessalonica** [Macedonia] (Acts 17:1-4)
 - e. **Berea** [Macedonia] (Acts 17:10-12)
 - f. **Athens** [Achaia] (Acts 17:16-17)
 - g. **Corinth** [Achaia] (Acts 18:1-4)
 - h. **Ephesus** [Asia] (Acts 18:19; 19:1, 8)
 - 1) *Note:* **Jewish Christians** continued to **meet** in the **temple** (Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:20-21, 42; 21:26-27; 22:17; 24:17-18) and **synagogues** (Acts 22:19; 24:12; 26:11)
 2. He **circumcised** Timothy (Acts 16:1-3)
 3. He **cut off his hair** at Cenchrea in connection with a **vow** (Acts 18:18)
 4. He kept a **Jewish feast** in Jerusalem (Acts 18:21)
 5. He wanted to be in Jerusalem for **Pentecost** (Acts 20:16)
 6. He **sponsored** four Jewish Christians who had taken a vow (Acts 21:23-26)
-

- D. This **apparent contradiction** is not really that hard to **reconcile**
1. As a Jewish Christian, Paul continued to **keep Jewish customs**
 - a. Not to be **justified** (Acts 13:38-39; Gal. 2:15-16)
 - 1) In the Jerusalem Council, Peter proclaimed that **Jews** would be **saved** in the same way as Gentiles **by faith** in Christ (Acts 15:7-11)
 - 2) Peter's **initial behavior** among Gentile Christians in Antioch – *i.e.* **living like a Gentile though a Jew** – and Paul's **rebuke** of Peter because of his later **hypocrisy** (Gal. 2:11-14) demonstrate that both Peter and Paul understood that Jewish Christians did not have to **“keep the law”** to be **justified** before God
 - 3) Paul's charge to the **Colossians** that they let no one **judge/condemn** them regarding the [non]observance of **Jewish rituals** (Col. 2:16-17) demonstrates that he understood that Jewish Christians did not have to **“keep the law”** to be **justified** before God
 - b. But out of **respect** for his **Jewish heritage** (Acts 21:20-26)
 - c. To **become all things** to all men (1 Cor. 9:19-23)
 - 1) Paul **lived like a Jew** among Jews, and he **lived like a Gentile** among Gentiles. This demonstrates that he understood that Jewish Christians were **permitted**, but not **required**, to **“keep the law”**
 2. And he **encouraged other Jews** to do the same (1 Cor. 7:17-24)

Conclusion:

- I. Reconciling Acts and Galatians is fraught with **difficulty**. Because of the **“sticky wickets”** that abound:
 - A. We must be **careful students** of the word
 1. Considering **all the pertinent information** [pro and con] (Pr. 18:13)
 2. Reserving judgment until **“both sides”** are given a fair hearing (Pr. 18:17)
 3. Weighing **the strength** of the various arguments
 - a. It is not the **quantity**, but the **quality**, of the arguments that ultimately matters
 - B. We should avoid **dogmatism**
 1. *Bertrand Russell*: “A habit of basing **convictions** upon **evidence**, and of giving to them only that **degree of certainty** which the **evidence warrants**, would, if it became general, **cure most of the ills** from which the world is suffering.” (Bold emphasis added, *Why I Am Not A Christian*, pp. vi-vii, quoted in Kenneth Chumbley, *The Gospel Argument For God*, p. 61)
 - C. We should be **tolerant** with those who have drawn different conclusions whenever we can be
- II. May the Lord help us to **rightly divide** His word (2 Tim. 2:15)

Kevin Kay
 42 Hillbrooke Way
 Caledonia, MS 39740
kevinskay@gmail.com

Appendix A:

Definitions Of *Pros*

James Strong: “4314 πρὸς.... **726 occurrences**; AV translates as ‘unto’ 340 times, ‘to’ 203 times, ‘with’ 43 times, ‘for’ 25 times, ‘against’ 24 times, ‘among’ 20 times, ‘at’ 11 times, **not translated** six times, **translated miscellaneous** 53 times, and ‘vr to’ once. 1 to the advantage of. 2 at, near, by. 3 to, towards, with, with regard to.” (*Enhanced Strong’s Lexicon*, 1995, n.p.)

BDAG: “**πρὸς** prep. expressing direction ‘on the side of’, ‘in the direction of’: w. gen. ‘from’, dat. ‘at’, or acc. (the most freq. usage in our lit.) ‘to’ (s. the lit. s.v. ἐνὶ. beg.) (Hom.+). 1. w. gen. (pseudepigr. only TestSol 10:4 C; apolog. exc. Ar.) **marker of direction or aspect from which someth. is determined, to the advantage of, advantageous for**.... 2. w. dat. (pseudepigr. only TestSol 6:4 D; TestAbr [s. below]; JosAs 19:1.—Just.; Mel., HE 4, 26, 7; Ath., R. 22 p. 75, 10) **marker of closeness of relation or proximity** a. of place **near, at, by**.... b. **in addition to**.... 3. w. acc. (pseudepigr. and apolog. throughout) **marker of movement or orientation toward someone/someth.** a. of place, pers., or thing **toward, towards, to**, after verbs α. of going.... β. of sending.... γ. of motion gener.... δ. of leading, guiding.... ε. of saying, speaking.... ζ. of asking, praying.... b. of time **near, at, or during (a certain time)** α. denoting approach **toward**.... β. of temporal duration.... c. of goal (**aiming**) **at** or (**striving**) **toward** α. with conscious purpose **for, for the purpose of, on behalf of**.... β. gener. of design, destiny.... γ. of the result that follows a set of circumstances (*so that*).... d. of relationship (hostile or friendly), **against, for** α. hostile **against, with** after verbs of disputing, etc.... β. friendly **to, toward, with**.... e. to indicate a connection by marking a point of reference, **with reference/regard to** α. **with reference to**.... β. **as far as ... is concerned, with regard to**.... γ. elliptically τί πρὸς τινα ἐπιμένει (sc. ἐπιμένει); **what is that to us?**.... δ. **in accordance with**.... ε. expressing purpose πρὸς τὸ w. inf. (s. Mayser II/1 p. 331f) **in order to, for the purpose of**.... f. in adverbial expressions.... g. **by, at, near πρὸς τινα ἐπιμένει (in company) with someone**... διαμένειν Ac 10:48 D; Gal 2:5b....” (874-875)

Thayer: “**πρὸς**, a preposition... **I.** with the ACCUSATIVE, *to, towards*, Lat. *ad*, denoting direction towards a thing, or position and state looking towards a thing... it is used **1.** of the goal or limit towards which a movement is directed: πρὸς τινα or τι, **a.** prop. after verbs of going, departing, running, coming, etc.... **b.** of a time drawing *towards* a given time.... **c.** metaph. of mental direction, with words denoting desires and emotions of the mind, *to, towards*.... **d.** of the issue or end to which anything tends or leads.... **e.** of an intended end or purpose....: πρὸς νοουθεσίαν τινός, 1 Co. 10:11; as other exx. add, Mt. 26:12; Ro. 3:26; 15:2; 1 Co. 6:5; 7:35; 12:7; 14:12, 26; 15:34; 2 Co. 4:6; 7:3; 11:8; Eph. 4:12; 1 Tim. 1:16; Heb. 6:11; 9:13; πρὸς τί, to what end, for what intent, Jn. 13:28; πρὸς τὸ ἐπιμένειν, for the purpose of asking alms, Acts 3:10; πρὸς τὸ w. an inf. *in order to*, etc.: Mt. 5:28; 6:1; 13:30; 23:5; 26:12; Mk. 13:22; 2 Co. 3:13; Eph. 6:11; 1 Th. 2:9; 2 Th. 3:8, also R G in Jas. 3:3. **f.** of the time for which a thing has been, as it were, appointed, i. e. during which it will last; where we use our *for*.... **2.** it is used of close proximity—the idea of direction, though not entirely lost, being more or less weakened; **a.** answering to our *at* or *by*.... **b.** i. q. (Lat. *apud*) **with, with the acc. of a person, after verbs of remaining, dwelling, tarrying, etc. (which require one to be conceived of as always turned towards one)**.... διαμένειν, Gal. 2:5.... **3.** of relation or reference to any person or thing; thus **a.** of fitness.... **b.** of the relation or close connection entered (or to be entered) into by one person with another.... **c.** *with regard to* (any person or thing), *with respect to, as to*; after verbs of saying.... **d.** *pertaining to*.... **e.** in comparison (like Lat. *ad*) i. q. *in comparison with*.... **f.** *agreeably to, according to*.... **g.** akin to this is the use of πρὸς joined to nouns denoting desires, emotions, virtues, etc., to form a periphrasis of the adverbs.... **II.** with the DATIVE, *at, near, hard by*, denoting close local proximity (W. 395 (369 sq.)); so six times in the N. T. (much more freq. in the Sept. and in the O. T. Apocr.).... **III** with the GENITIVE, **a.** prop. used of that from which something proceeds; **b.** (Lat. *a parte* i. e.) *on the side of*.... **IV.** in COMPOSITION πρὸς signifies **1.** direction or motion to a goal.... **2.** addition, accession, *besides*.... **3.** vicinity.... **4.** our *on, at*.... **5.** *to* or *for*, of a thing adjusted to some standard....” (541-543)

“4314. *πρός* *prós*; prep. governing the gen., dat., and acc. and corresponding in its basic meaning to the primary force of these cases themselves. Toward.

