

ZONDERVAN

Galatians

Copyright © 2010 by Thomas R. Schreiner

This title is also available as a Zondervan ebook.

Visit www.zondervan.com/ebooks

Requests for information should be addressed to:

Zondervan, *Grand Rapids, Michigan 49530*

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Schreiner, Thomas R.

Galatians / Thomas R. Schreiner.

p. cm. (Zondervan exegetical commentary series on the New Testament)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN: 978-0-310-24372-4 (hardcover, printed)

1. Bible N.T. Galatians—Commentaries. I. Title.

BS2685.53.S37 2010

227'.4077—dc22

2010019091

All Scripture quotations from books other than Galatians (which is a translation by the author), unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the Holy Bible, *New International Version*®, *NIV*®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by Biblica, Inc.™ Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved worldwide.

Any Internet addresses (websites, blogs, etc.) and telephone numbers printed in this book are offered as a resource. They are not intended in any way to be or imply an endorsement by Zondervan, nor does Zondervan vouch for the content of these sites and numbers for the life of this book.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or any other—except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Cover design: *Tammy Johnson*

Interior design: *Beth Shagene*

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Series Introduction	9
Author's Preface	13
Abbreviations	15
Introduction to Galatians	21
Select Bibliography	61
Theology of Galatians	71
Themes in Galatians	387
Scripture Index	403
Subject Index	413
Author Index	420

Introduction

Martin Luther captured the message of Galatians and the teaching of Jesus (Matt 5:3) when he wrote:

Therefore, God accepts only the forsaken, cures only the sick, gives sight only to the blind, restores life to only the dead, sanctifies only the sinners, gives wisdom only to the unwise fools. In short, He has mercy only on those who are wretched, and gives grace only to those who are not in grace. Therefore no proud saint, no wise or just person, can become God's material, and God's purpose cannot be fulfilled in him. He remains in his own work and makes a fictitious, pretended, false, and painted saint of himself, that is, a hypocrite.¹

Amazingly, Gordon Fee writes from quite a different perspective, saying that his goal is to help people read Galatians “as if the Reformation had never happened.”² On the one hand, Fee's goal is laudable. He wants to read the text on its own terms. On the other hand, it is remarkably naïve and ahistorical, for he pretends that he can read Galatians as a neutral observer of the text apart from the history of the church. I am not suggesting that we must read Galatians *in defense* of the Reformation, nor am I denying that the Reformation may be askew in some of its emphases. But it must be acknowledged that none of us can read Galatians as if the Reformation never occurred. Such a reading is five hundred years too late. Nor can we read Galatians as if the twentieth century never happened or apart from the works of Ignatius, Irenaeus, Augustine, Anselm, Aquinas, and the like. We can consider whether Reformation emphases were wrong (I will argue that they were not), but what we cannot do is read Galatians as if we were the first readers.

Paul is engaged in a battle for the gospel in this letter, and his words still speak to us today. Vital issues for the Christian life are tackled in Galatians. Paul unpacks the heart of the gospel. We see the meaning and the centrality of justification by faith, which Luther rightly argued was the article by which the church stands or falls. How can a person stand before a holy God without being condemned? Paul answers that question in Galatians.

1. Martin Luther, “The Seven Penitential Psalms,” trans. by Arnold Guebert, in *Selected Psalms III from Luther's Works* (ed. Jaroslav Pelikan; St. Louis: Concordia, 1958), 14:163.

2. Gordon D. Fee, *Galatians* (Pentecostal Commentary Series; Dorset: Deo, 2007), 1.

Jesus Christ is also central in Galatians. We will see that Jesus is fully divine and hence should be worshiped. And the cross of Christ plays a fundamental role in the letter, for no one is justified apart from the cross. Believers are right with God because Christ on the cross bore the curse that believers deserved, and Christ freed us from the power of sin through his death and resurrection.