(I) With the gen., implying motion or direction from a place, hither. Also in the direction of a place meaning at or toward. Figuratively of the source, agent, or cause from which something comes or proceeds. Also expressing dependence or relation of any kind from or with someone, the pertaining or belonging in any way to a person or thing. In the NT, used once, figuratively meaning pertaining to, for, for the benefit of (Acts 27:34).

(II) With the dat., marking a place or object by the side of which a person or thing is, meaning rest or remaining by, at, near, as if in answer to the question “Where?” (Mark 5:11 [UBS], where TR has *tá órē* [pl.] [3735], the mountains, in the acc. pl.; Luke 19:37, “at the descent of the mount”; John 18:16, “at the door”; 20:12; Rev. 1:13).

(III) With the acc., marking the object toward or to which something moves or is directed. See IV below.

(A) Of place, thing, or person meaning toward, to, unto, as if in answer to the question “Whither?” With the acc. of place, thing, person: (1) Particularly of motion or direction after verbs of going, coming, departing, returning, and also after similar nouns (Matt. 2:12; 3:5, 14; 10:13; 11:28; 25:9; Mark 1:33; 6:25, 45; 10:1; Luke 8:4, 19; 24:12; John 3:20; 6:37; 7:33; Acts 3:11; 28:30; Rom. 1:10; Gal. 1:17). After or before *gínomai* (1096), to become (John 10:35; Acts 7:31; 13:32; 2 Cor. 1:18). After verbs of sending, with the acc. of person (Matt. 21:34; Luke 23:7; John 16:7; Acts 15:25; Eph. 6:22; Titus 3:12), hence *epistolé* *prós* (*epistolé* [1992], letter), letter for (Acts 9:2; 22:5; 2 Cor. 3:1). After verbs of leading, bringing, or drawing by force or otherwise (Matt. 26:57; Mark 9:17, 19; 11:7; Luke 12:58; John 12:32; 14:3; Acts 23:15; Rev. 12:5). After verbs implying motion to a place and also a subsequent remaining there, meaning at, upon, but also to, unto. With verbs of falling such as *piptō* (4098), to fall, having the same meaning as *prospiptō* (4363), to fall toward (Mark 5:22; 7:25; Sept.: Ex. 4:25). With verbs of laying, putting, casting (Matt. 3:10; 4:6; Mark 10:7; Luke 3:9; 16:20; Acts 3:2; 5:10; 13:36). After verbs and words implying direction in a close proximity as turning, reaching, looking (Luke 7:44; Acts 9:40; Rom. 10:21; 2 Cor. 3:16; Eph. 3:14; James 4:5). To see something face to face (1 Cor. 13:12; Sept.: Gen. 32:30). To speak mouth to mouth (2 John 1:12). (2) With all verbs and words which include the idea of speaking to someone, mostly with the acc. of person: (a) Generally after *épō* (2036), to say (Matt. 3:15; Luke 1:13, 18, 34); *laléō* (2980), to speak (Luke 1:19, 55; 2:18, 20; Sept.: 2 Chr. 10:16); *légō* (3004), to say (Luke 5:36; 7:24); *phēmi* (5346), to say (Luke 22:70; Acts 2:38). With verbs of answering, as *apokrinomai* (611), to answer (Acts 3:12; 25:16; Sept.: 1 Sam. 14:19); accusing as *katēgorēō* (2723), to accuse (John 5:45); praying, entreating, as *boáō* (994), to cry (Luke 18:7; Sept.: 1 Sam. 12:10); *déomai* (1189), to beseech (Acts 8:24); *déēsis* (1162), supplication (Rom. 10:1); *eúchomai* (2172), wish (2 Cor. 13:7); *proseuchē* (4335), prayer (Acts 12:5; Rom. 15:30); *ēran phōnēn prós tón Theón* (*ēran*, aor. of *airō* [142], lift up; *phōnē* [5456], voice; *Theós* [2316], God), lift up the voice to God (Acts 4:24 [cf. Is. 24:14]). With words of declaring, making known, as *anádeixis* (323), exhibition, showing (Luke 1:80); *gnōrizō* (1107), to make known (Phil. 4:6); *emphanizō* (1718), to exhibit, show (Acts 23:22); of command and the like, such as *entolé* (1785), precept, commandment (Acts 17:15); *apología* (627), defense (Acts 22:1); with the acc. of thing, as *laléō prós tó ouís* (*laléō* [2980], to speak; *ouís* [3775], ear), to speak to one in his ear meaning privately (Luke 12:3). (b) Of mutual words and sayings: *állos prós állon légontes* (*állos* [243], another [in this case, one to another]; *légontes* [3004], saying) “saying one to another” (Acts 2:12); *prós allēlous* (240), themselves (Mark 8:16, to one another, one to another; 9:34; 15:31; John 6:52; 16:17; Acts 2:7; 4:15); *prós heautoús* (*heautoús* [pl.] [1438], themselves), among themselves (Mark 9:33; 14:4; 16:3; Luke 22:23). (c) After verbs of swearing to someone meaning to promise with an oath (Luke 1:73). (3) Figuratively after verbs and words implying direction of the mind or will, an affection or disposition meaning toward someone. (a) Favorable, implying good will, confidence (2 Cor. 3:4; 7:4, 12; Gal. 6:10; Eph. 6:9; Phil. 2:30; Col. 4:5; 1 Thess. 1:8; 4:12; 5:14; 2 Tim. 2:24; Titus 3:2; Phile. 1:5). (b) Unfavorable, meaning against (Acts 6:1; 24:19; 25:19; 1 Cor. 6:1; Eph. 6:11; Col. 3:13, 19; Heb. 12:4; Rev. 13:6); after verbs of sending (Acts 23:30).

(B) Of time: (1) Particularly of a time when, meaning toward, near (Luke 24:29). (2) As forming with

the acc. a periphrasis for an adv. of time, meaning at, for, *prós kairón* (*kairós* [2540], season), meaning for a season, a while, briefly (Luke 8:13; 1 Cor. 7:5); *prós kairón hōras* (*hōra* [5610], hour), meaning for a short time (1 Thess. 2:17); *prós hōran* (John 5:35, “for a season”; Gal. 2:5); *prós olígas hēméras* (*oligos* [3641], a few; *hēméra* [2250], day.), for a few days (Heb. 12:10); *prós tó parón* (*parón*, the pres. part. neut. of *páreimi* [3918], to be present), meaning for the present, at present (Heb. 12:11); *prós olígon*, implying *chrónon* (5550), time (*oligos* [3641], a little; *chrónos*), “for a little time” (1 Tim. 4:8; James 4:14).

(C) Figuratively denoting the direction, reference, or relation which one object has toward or to another.

(1) Toward, in reference or respect to, as to, implying the direction or remote object of an action. (a) With the acc. of person (Mark 12:12; Acts 24:16; Rom. 4:2; Heb. 1:7, 8); *tí prós sé*, “What is that to thee?” or in the pl. *tí prós hēmás*, “What is that to us? [*se*, {4571}, thee; *hēmás*, {2248}, us]” (Matt. 27:4; John 21:22, 23). (b) Followed by the acc. of thing (Luke 18:1; 2 Cor. 4:2; Heb. 9:13). After verbs of replying (Matt. 27:14; Rom. 8:31). The expression *tá prós* followed by the acc. sing. or pl. meaning things relating or pertaining to any person or thing or condition (Luke 14:32; 19:42; Acts 28:10; 2 Pet. 1:3). *Tá prós [tón] Theón* means things pertaining to God, divine things (Rom. 15:17; Heb. 2:17; 5:1; Sept.: Ex. 18:19). (2) Spoken of a rule, norm, or standard, meaning according to, in conformity with (Luke 12:47; 2 Cor. 5:10; Gal. 2:14; Eph. 3:4). (3) Of the motive, ground, or occasion of an action, meaning on account of, because of, for (Matt. 19:8; Mark 10:5). (4) As marking the end result, the aim or purpose of an action, followed by the acc. meaning for what, why, to what end, for what purpose (John 13:28). After verbs expressing the end, aim, tendency of an action or quality (Acts 3:10; Rom. 3:26; 15:2; 1 Cor. 6:5; 7:35; 10:11; 2 Cor. 1:20; Eph. 4:12; 1 Tim. 1:16; 4:7; Heb. 5:14; 6:11; 1 Pet. 4:12). Especially followed by the inf. with the neut. def. art. *tó*, meaning in order that (Matt. 5:28; 6:1; 13:30; 23:5; Mark 13:22; Eph. 6:11; James 3:3). After nouns and adj. (John 4:35; 11:4; Acts 27:12; 2 Cor. 10:4; Eph. 4:14, 29; Col. 2:23; 2 Tim. 3:17; Titus 1:16; 1 Pet. 3:15). Of a tendency and result (2 Pet. 3:16; 1 John 5:16, 17). (5) The relation in which one person or thing stands toward or with another (Luke 23:12; Acts 2:47; 3:25; 28:25; Rom. 5:1; 2 Cor. 6:15; Heb. 9:20; 10:16). In a comparison (Rom. 8:18, “to be compared with”).