Paul also emphasizes the power of the Holy Spirit in the lives of believers, for as Christians we please God only through relying on the Spirit. The Christian life is not an exercise in autonomy or self-effort but is lived in dependence on the Holy Spirit. The role of the law in the Christian life is also unpacked, so that we gain a sharper profile of the relationship between the old covenant and the new, between the law and the gospel, between the old age and the age to come. Galatians focuses on soteriology, but at the same time the nature of sin is set forth in the letter, and thereby we understand more clearly why the death of Jesus Christ is of supreme importance. Reading Galatians should not be merely an academic enterprise. The gospel Paul proclaims in it has often been used by the Lord to revive the church. We see from Paul's passion for the gospel that issues of life and death are at stake.

Author

No significant scholarly debate exists on whether Paul wrote Galatians.³ Indeed, Galatians is often identified as quintessentially Pauline. I will assume, therefore, without further argumentation that Galatians was written by Paul.

Recipients

Was the letter to the Galatians written to south or north Galatia? Why does it even matter? It should be said at the outset that the destination of the letter does not fundamentally change its interpretation. Where it makes a difference is in terms of history. The destination of the letter determines how we correlate Galatians with Acts. For instance, did Paul's confrontation with Peter (Gal 2:11 – 14) take place before the apostolic council of Acts 15 (so most who support the south Galatian theory) or after that meeting (the north Galatian theory)? Now it does affect interpretation to some extent. Does Paul omit mentioning any of his visits to Jerusalem in the letter to the Galatians (see more on this below)? How do we correlate the Pauline visits to Jerusalem with his visits as they are recorded in Acts? The issue is of some importance because we have a historical faith and believe that the events of biblical history are significant. Still, the importance of the issue must not be

3. For a helpful history of interpretation of Galatians, see John Riches, *Galatians through the Centuries* (Blackwell Bible Commentaries; Oxford: Blackwell, 2008).

exaggerated, and some readers may want to skip to the next section and read about the situation of the letter.

Galatia became a Roman province in 25 BC, and the province included people from many ethnic groups, including the “Celts” or “Galatians,” who had migrated to Asia Minor by 278 BC.⁴ In Paul’s day the province was a large area that touched the Black Sea in the north and the Mediterranean in the south. As time passed, however, the province changed. “Vespasian detached almost all of Pisidia from Galatia in AD 74 and about AD 137 Lycaonia Galatica was removed and added to an enlarged province of Cilicia. In AD 297 southern Galatia was united with surrounding regions to form a new province of Pisidia with Antioch as its capital.”⁵

Hence, commentators in early church history naturally thought Galatians was written to the province as it existed in later Roman history, and therefore, virtually all scholars believed that Galatians was written to the ethnic Galatians in the northern part of the province. But the work of William Ramsey and others in the twentieth century has provoked scholars to reexamine the destination of the letter, for scholars are now apprised of the dimensions of the Galatian region during Paul’s day. Therefore, the identity of the recipients of the letter has been debated intensely in the last century.

The north Galatian theory maintains that the letter was sent to ethnic Galatians located in the northern part of the Galatian province.⁶ As Philip Esler remarks, the north Galatian theory could be described as “tribal” Galatia since on this view the letter was sent to those who were ethnically Galatians.⁷ The south Galatian view proposes that the letter was sent to the cities Paul visited on his first missionary journey in Acts 13–14.⁸ It is not the purpose of this commentary to discuss in detail the destination of the letter, but some of the major arguments for both views will

4. Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 2–3.

5. *Ibid.*, 5.

6. This view is accepted by most German NT scholars, though it is not limited to them. E.g., Hans Dieter Betz, *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 1–5.

7. Philip F. Esler, *Galatians* (New York/London: Routledge, 1998), 32. Esler supports the north Galatian theory (32–36).