(IV) Sometimes *prós* with the acc. is used after verbs which express simply rest, meaning at, by, in a place, the same as *prós* with the dat. However, in such instances, for the most part, the idea of a previous coming to or direction toward that place is either actually expressed or is implied in the context.

(A) Generally with the acc. of place (Mark 11:4; 14:54; Luke 22:56; John 20:11). With the acc. of person, meaning with, by, among (Matt. 26:18, 55; Mark 14:49; Acts 12:20; 13:31; 1 Cor. 16:7; 2 Cor. 1:12; Gal. 1:18; 2:5; 4:18; Phil. 1:26; 2 Thess. 2:5; Sept.: Is. 19:19). With the reflexive pron. *heautón* (1438), himself, meaning standing by himself or he prayed to or with himself (Luke 18:11).

(B) Rarely, and only in later usage, is the idea of previous motion or direction completely dropped, and *prós* with the acc. is then the same as *pará* (3844), near, with the dat. (Matt. 13:56; Mark 2:2; 4:1; 6:3; John 1:1; Phile. 1:13).

(V) In composition *prós* implies:

(A) Motion, direction, reference, meaning toward, to, at, as *proságō* (4317), to lead toward, to approach, bring near; *proseggízō* (4331), to approach near; *prosérchomai* (4334), to come near; *prosdokáō* (4328), to expect, wait for.

(B) Accession, addition, meaning thereto, over and above, moreover, further, as *prosaitēō* (4319), to ask repeatedly; *prosapeilēō* (4324), to threaten further. Used intensively as *próspeinos* (4361), intensely hungry; *prophilēs* (4375), friendly toward, acceptable, lovely, very dear.

(C) Nearness, a being or remaining near, at, by, as *prosdreúō* (4332), to attend as a servant, wait on; *prosménō* (4357), remain in a place, abide still.

Syn.: *epí* (1909), upon; *eis* (1519), to.” (The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament,

End Notes

¹ *Theodor Zahn*: “From the time of its establishment, the province, the **boundaries** of which **fluctuated greatly**, included besides the **Galatian region** the greater part of the region of **Pisidia, Isauria, and Lycaonia**, also a portion of eastern **Phrygia**, though the greater part of Phrygia belonged to the province of **Asia**. In Asia Minor, as elsewhere, the organisation and marking out of Roman provinces, though furnishing new names, did not by any means **displace the old territorial designations**. Roman writers, such as the elder **Pliny** (died 79) and **Tacitus** (*circa* 115), also the geographer **Ptolemy** (*circa* 150), understood by **Galatia** the entire **Roman province**, which, besides other districts, included **Galatia proper**” (Bold emphasis added, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 1:174).

² See Steve Gibson, *Galatians 6:10 and the Great Collection*, and Steve Gibson “The Meaning of Galatians 6:10,” *The Restorer*, Aug., 1990, 10:8:11-13.

³ See Martin Pickup, “A Response to Steve Gibson’s Galatians 6:10 and the Great Collection,” *Guardian of Truth* XXXV: 15, August 15, 1991, 496-498.; *Guardian of Truth* XXXV: 17, September 5, 1991, 528-530; and *Guardian of Truth* XXXV: 18, September 19, 1991, 554-556.

⁴ *J. B. Lightfoot*: “**Mysia, Phrygia, Pisidia**, are all ‘**geographical expressions**’ destitute of any political significance; and as they occur in the same parts of the narrative with **Galatia**, it seems fair to infer that the latter is similarly used. The **direct transition** for instance, which we find from **Galatia to Phrygia**, is only explicable if the two are **kindred terms**, both alike being used in a popular way. Moreover, St Luke distinctly calls **Lystra and Derbe ‘cities of Lycaonia,’** [Acts 14:6, ksk] while he no less distinctly assigns **Antioch to Pisidia** [Acts 13:14, ksk]; a convincing proof that in the language of the day they were **not regarded as Galatian towns.**” (*Saint Paul’s Epistle To The Galatians*, 19).

⁵ *Daniel Wallace*: “In Acts 13:13; 13:14; and 14:6, Luke speaks of **Pamphylia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia** respectively, all of which are **geographical terms**. This indicates that he probably used the term “**Phrygian and Galatian region**” in 16:6 as a **geographical term**, too.” (Bold emphasis added, “Galatians: Introduction, Argument, and Outline,” 2).

⁶ *James Montgomery Boice*: “**The southern Galatia hypothesis** does not take Luke’s terminology seriously enough. Luke does not refer to those living in the cities of **Derbe, Lystra, Iconium**, and Pisidian **Antioch** as **Galatians** when he describes Paul’s work there. He used geographical titles—**Pamphilia** (Acts 13:13), **Pisidia** (Acts 13:14), and **Lycaonia** (Acts 14:6). It is strange to think that he is not, therefore, still using **geographical terminology** when he refers to **Galatia** a few chapters later. (Bold emphasis added, *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Romans through Galatians*, 10:416).

⁷ *Donald Guthrie*: “It should be noted that the **tense** of the participle implies that after being **prevented** from speaking the word in Asia Paul and his companions proceeded through **Phrygia and Galatia.**” (*New Testament Introduction*, 467).

⁸ *Daniel Wallace*: “Acts 16:6 and 18:23 are taken to mean, respectively, ‘**the Phrygian-Galatian region**’ and ‘**the [Roman] province of Galatia and Phrygia.**’ In the first instance, Φρυγίαν is taken (rightfully) as an **adjective**, and thus indicates that Luke is here using a **political** (rather than an ethnic/geographical) term. This opens up the **distinct possibility**—even though it may be **against his normal practice**—that he does the **same thing** in Acts 18:23. If so, **in neither verse does Luke affirm that Paul visited the geographical region of Galatia.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 3).

Donald Guthrie: “According to Ramsay Acts 16:6 refers to the **Phrygic-Galatic region**, by which he meant that part of the Roman province of **Galatia** which was inhabited by **Phrygians** and was known geographically as **Phrygia**. This involves treating ‘**Phrygian**’ (Φρυγίαν) as an **adjective**....The parallel description in Acts 18:23 was taken to mean districts in the province of **Galatia** and the part of **Phrygia** in the adjoining province of **Asia.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 468).

For a more detailed explanation, see William Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*, 80-81, 90-93.

⁹ See F. F. Bruce, “Galatian Problems. 2. North or South Galatians?” *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 52 (1970): 258.

¹⁰ *F. F. Bruce*: “The **non-repetition of the article** before Γαλατικὴν χώραν (except in the Byzantine text) suggests that **this, and not ‘Phrygia and Galatic region’**, is the **proper translation**. Φρύγιος appears as an **adjective** of both two and three terminations but predominantly of three, even in later Greek; Φρυγίαν is therefore most probably an **adjective here**, and not a noun, as (e. g.) E. Haenchen asserts (*Acts*, 483).” (Bold emphasis added, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* 11, n. 42).

Cuthbert Hamilton Turner: “That the phrase ‘**Phrygian and Galatian district**’ (τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, 16:6) or ‘**Galatian and Phrygian district**’ (τὴν Γαλῶραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, 18:23) means **not two places, but one** and the same, follows as well from the inclusion of both under a **single article**, as from the fact that the names are given in **reverse order** on the second occasion, though the **direction of the journey was the same** as on the first, from east to west.” (Bold emphasis added, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, 1:422)

¹¹ *F. F. Bruce*: “The **narrative** of Acts 15:41-16:8 is certainly **more intelligible** if the ‘**Phrygian and Galatic region**’ is that **part of Phrygia included in the province of Galatia**. Although there were naturally lines of communication linking the various regions of the province, the **cities of North Galatia** were **not readily accessible** from the road leading from **Cilician Gates** through **Lystra**. Any one proposing to evangelize North Galatia would have been better advised to set out from **some other place than Lystra**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 13).

¹² *Ben Witherington, III*: “There is in any case no reason to think that Luke assumed that Paul took a **major detour** after Lystra, going far to the north to the region of Ancyra before coming to Ephesus. In short, there is **no reason** either in **Galatians** or in **Acts** to assume that Paul evangelized north Galatia.” (Bold emphasis added, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul’s Letter to the Galatians*, 6).

James Montgomery Boice: Being **forbidden** by the Holy Spirit to preach either in **Asia** to the south or **Bithynia** to the north (Acts 16:6, 7), Paul and his companion, Timothy, pressed on through **Iconium** and **Antioch** of Pisidia to **Troas**, where for the first time on the journey they encountered an **open door** before them into **Greece**. On this journey they would have passed through areas of **Phrygia** and **Roman Galatia**, as Acts 16:6 indicates; but they would have had to take a most **unlikely detour** of about **three hundred miles** to have entered **ethnic Galatia** and to have preached there. The difficulty of assuming that Paul traveled three hundred miles to preach in Galatia is further increased when we take into account the probability that Paul went there originally as a **sick man** ([Gal.] 4:13).” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 413).

¹³ *William Ramsay*: “We must observe that a **non-Roman people**, and an individual who is not a Roman or Latin citizen, could **belong to the empire** only by virtue of **belonging to a Province**. The status of each non-Roman person in the Empire was that of a ‘**provincial**’; and he was designated as a **member of the Roman Empire**, not by his **nation**, but by his **Province**. His nation was a **non-Roman idea**; so long as a person is described as a **Phrygian** or a **Lycaonian**, he is thereby described as **outside of the Empire**....

“When an audience of **Antiochians** and **Lystrans** was addressed by a **courteous orator**, he would certainly not address those citizens of the **Coloniae** by the servile designation as **Phrygians** or **Lycaonians**. If he sought to please them, he would designate them either as **Galatae**, i.e., members of the Roman Empire as being members of the **Province Galatia**, or as **Coloni**, citizens of **Roman Coloniae**, which would be an even more honorific term.” (Bold emphasis added, *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians*, 119-120).

¹⁴ *Richard Longenecker*: “Even where Paul and Luke treat the **same event**, as is generally thought to be the case with respect to Gal 1:18-20 and Acts 9:26-30, the **differences** between the accounts is a clear indication that the two authors wrote from **different perspectives**, shaping their presentations in strikingly **different ways**” (Bold emphasis added, *Galatians. Word Biblical Commentary* 41:lxviii).

¹⁵ *Donald Guthrie*: “The cities of Pessinus, Tavium and Ancyra were all on the central plateau and were not the sort of places to be **visited** at a time of **bodily weakness**.^{15c}” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 469).

¹⁶ *R. J. Utley*: “Some have linked Paul’s illness in Gal. 4:13 to **malaria**. They assert that Paul went north into the highlands to **get away** from the marshy, malaria-infested, coastal lowlands.” (Bold emphasis added, *Paul’s First Letters: Galatians and I & II Thessalonians*, 11:1).

¹⁷ *William Hendriksen*: “On the other hand, the **churches** established in the **southern part** of the Roman province of **Galatia** consisted of both **Jews** and **Gentiles**, perhaps in Equal proportion. The **Jews** may even have **predominated**. In fact, in **Antioch of Pisidia** there were ‘**many Jews**’ who turned to Christ (Acts 13:43). In

Antioch and in **Iconium** there were found **synagogues** of Jews. Into these synagogues the apostle entered and preached. At **Iconium** ‘a **great multitude** both of **Jews** and of **Greeks** believed’ (Acts 14:1). This decided difference between the **constituency** of the **southern churches**, described in the book of Acts, and the **Gentile converts** whom Paul addresses in his letter to the Galatians, proves that this **letter** cannot have been written to **South** and must have been intended for **North Galatia**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Exposition of Galatians*, 9).

William Ramsay: “A **few late Galatian inscriptions**, belonging to the **fourth** and **fifth centuries**, mention persons with **Jewish names**: at Eudoxias Jacob the Deacon and Esther, at Tavium Daniel, Joannes, etc., elsewhere Joannes, Sanbatos, Thadeus, etc.; but all are probably late, and may be Christian (or Jewish Christian). . . .

“**No settlements of Jews** are known to have been made in North Galatia by the Greek kings, whereas **large bodies of Jews** were settled in the cities along the great line of communication through **Lycaonia** and **Southern Phrygia** by the Seleucid kings. Thus **North Galatian Jewish settlements** are **later** and **sporadic**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 168-170).

¹⁸ *R. Alan Cole*: “In the **south**, with **large Jewish communities** and a considerable **Jewish element** in the churches, such a **problem** would have to be **faced squarely** from the **start** before a Jew so much as believed in Jesus. There was **little likelihood** of its **appearing later** as a new and unexpected temptation to which the whole church succumbed.” (Bold emphasis added, *Galatians: An Introduction and Commentary*, 9:18).

James Montgomery Boice: “Paul assumes in his letter that **all**, or at least **most**, of the **Galatians** are **Gentiles**. But this **does not seem to fit conditions** in the **south** where, according to Acts, there was a **large Jewish population**. Moreover, if the **churches of Galatia** possessed **large numbers of Jews**, it is hard to see how the situation of a **later drifting into Judaism** by Paul’s converts could have **occurred at all**, particularly in a manner that would have surprised him. Indeed, the issue of a **Christian’s relationship to the law of Moses** would have had to be **faced from the start**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 10:416).

¹⁹ *Richard Longenecker*: “So with the province of **Galatia reduced** to its original ethnological dimensions, early commentators **generally assumed** that Paul’s addressees were **located there**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:lxiii).

Timothy George: “In their day the *Provincia Galatia* had again **been reduced in size** to encompass an area roughly equivalent to the **old pre-Augustan kingdom of Galatia**, a fact that reflected the shifting circumstances of Roman imperial policy. Moreover, by the fourth and fifth centuries **the Christian faith was thriving** in this part of northern Asia Minor. For example, in A.D. 314 an important meeting of the church, the Council of Ancyra, convened in the ancient Galatian capital. Very likely the church fathers of this period **read back into the New Testament the contemporary church setting of their own day**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Galatians. The New American Commentary*, 30:40-41).

R. K. Rapa: “[E]arly in the second century AD, the Roman province of Galatia began to be **diminished** until it entailed little more than the **original territory** of the **ethnic Galatians**. It was **natural**, then, for the **early church** to understand ‘**Galatia**’ in terms of its own day, and little was made of the question of the identity of the Galatians until the **eighteenth century**. Throughout the **major period** of the history of Christianity, then, the view that Paul wrote to the North Galatians has been the ‘**default**’ **position**.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary: Romans–Galatians (Revised Edition)* 11:550).

William Ramsay outlines the changing dimensions of the Roman province of Galatia from 25 BC – AD 297 (See *The Historical Geography Of Asia Minor*, 252-254, 453; *The Church in the Roman Empire Before A.D. 170*, 13-15).

²⁰ *R. K. Rapa*: “Though Ramsay **began** this work firmly convinced of the **North Galatian destination** for the letter, his **explorations** throughout **Asia Minor** in the decades of the **1880s** and **1890s** convinced him, on **historical** and **archaeological grounds**, that Paul must have written to the **political Galatians** of southern Asia Minor rather than to the ethnic Galatians of the north.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 11:551).

²¹ *Douglas Moo*: “This view of the gospel, Paul suggests, is **what he has been preaching** and **what the Galatians have themselves accepted**; thus he wants it to ‘**remain with you**.’ ‘**You**’ must certainly include the **readers** of the letter, the Galatian Gentile Christians, but probably also includes **all Gentile believers**.” (“Galatians,” *Baker Exegetical Commentary of the New Testament*, 130)

²² *Ben Witherington, III*: “Paul says in this purpose clause that the reason he did not yield to pressure on the circumcision question is in order that **‘the truth of the Gospel might remain for you’**. The verb indicates that **at the time Paul is writing, the Galatians had already responded favorably to Paul’s Gospel of freedom**, therefore it was a matter of remaining in this truth, staying the course, going on on the same track, which is the essential positive advice Paul is giving in this deliberative speech. Now Paul is probably not suggesting that he **already had converts in Galatia** at the time of the second visit to Jerusalem, although that is **not entirely impossible**. He is most likely saying that he stood on principle about a Law-free Gospel so that **his Gentile converts wherever they were or would be could be benefited**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 138).

²³ *Richard Longenecker*: “The verb διαμείνω, **‘might remain,’** implies that **at the time of writing** the addressees **had previously responded positively** to Paul’s preaching and so were already in possession of ‘the truth of the gospel.’ The pronoun ὑμεῖς, **‘you,’** refers directly to **Paul’s Galatian converts**, though by extension has **all Gentile Christians** in view as well.” (Bold emphasis added, *Galatians. Word Biblical Commentary*, 41:53)

²⁴ *J. Louis Martyn*: “His **silence** in [Gal.] 1:21 regarding the **founding of the Galatian churches** is, then, far from insignificant. It is the strongest indication that, when he went to the **Jerusalem conference**—in the company of his coworker Barnabas—he had **not yet traveled to Galatia**.” (“Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,” *Anchor Yale Bible*, 33A:184)

²⁵ *James Montgomery Boice*: “This means that if **Luke used local, ethnic names** (as he seems to have done), it would have to be shown that **Paul used local, ethnic names, too**. Did he? Apparently not, for Paul seems to have preferred **provincial titles**, especially when referring to groups of churches. Thus Paul writes of the churches of **Macedonia** (2 Cor 8:1), **Asia** (1 Cor 16:19), and **Achaia** (2 Cor 1:1). He also speaks of **Judea, Syria, and Cilicia**, but never of **Lycaonia, Pisidia, Mysia, and Lydia** (which are not Roman names). The presumption that he is also using the **Roman title** in speaking of **Galatia** is therefore **strong**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 10:414-415).