8. For a defense of a south Galatian destination, see Rainer Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology* (trans. Doug Scott; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 286–91; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 43–56; Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1990), lxiii–lxxxvii; Colin J. Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (WUNT 49;

Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 247–51, 277–307; Stephen Mitchell, *The Rise of the Church* (vol. 2 of *Anatolia: Land, Men, and God in Asia Minor*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 1–5; Cilliers Breytenbach, *Paulus und Barnabas in der Provinz Galatien: Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16,6; 18,23 und den Adressaten des Galaterbriefes* (AGJU; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 99–173; Richard Bauckham, “James, Peter, and the Gentiles,” in *The Missions of James, Peter, and Paul: Tension in Early Christianity* (ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans; NovTSup 115; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 135–36; James M. Scott, *Paul and Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul’s Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians* (WUNT 84; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995), 181–215. But Scott’s appeal to the table of nations fails to convince. For a critique of Scott, see Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Jesus and the Twelve* (vol. 1 of *Early Christian Mission*; Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004), 498–99; *idem*, *Paul and the Early Church* (vol. 1 of *Early Christian Mission*; Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004), 1298–99.

be presented, and I will argue that the south Galatian hypothesis is more likely. In any case, the interpretation of the letter is not affected significantly by whether one holds to a north or south Galatian hypothesis,⁹ though one's view on the destination of the letter has major implications for Pauline chronology.

Support for the North Galatian Theory

I begin with arguments supporting the north Galatian theory, but will also note the counter-arguments of those who support the south Galatian theory.

(1) J. B. Lightfoot supports the north Galatian view by contending that the temperament of the Galatians fits with what we know about the Gauls, that is, that they were fickle and superstitious.¹⁰ This argument is hardly convincing, for fickleness and superstition were not limited to Gauls.¹¹

(2) Acts 16:6 and 18:23 likely refer to north Galatia. These two visits square with Gal 4:13, where Paul says that he preached to the Galatians when he was sick “formerly [the first time]” (πρότερον). Now if Paul visited the Galatians a first time, then he also was present a second time, and this fits with Acts 16:6 and 18:23. Again, this argument is hardly decisive. Acts 16:6 says nothing about founding new churches, and the Greek word can be translated “at first” and does not necessarily imply two visits. Further, even if there were two visits, Paul may have counted the retracing of his steps in Acts 13–14 as a second visit.¹² Finally, in Acts 16:6 the word “Phrygian [country]” is likely an adjective, specifying the part of Galatia in which Paul traveled, and Acts 18:23 describes Paul's travels in southern Galatia and Phrygian Asia.¹³

(3) It is important to observe that the churches visited in Acts 13–14 are not identified as Galatian churches by Luke. But we must be careful here, for Luke's terminology is not necessarily the same as Paul's. Paul typically refers to Roman provinces, whereas Luke refers to ethnic groupings in the provinces, though the issue is complex and cannot be resolved simplistically.¹⁴

(4) Paul would not use the term “Galatians” to describe those living in south Galatia, for they were not “Galatians” ethnically.¹⁵ The ethnic Galatians were the Gauls who lived in the north, and secular writers regularly use the term “Galatians”

9. A number of scholars have supported a north Galatian destination, but at the same time defend the historical accuracy of the letter. See, e.g., Lightfoot (see the next note); J. Gresham Machen, *Machen's Notes on Galatians: Notes on Biblical Exposition and Other Aids to Interpretation of the Epistle to the Galatians from the Writings of J. Gresham Machen* (ed. John H. Skilton; Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1977), 22–26.

10. J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians with Introductions, Notes and Dissertations* (repr.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957), 4, 12–15.

11. So Bruce, *Galatians*, 8.

12. *Ibid.*, 44.

13. Cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, 11–13; Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*, 280–85; Witherington, *Galatians*, 6.

14. Cf. Bruce, *Galatians*, 15; Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 289.

15. So J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1997), 16.

to refer to the north Galatians. But what other term would Paul use to describe the Galatians, for those living in the province of Galatia came from many ethnic groups?¹⁶ Only the term “Galatians” would be sufficiently comprehensive to include all of them.

(5) If Galatians were addressed to churches founded on Paul’s first journey, Paul would not have written in Gal 1:21, “Then I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia,” but instead, “Then I came to Syria and Cilicia and on to you.” But this argument fails to recognize that 1:21 does not refer to the first missionary journey but to the interval between Acts 9:30 and 11:25.¹⁷

(6) One of the strongest arguments for supporting the north Galatian view is the relationship between Acts 15 and Gal 2:1 – 10. Those who support the north Galatian view argue that Acts 15 refers to the same events as Gal 2:1 – 10. On this view, the chronology of Paul’s visits to Jerusalem was as follows: Acts 9:26 – 28 = Gal 1:18; Acts 11:30/12:25 is skipped in Galatians; Acts 15:1 – 35 = Gal 2:1 – 10.¹⁸ The arguments for identifying Acts 15 with Gal 2:1 – 10 are quite impressive. First, the subject in both texts is the same: circumcision. Second, the place is the same: Jerusalem. Third, the people are the same: James, Peter, John, Paul, and Barnabas. Fourth, the decision was the same: circumcision was not required.¹⁹ The response to this argument will be explained below.