²⁶ *Richard Longenecker*: “**1 Peter 1:1** seems to denote the **province** in general, since it is associated with the other Anatolian provinces of **Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:lxiii).

William Ramsay: “**The superscription of 1 Peter** to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, beyond a doubt **employs these terms in the Roman sense**. . . . If, on the other hand, we take these terms in the **popular sense** in which they were employed by some writers, **what an amorphous and haphazard enumeration it is! Mysia, Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, are omitted**, some of the most important and **many of the earliest Christian churches are excluded**, and precisely the countries where evidence of **the strength and numbers of the Jews is strongest are left out**.” (Bold emphasis added, *The Church*, 110).

²⁷ *H. Wayne House*: “Paul often used **territorial** rather than official names, e.g., **Syria** (in Gal. 1:21) for **Seleucidian Syria**, in which was Antioch rather than the broader Roman province to which also Jerusalem belonged. In reference to Christians in Judea, he was thinking of the territory of **Judea** (2 Cor. 1:16; 1 Thess. 2:14); **Arabia** was territorial, not a name for the kingdom of the Nabatians (Gal. 1:17).” (Bold emphasis added, 138)

²⁸ *R.C.H. Lenski*: “[I]f Paul desired to name the churches of **Phrygia, Pamphylia, and Lycaonia** in Lower Galatia with **one name**, that name could have been only **‘Galatians.’**” (Bold emphasis added, *The Interpretation of St. Paul’s Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians* 12).

Robert K. Rapa: “[O]nly the term **“Galatians”** would fit the letter in this **historical time period** in that Paul could not have used a **more inclusive term** for churches from such a **large geographical area**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 11:551).

Wilfred L. Knox: “His readers are addressed as **Galatians** for the reason that there is **no other single name** which would **apply to them all**. Antioch lay in **Pisidia**, Iconium in **Phrygia**, Lystra and Derbe in **Lycaonia**.” (Bold emphasis added, *A New Commentary On The Holy Scriptures: Including The Apocrypha*, 3:530)

²⁹ See William Ramsay, *A Historical Commentary On St. Paul’s Epistle To The Galatians*, 12ff, 73-74, 79, 160.

³⁰ *J. B. Lightfoot*: “It is **strange** that while we have more or less **acquaintance** with all the other **important Churches** of St Paul’s founding, with **Corinth and Ephesus**, with **Philippi and Thessalonica**, not a **single name** of a person or place, scarcely a **single incident** of any kind, connected with the Apostle’s preaching in **Galatia**, should be **preserved** in either the history or the epistle.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 21).

³¹ *William Hendriksen*: “[I]t was to the churches of *South Galatia* that the **regulations** of the **Jerusalem Council** were delivered, showing that it was exactly there that **Judaism was a live issue**, the very Judaism against which Paul contends in his letter.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 13).

³² *James Montgomery Boice*: “It is more natural to suppose that the **legalistic party** would have pursued Paul first in the **southern region** of Galatia, where Paul had early established **good churches**, than that they would have **bypassed** these bastions of “Paulinism” in order to push on over the **remote northern plateau** to less important strongholds (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 10:415).

R. Alan Cole: “We know that he had already met with **Jewish opposition** in the **south**. If Jews were turning to Christ, this would be intensified. **Antioch** was near; even **Jerusalem** was not too far away. What more natural than that **emissaries of the Judaizers** should have **campaigning in the south?**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 9:19).

³³ *F. F. Bruce*: “The **southern side** of the Anatolian plateau was **more important** than the northern under the earlier Roman Empire; the full development of the northern side did not take place until **Diocletian** transferred the centre of imperial administration to **Nicomedeia** in AD 292.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 9).

³⁴ *Daniel Wallace*: “The reference to **Paul’s companions** in Acts 20:4, who were apparently part of this **delegation**, includes **Sopater** (of Berea), **Aristarchus** and **Secundus** (from Thessalonica), **Gaius** (from Derbe), **Timothy** (from Lystra), etc. The **churches of Galatia** are explicitly mentioned as **participating** in this good will gesture in 1 Cor. 16:1. On the south Galatian theory, **Timothy** and **Gaius** would be the **delegates**; on the north Galatian theory, **no one is mentioned. This silence is difficult to explain.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 4).

³⁵ *Daniel Wallace*: “In Gal. 2:13 Paul says that ‘**even Barnabas was carried away by their insincerity.**’ The grammar (□στε plus indicative mood, found elsewhere in the NT only in John 3:16) indicates ‘actual result’ rather than [sic] ‘natural result’ (which □στε plus the infinitive more normally indicates); further, the □στε clause follows an ascensive καί, which in itself expresses **some surprise**. The implication seems to be that **the audience knew that such insincerity was against Barnabas’ normal character.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 5, n. 13).

³⁶ *Kenneth Wuest*: “The name Syria is placed first because **Paul’s ministry at Antioch preceded that at Tarsus**, and because **Cilicia was subordinate to Syria** in the Roman empire, being only a district of the great province of Syria.” (Bold emphasis added, *Wuest’s Word Studies from the Greek New Testament: For the English Reader*, 54).

Frederick Rendell: “The name Syria is **placed before** Cilicia, though the ministry at Tarsus **preceded** that at Antioch: for the latter was by far the **more important** and **prolonged ministry**. A further reason for placing Syria first was the **subordinate position** of Cilicia: for Roman **Cilicia was, like Judæa, only a district of the great province of Syria**, separately administered by an imperial procurator at Tarsus.³⁶” (Bold emphasis added, *The Expositor’s Greek Testament*, 3:157)

³⁷ *William Ramsay*: “In accordance with his usual practice, Paul here thinks and speaks of the **Roman Province**, which consisted of two great divisions, **Syria and Cilicia**; and he designates it by the **double name**, like *Provincia Bithynia et Pontus*.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, , 277).

Timothy George: “From 25 B.C. to A.D. 72, **Syria and Cilicia were united** as a single Roman province with a common governor who was based in **Syrian Antioch. Tarsus**, Paul’s home city, was the **capital of Cilicia**, which covered the southeastern region of Asia Minor.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 30:130).

³⁸ For a brief explanation of other views, see Richard Longenecker (*Ibid.*, 41:lxv).

³⁹ *D. A. Carson & Douglas Moo*: “On the face of it, in Galatians 1-2 Paul purports to give a **complete list of his trips to Jerusalem**, and leaving out the one recorded in Acts 11:30 would leave him open to a charge of **fudging the record.**” (Bold emphasis added, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 463)

David deSilva: “To **omit mention of a visit** (e.g., the famine relief visit...), especially when he invokes **oaths** about the **truthfulness** and **completeness** of his information (Gal 1:20), would leave Paul open to immediate **disconfirmation and loss of the debate** in Galatia.” (Bold emphasis added, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation*, 494)

F. F. Bruce: “The force of Paul’s argument here depends on his giving a **consecutive account of his career since his conversion**, with special reference to **his visits to Jerusalem**. His case would be **weakened** if his readers were given reason to suspect that he had **omitted any material detail**—it would be particularly suspicious if he omitted a **visit to Jerusalem**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 97)

Richard Longenecker: “[T]he identification of Gal 2:1-10 with Acts 15:1-30 forces one to say that Paul in Galatians has **omitted** reference to the **famine visit** of Acts 11:27-30 for reasons of his own. But it is difficult to imagine how Paul, who **affirms his truthfulness** so vehemently in Gal 1:20, could have **failed to mention that visit** in the recitation of his contacts with the Jerusalem leaders in Gal 1-2. In the context of his emphasis on the **minimal nature** of his **contacts** with the Jerusalem leaders (Gal 1:16-17, 18-19; 2:1) and their **confirmation of his ministry** on those few occasions when they did meet (Gal 1:23-24; 2:6-9), such an omission is **hard to justify** since it tends to **discredit his argument**. Would not his opponents have been quick to seize on such an omission? Would they not have said that, after all, there was a second visit of Paul to Jerusalem, which Paul has failed to mention—perhaps because it showed that he was no independent apostle, as he claimed, but a mere disciple whose authority stemmed from the apostles at Jerusalem?” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:lxxviii)

⁴⁰ *Cuthbert Hamilton Turner:* “But if this seems a difficulty, the solution is simple; St. Paul is enumerating, not his visits to Jerus. *per se*, but his visits for intercourse with the elder apostles, $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\mu\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (Gal 1:17), and would necessarily omit any visit when they were absent.” (Bold emphasis added, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, 1:423)

⁴¹ *Douglas Moo:* “With this text Paul’s sketch of his relationship with the Jerusalem authorities **shifts direction**. . . . But if Paul in Gal. 1 shows that he did not **learn** his gospel from the Jerusalem apostles, he now demonstrates that those apostles did not **add anything** to his gospel (2:6. . .).” (“Galatians,” *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*, 118)

Mike Willis: “The better understanding of this text is to view it as **another argument** presented by Paul to strengthen his case. He has already presented the evidence for **the source of his apostleship**. He now turns to show that the Jerusalem brethren **endorsed his gospel**. Consequently, he is **not interested in relating every trip** that he made to Jerusalem. Because he changed his point of emphasis, **the absence of any reference to the trip to Judea** during which funds to assist the needy in Judea were distributed (Acts 11:27-30) is **logical**. **Nothing happened** on that trip **pertinent** either to his **next point** or his **preceding point**. Those who knew of his work knew that he had **already been preaching** what he was **presently preaching** prior to that trip (the trip in Acts 11:27-30 is estimated to have occurred in A.D. 44-46, approximately **ten years** after Paul began preaching). If Paul had been **preaching the gospel for ten years**, the mention of a **meeting with the apostles** that occurred at **some subsequent time** would **prove nothing** as to the **source** of his message.” (Bold emphasis added, *Truth Commentaries: Galatians*, 47)

⁴² *Richard Longenecker:* “[I]t is difficult to imagine why Peter and Barnabas ($\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\beta\alpha\rho\nu\alpha\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, ‘even Barnabas’) would have **caved in** under the pressure of Jewish Christians from Jerusalem if the **decision** and **decrees** of the **Jerusalem Council** had then been in **existence**. The situation at Syrian Antioch, it seems, could only have arisen where there were **no clear guidelines to govern table fellowship** between Jewish and Gentile Christians. While one could posit various reasons for Peter’s action, only in the **confusion** of the **pre-council period** would such a pioneer in the Gentile mission as **Barnabas** have **pulled back** from **full fellowship** with Gentiles under Jewish Christian pressure.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:lxxxi)

⁴³ *William Hendriksen:* “It is exactly as Greijdanus says: ‘The question whether Paul in obtaining his gospel ministry had been **dependent on the other apostles** could have reference only to **the early period of that ministry**.’ It is not even strictly necessary to argue that on this relief mission Paul and Barnabas had contacted only ‘**elders**’ and not ‘**apostles**’ in Jerusalem, for even if everyone of the apostles had been in the welcoming committee and if Paul had remained with them for an entire year, **they could not have given him the gospel which he already had, and which he had been proclaiming for such a long period!**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 74)

⁴⁴ *Richard Longenecker:* “The **language** and **syntax** of 2:1a do not, however, aid us in any direct manner in answering the question as to whether the fourteen years of Paul’s second Jerusalem visit should be counted from his **conversion** (1:15) or from his **first Jerusalem visit** (1:18-20). The **probability** is that the three years of 1:18 and the fourteen years of 2:1 are to be understood **concurrently, not consecutively**—that is, that both are to be measured from **Paul’s conversion** and not that the fourteen years are to be counted from his first Jerusalem visit.

Determination of that matter, however, can only be made in connection with a number of other issues having to do with the addressees and date of the letter....” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:45)

⁴⁵ *Richard Longenecker*: “The adverb $\pi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\alpha$, ‘**then,**’ appears frequently in Koine Greek (at times with its cognate $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\alpha$) in enumerations to denote **chronological sequence** or the **logical succession of ideas** (cf. 4 Macc 6:3; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.92; 1 Cor 15:5b-7) and is often contrasted with $\pi\rho\iota\tau\omicron\nu$, ‘**first**’ (cf. 1 Cor 15:46; 1 Thess 4:16b-17; Heb 7:2; Jas 3:17; see also the $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\rho\eta \dots \pi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\alpha \dots \pi\alpha\rho\iota\tau\alpha$ series of 1 Cor 15:23-24). Here it is contrasted with $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$, ‘**immediately thereafter,**’ of v 16b. Therefore, just as ‘**immediately thereafter**’ refers back to **Paul’s Damascus-road experience**, so ‘**after three years**’ has as its referent that **same experience**—i.e., **the three years are not to be counted from the immediate antecedent**, Paul’s return to Damascus after residence in Arabia, **but from the earlier antecedent** of vv 15-16a, the crisis in Paul’s life that occurred on his way to Damascus. The **exact interval** of time between this revelatory experience and his first visit as a Christian to Jerusalem, however, **cannot be determined**—and so the **precise length of time** spent in either Arabia or Damascus **cannot be calculated**—for ‘**after three years**’ is probably to be understood in an **inclusive manner** to mean ‘**in the third year**’ rather than ‘**after three full years**’ (cf. $\mu\epsilon\tau\ \tau\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma \ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma$, ‘**after three days,**’ of Mark 8:31; 10:34 par.)” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:37)

⁴⁶ *Timothy George*: “[I]n the New Testament era **an inclusive method of reckoning** periods of time was often used. By this method **any portion of a given year could be counted as a whole year**.... This means that in Gal 1:18 the ‘**three years**’ could have been **slightly more than one**, and the ‘**fourteen years**’ of Gal 2:1 possibly could have **covered only twelve**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 30:136)

⁴⁷ *Donald Guthrie*: “[I]t is not impossible that at a **public conference** of the **whole church** there would have been some **private discussions preparatory** or **subsequent** to the general assembly, and if so Paul may have had greater cause to mention these talks since they clearly indicated his **relationship** with the **Jerusalem leaders**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 475-476)

⁴⁸ *Richard Longenecker*: “Paul may be speaking of **two events** in this verse: one when he appeared before the **Jerusalem Christian community** in an open session (v 2b), and the other when he met privately with the **Jerusalem leaders** (v 2c), either before or after the open session.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:48)

Richard Longenecker: “On the other hand, the verse may be read simply as a **general statement** (‘I set before them the gospel that I preach among the Gentiles’), with succeeding amplifications as to (1) the essentially **private nature** of the principal discussion (v 2c), (2) the **identity and character** of those taking part (vv 2c, 6-9), and (3) the **result and agreements** reached (vv 7-10).” (Bold emphasis added *Ibid.*, 41:48)

⁴⁹ *Richard Longenecker*: “The **repetition of the article** $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ suggests that **two geographical districts** are in view: the district of **Syria** and that of **Cilicia**. From v 22 it seems evident that Paul does not regard **Judea** (here probably the **Roman province of Judea**, which included the districts of **Judea, Samaria, and Galilee**....) as **part of Syria**. So by the district of **Syria** he probably means **the area around Antioch** and by the district of **Cilicia** **the area around his hometown of Tarsus** (cf. Acts 9:30; 11:25-26). (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:40)

⁵⁰ *Martin Pickup*: “[I]t seems strange that Paul would **make no mention** in Galatians of **the decrees** of the **Jerusalem Conference** which by that time he had **already delivered** to these churches (Acts 15:22-29; 16:4). These decrees had addressed the **Judaizing heresy**, the very issue which Paul is discussing in Galatians.” (Bold emphasis added, “A Response to Steve Gibson’s ‘Galatians 6:10 and the Great Collection’ (1),” *Guardian of Truth*, Aug. 15, 1991, 497)

James Montgomery Boice: “[I]t is **most unlikely** that Paul would have **neglected to appeal to the council** if, at the time of writing this letter, he held such a **trump card** in his hand. If the matter had already been **decided**, why did Paul not simply **quote the council**?” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 419)

F. F. Bruce: “After the publication of the apostolic decree of Acts 15:20, 29, it would have been **difficult** for judaizing preachers invoking the authority of the leaders of the Jerusalem church to **impose circumcision on Gentile Christians**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 52)

Richard Longenecker: “A second omission in Galatians that stands in the way of taking Gal 2:1-10 as Paul’s account of the Jerusalem Council... is **Paul’s silence** as to the **major decision** of the council, which decision would have served as the **coup de grâce** to the conflict at Galatia.... it is difficult to see why in the midst of the Galatian

conflict he chose to be **silent** about the **decision** reached at Jerusalem—or how, in fact, he **could have avoided any mention of it**—if he were **writing after the Jerusalem Council**. Paul certainly did not draw his punches or refrain from using arguments advantageous for his position elsewhere in his Galatian letter. It seems, therefore, **inconceivable** that he would **not have brought in the decision of the Jerusalem Council** in his debate with the Judaizers—indeed, that he would not have driven its major point home in his argument—had he known about the council’s decision when writing Galatians.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:1xxix)

⁵¹ *Richard Longenecker*: “Furthermore, assuming that **Paul’s clash with Peter** of Gal 2:11-14 took place **after the Jerusalem Council**, Paul’s account of that clash **undercuts his whole argument** and turns to the advantage of his judaizing opponents. Indeed, it would reveal Paul’s recognition of a **chasm** that still existed between himself and the Jerusalem apostles, which had only **superficially** been **bridged over** at the Jerusalem Council. The inclusion of this Antioch episode in Paul’s argument at a time **before** the council is **understandable**. But to use it in support of his polemic **after** the decision of the council, and without **reference** to that **decision**, casts considerable doubt on **Paul’s logical powers**. One might, of course, attempt to rescue Paul’s logic by **reversing the order of events** in Gal 2, so that Gal 2:11-14 refers to a time **before the Jerusalem Council** and Gal 2:1-10 is Paul’s version of that council....That, however, is a rather **drastic expedient** for which there is **no manuscript support** and which flies in the face of any **normal reading**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:1xxx)

⁵² *Ben Witherington, III*: “Paul’s use of **temporal designations of sequence**...strongly suggests he is following the **normal rhetorical practice** at this point. Certainly, his audience listening to 1:13-2:14, would assume that the incident at Antioch **followed** the second meeting in Jerusalem, in the absence of hints or statements to the contrary.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 97)

Ben Witherington, III: “Verse **18** begins with the word **ἔπειτα** which must surely be seen to indicate **temporal sequence**. It is also found in **vs. 21** and again at **2:1**, and what it means in one of these instances is surely what it means in all of them....It is natural in the wake of these three uses of **□πειτα**, which should be translated **‘then’**, that we take the **ὄτε δὲ** (**‘but when’**) in 2:12 to indicate **further developments** (cf. the identical phrase at 1:15) that took place **after the sequence of three events**, unless there are strong reasons in the context to think otherwise, and there are not.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 118)

R.C.H. Lenski: “**When did this episode occur? Before or after** the public acknowledgment mentioned in v. 9? **No indication of time appears**. Such a **temporal particle** ought to appear if this happened **earlier**. Otherwise the **natural thing** to do is to **follow the previous narrative** where **one episode succeeds the other in time**, and to understand **this last as likewise occurring later than the preceding**...**Paul follows the chronological order up to 2:10, the natural expectation is that he continues thus in the final episode**. If Paul now **reversed the order of time**, this would necessitate **an indication** to this effect. Besides all this, it is **incomprehensible** that Paul could use this episode regarding Peter as **the climax** of his historical proof if it had **occurred at an earlier date**. Then, most assuredly, **the conference would form the climax**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 90-91)

Richard Longenecker: “The Antioch episode of 2:11-14 is the last account in Paul’s *narratio* of 1:11-2:14. It is not introduced by the adverb **□πειτα** (**‘then,’ ‘next’**), as are the three preceding stages of Paul’s defense (cf. 1:18ff.; 1:21ff.; 2:1ff.), but by the indeterminate particle **□τε** (**‘when’**). This has led a number of commentators to postulate that **the Antioch episode is not related in its true historical order**, but must be seen as having taken place before the meeting narrated in 2:1-10.... It is **most natural**, however, to take the Antioch episode of 2:11-14 as having occurred **after the meeting narrated in 2:1-10**. And that is how the **vast majority of commentators** have taken it, whether they see the meeting of 2:1-10 as being the famine visit of Acts 11 or the Jerusalem council of Acts 15.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 41:63-64)

⁵³ *Timothy George*: “The most natural and most obvious way to read the expression **‘so quickly’** is with reference to **a defection that took place shortly after the conversion of the Galatians**, that is, almost immediately after Paul’s missionary activity among them. True, this expression is a **relative one** and could conceivably be **stretched to cover a period of several years**. However, it more likely refers to the eruption of **a controversy that followed almost in the wake of Paul’s first preaching ministry in Galatia**.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 30:47)

⁵⁴ R. Alan Cole: “If, as most scholars assume, *to proteron* in 4:13 should be translated ‘**on the former occasion**’, and not simply ‘**at first**’ (see RSV), then at least **two visits** by Paul to the region must be assumed, although **BAGD denies that any distinction is being drawn here between an earlier and a later visit.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 9:32)

⁵⁵ F. F. Bruce: “The phrase ‘**at first**’ (τῷ πρότερον) **possibly**, though **not necessarily**, implies that by the time he wrote he had paid them at least **two visits**. Not necessarily, I say, because the words may simply mean, ‘it was bodily illness that **originally** led to my bringing you the Gospel’. That is how the NEB text has it, although a footnote offers in place of ‘originally’ the alternative renderings ‘**formerly**’ or ‘**on the first of my two visits**.’” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 44)

⁵⁶ D. A. Carson & Douglas Moo: “In **classical Greek** the expression means **on the former of two occasions**, but in **Hellenistic Greek** it signifies ‘**formerly, in the past**’ (as in John 6:62; 9:8; Heb. 4:6, etc.).” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 462)

Donald Guthrie: “Yet τῷ πρότερον could be understood to mean ‘**originally**’, after its **more common Koine meaning**, and **two visits would not then be implied.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 473)

Ben Witherington, III: “It is quite true that the adjective **πρότερος** can function as a **comparative** (the former of two) in distinction from **πρώτος** (the first of a series), but in **Hellenistic or Koine Greek** the two terms often were **equivalent**. In their detailed analysis of the papyri and comparison of them with the New Testament, J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan pointed out that **πρότερον** in all its NT uses has the more general sense of ‘**previously**’ or ‘**originally**’, **not the comparative sense** (on the former of two occasions)... Other grammarians of the Greek NT are in agreement that it is **unlikely** that we have a **comparative use** of the neuter substantive here.” (Bold emphasis added, *Ibid.*, 12)

⁵⁷ “An **inscription** discovered at nearby **Delphi** indicates that in all likelihood **Gallio’s term of office** was from **mid-51 to mid-52**. The incident recorded in Acts 18:12-17 probably occurred at **the beginning** of Gallio’s term, since the Jews hoped to get a ruling against Paul from their new proconsul. Not long after that, **Paul left Corinth**, probably in **the summer or autumn of 52**. According to Acts 18:11 Paul had spent **18 months in Corinth**; that means that he probably arrived in the **early months of 50 or the end of 49**. That arrival date is confirmed by Acts 18:2, which says that **Aquila and Priscilla** had only recently been **exiled from Rome** when Paul came to Corinth. A fifth-century historian, **Orosius**, dated the **edict of Claudius** expelling the Jews from Rome in **AD 49**. Therefore, Paul and Aquila and Priscilla probably arrived close together late in **49 or early in 50.**” (Bold emphasis added, *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*, 279-280)

⁵⁸ “Between Paul’s departure from **Corinth** on the second missionary journey (Acts 18:18) in the autumn of **51** and his arrival in **Corinth** on the third missionary journey (20:2) in the **late winter** of **56** are **five years** of activities that cannot be given **exact dates**. Paul said that he worked during **three** of those years in **Ephesus** (20:31; cf. 19:1-20:1). With enough time allowed for the travels before and after, that stay at Ephesus probably lasted from **52 or 53** to the summer of **55 or 56** (cf. 1 Cor 16:8). During his long stay in Ephesus, Paul wrote his **First Letter to the Corinthians**. Then, on his way to **Corinth** in **56**, he wrote **2 Corinthians** from **Macedonia.**” (Bold emphasis added, “Chronology of the Bible (New Testament), *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*, 280)

⁵⁹ J. B. Lightfoot: “Both epistles exhibit the same combination of **protest** and **concession** in combating the exclusive rights claimed for the elder Apostles, the same **vehement condemnation** of the false teachers guarded by the same **careful suppression** of names, the same **strong assertion** of his Apostolic office tempered with the same **depreciation** of his own personal merits.” (*St. Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians*, 44)

⁶⁰ “A careful analysis of the evidence given by Eusebius, a fourth-century historian, leads to the probable conclusion that **Felix** was replaced in the summer of **59**.

“Working backward from that date, **Paul’s arrest** in Jerusalem (Acts 21:33) must have occurred in **57**, some two years before the coming of Festus. More precisely, Paul’s arrest probably occurred in the **late spring or summer of 57**; Paul’s goal (20:16) was to arrive in Jerusalem by Pentecost of that year, and Pentecost occurred at the end of May. He was not long in the city before he was arrested.

“The **Passover** festival, 50 days before Pentecost, was celebrated by Paul with the church in Philippi (Acts 20:6). That would have been **April 7-14, AD 57**. Only after the feast did he continue his hurried journey to Caesarea and Jerusalem (20:6-21:16). Before his Passover visit to Philippi, Paul had spent **three months in Greece** (20:3).

Allowing some time for him to travel through **Macedonia** and visit the **Thessalonians** and **Bereans**, those three months were probably the **winter months of 56-57** (Acts 20:3; cf. 1 Cor 16:6). No doubt they were spent in the main church of Greece, **Corinth**, and were used in part for the writing of the Letter to the **Romans**.” (Bold emphasis added, “Chronology of the Bible (New Testament), *Tyndale Bible Dictionary*, 280)

Bibliography

- Arichea, Daniel C., and Eugene Albert Nida. *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1976. Print. UBS Handbook Series.
- Armstrong, W. P. "Chronology of the New Testament." Ed. James Orr et al. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia* 1915: Print.
- Arndt, William, Frederick W. Danker, et al. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature* 2000 : Print.
- Barclay, William. *The Letters to the Galatians and Ephesians*. Louisville, KY; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002. Print. The New Daily Study Bible.
- Barry, John D., Douglas Mangum, et al. *Faithlife Study Bible*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012, 2016. Print.
- Berkhof, L. *New Testament Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans-Sevensma Co., 1915. Print.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "Paul (Person)." Ed. David Noel Freedman. *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* 1992 : Print.
- Boice, James Montgomery. "Galatians." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Romans through Galatians*. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelien. Vol. 10. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1976. Print. *
- Bruce, F. F. "Acts of the Apostles." Ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Revised* 1979-1988 : Print.
- _____. *New International Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1979. Print.
- _____. *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1982. Print. New International Greek Testament Commentary.*
- Calvin, John, and William Pringle. *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians*. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010. Print.
- Campbell, Donald K. "Galatians." *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures*. Ed. J. F. Walvoord and R. B. Zuck. Vol. 2. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1985. Print.
- Carson, D. A. et al., eds. *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition*. 4th ed. Leicester, England; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994. Print.
- Carson, D. A., and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Second Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005. Print.*
- Cole, R. Alan. *Galatians: An Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 9. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1989. Print. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries.*
- Constable, Tom. *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible*. Galaxie Software, 2003. Print.
- Crossway Bibles. *The ESV Study Bible*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Bibles, 2008. Print.
- deSilva, David Arthur. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004. Print.
- Donfried, Karl P. "Chronology: New Testament." Ed. David Noel Freedman. *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary* 1992 : Print.
- Drane, John William. *Introducing the New Testament*. Completely rev. and updated. Oxford: Lion Publishing plc, 2000. Print.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. London: Continuum, 1993. Print. Black's New Testament Commentary.
- Dvorak, Allen. "Did The Events Recorded In Acts 15 Take Place Before Or After Those Recorded In Galatians 1 & 2?" Unpublished article.
- Elwell, Walter A., and Philip Wesley Comfort. "Chronology of the Bible (New Testament). *Tyndale Bible Dictionary* 2001.

-
- Elwell, Walter A. *Evangelical Commentary on the Bible*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1995. Baker Reference Library.
- Finegan, J. "Chronology of the NT." Ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Revised 1979-1988* : Print.
- George, Timothy. *Galatians*. Vol. 30. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994. Print. The New American Commentary.*
- Gundry, Robert H. *Commentary on the New Testament: Verse-by-Verse Explanations with a Literal Translation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010. Print.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 4th rev. ed. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996. Print. The Master Reference Collection.*
- Hahne, Harry A. "The Apostle Paul's Life In Galatians And Acts." <http://www.balboa-software.com/nt2/Galatians%20and%20Acts.pdf> .
- Hendriksen, William, and Simon J. Kistemaker. *Exposition of Galatians*. Vol. 8. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953-2001. Print. New Testament Commentary.*
- Herrick, Greg, TH.M. "The Date and Destination of Galatians." <https://bible.org/article/date-and-destination-galatians> .*
- Hindson, Edward E., and Woodrow Michael Kroll, eds. *KJV Bible Commentary*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1994. Print.
- Hoehner, H. W. "Chronology of the New Testament." Ed. D. R. W. Wood et al. *New Bible dictionary* 1996 : Print.*
- House, H. Wayne. *Chronological And Background Charts Of The New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Academic Books.*
- Hughes, Robert B., and J. Carl Laney. *Tyndale Concise Bible Commentary*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001. Print. The Tyndale Reference Library.
- Jamieson, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. *Commentary Critical and Explanatory on the Whole Bible*. Vol. 2. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997. Print.
- Keener, Craig S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1993. Print.
- Kerr, Gary. "Dating The Book Of Galatians," Unpublished Article.
- Knox, Wilfred L. "Galatians." *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture: Including the Apocrypha*. Ed. Charles Gore, Henry Leighton Goudge, and Alfred Guillaume. Vol. 3. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. Print.
- Lange, John Peter, Philip Schaff, and Otto Schmoller. *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Galatians*. Ed. M. B. Riddle. Trans. C. C. Starbuck. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2008. Print.
- Lenski, R. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians and to the Philippians*. Columbus, O.: Lutheran Book Concern, 1937. Print.*
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber, ed. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations*. 4th ed. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874. Print. Classic Commentaries on the Greek New Testament.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Vol. 41. Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1998. Print. Word Biblical Commentary.
- MacArthur, John F., Jr. *The MacArthur Study Bible: New American Standard Bible*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2006. Print.
- Mangum, Douglas, and Derek R. Brown. *Galatians*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012. Print. Lexham Bible Guide.
- Martyn, J. Louis. *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. 33A. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 2008. Print. Anchor Yale Bible.
-

- McClelland, Scott E. "Galatians." *Evangelical Commentary on the Bible*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1995. Print. Baker Reference Library.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning, United Bible Societies. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition a Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (4th Rev. Ed.)*. London; New York: United Bible Societies, 1994. Print.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2013. Print. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament.*
- Myers, Allen C. *The Eerdmans Bible Dictionary* 1987 : Print.
- Pfeiffer, Charles F., and Everett Falconer Harrison, eds. *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary: New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962. Print.
- Piper, John. "Chronology, New Testament." *Baker encyclopedia of the Bible* 1988 : Print. *
- Porter, Stanley E. "Chronology of the New Testament." Ed. David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers, and Astrid B. Beck. *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* 2000 : Print.
- Ramsay, W. M. *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1900. Print.*
- _____. *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1893. Print.
- _____. *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*. London: John Murray, 1890. Print.
- Rapa, Robert K. "Galatians." *The Expositor's Bible Commentary: Romans–Galatians (Revised Edition)*. Ed. Tremper Longman III & Garland, David E. Vol. 11. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008. Print.*
- Rendall, Frederic. "The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians." *The Expositor's Greek Testament: Commentary*. Vol. 3. New York: George H. Doran Company. Print.
- Robertson, A.T. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1933. Print.
- Silva, Moisés. "Galatians." *New Bible Commentary: 21st Century Edition*. Ed. D. A. Carson et al. 4th ed. Leicester, England; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994. Print.
- Sloan, David B. "Biblical Chronology." Ed. John D. Barry et al. *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* 2016 : Print.
- Spence-Jones, H. D. M., ed. *Galatians*. London; New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1909. Print. The Pulpit Commentary.
- Stott, John R. W. *The Message of Galatians: Only One Way*. Leicester, England; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1986. Print. The Bible Speaks Today.
- Strong, James. *Enhanced Strong's Lexicon* 1995 : Print.
- Sweeney, James P. "Chronology of the New Testament." Ed. John D. Barry et al. *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* 2016 : Print. *
- Thayer, Joseph Henry. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament: being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti* 1889 : Print.
- Traylor, John H., Jr. "Chronicles, Books Of." Ed. Chad Brand et al. *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary* 2003 : Print.
- The New King James Version*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1982. Print.
- Turner, Cuthbert Hamilton. "CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT." Ed. James Hastings et al. *A Dictionary of the Bible: Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology* 1911-1912 : Print.
- Utley, Robert James. *Paul's First Letters: Galatians and I & II Thessalonians*. Volume 11. Marshall, TX: Bible Lessons International, 1997. Print. Study Guide Commentary Series.

-
- Vincent, Marvin Richardson. *Word Studies in the New Testament*. Vol. 4. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887. Print.
- Vine, W. E., Merrill F. Unger, and William White Jr. *Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words* 1996 : Print.
- Wallace, Daniel B. "Galatians: Introduction, Argument, and Outline." 1999. <https://bible.org/seriespage/9-galatians-introduction-argument-and-outline>.*
- Walvoord, John F., and Roy B. Zuck, Dallas Theological Seminary. *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1985. Print.
- Wiersbe, Warren W. *The Bible Exposition Commentary*. Vol. 1. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996. Print.
- _____. *Wiersbe's Expository Outlines on the New Testament*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1992. Print.
- Willis, Mike. *Truth Commentaries: Galatians*. Guardian of Truth Foundation: Bowling Green, Kentucky, 1994.*
- Wilkin, Robert N. "The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Galatians." *The Grace New Testament Commentary*. Ed. Robert N. Wilkin. Denton, TX: Grace Evangelical Society, 2010. Print.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998. Print.*
- Wuest, Kenneth S. *Wuest's Word Studies from the Greek New Testament: For the English Reader*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997. Print.
- Youngblood, Ronald F., F. F. Bruce, and R. K. Harrison, Thomas Nelson Publishers, eds. *Nelson's new illustrated Bible dictionary* 1995 : Print.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Trans. Melancthon Williams Jacobus. Vol. 1. Edinburgh; London; New York: T&T Clark; Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co. Limited; Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909. Print.
- Zodhiates, Spiros. *The complete word study dictionary: New Testament* 2000 : Print.

*The most helpful resources to me.