(7) Paul in Gal 2:1 – 10 presents himself as the leader of the missionary team of Paul and Barnabas. But if Gal 2:1 – 10 is equivalent to Acts 11:27 – 30/12:25 (as most who support the south Galatian view claim),²⁰ Gal 2:1 – 10 occurred before the first missionary journey. Luke consistently lists Barnabas before Paul at the beginning of the first missionary journey (Acts 13), suggesting that Barnabas was the leader at the time. But if the south Galatian view is true, Barnabas should be listed before Paul in Gal 2:1 – 10. So, the mention of Paul first in 2:1 – 10 suggests that he is the leader of the team, and therefore (say those who support the north Galatian theory) 2:1 – 10 reflects the events after the first missionary journey.²¹ But this argument also fails to convince, for Paul naturally relays the visit to Jerusalem from his perspective, and this accounts for Paul’s prominence.

(8) According to Gal 2:1 – 10, Paul is recognized as an apostle. But if the south Galatian theory is true, on what basis was Paul acknowledged to be an apostle? For, according to the usual south Galatian theory, Paul had not yet been on the first missionary journey. If anybody would be called the apostle to the Gentiles, it would

16. So Bruce, *Galatians*, 16; Riesner, *Paul’s Early Period*, 287 – 88; Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*, 290 – 305.

17. So Bruce, *Galatians*, 15 – 16; Schnabel, *Paul and the Early Church*, 1077.

18. Other scholars argue that the account in Acts is not historically reliable. For a response to this view, see Hemer,

The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History.

19. See Lightfoot, *Galatians*, 123 – 28.

20. See Longenecker, *Galatians*, lxxvii – lxxxiii; Schnabel, *Paul and the Early Church*, 987 – 1003.

21. So Robert H. Stein, “The Relationship of Galatians 2:1 – 10 and Acts 15:1 – 35: Two Neglected Arguments,” *JETS* 17 (1974): 241 – 42.

seem to be Barnabas, not Paul — if the south Galatian theory is true. Those who support the north Galatian destination point out that it makes perfect sense for Paul to be acknowledged as an apostle if the first missionary journey had already taken place (Acts 13 – 14), and Gal 2:1 – 10 is equivalent with Acts 15:1 – 35.²² But those who support the south Galatian theory have a good counter-argument. An acknowledgment of Paul's apostleship in Gal 2:1 – 10 is scarcely surprising, for he had presumably done missionary work during his years at Tarsus. In any case, he and Barnabas had ministered together among the Gentiles in Antioch for a year, and Paul could have been identified as an apostle on the basis of his work in that city.

(9) The similarity of subject matter in Galatians and Romans suggests, according to the north Galatian hypothesis, that they were written at roughly the same time. If Galatians were written to north Galatia, it may have been written between AD 50 – 57 and Romans is probably between AD 55 – 57, and hence the two are rather close together. But trying to assign a date based on the similarity of subject matter is precarious. Indeed, there are some significant differences between Galatians and Romans as well, and hence trying to assign a date based on the similarity of content is arbitrary. Furthermore, even if the letters do overlap significantly in content, we can hardly establish a date on such a basis. We could just as easily argue that Paul's theology on the law remained stable over the ten to fifteen years that he wrote letters.²³ We all know people whose views have not changed in any significant way over twenty to thirty years, and there is no reason to doubt that Paul may have been the same, especially when we consider that he had served as a missionary for fifteen years or more before the writing of his first canonical letters.

(10) Most scholars throughout church history have argued that the letter was written to north Galatia. This argument loses much of its force when we realize that south Galatia was separated from north Galatia and incorporated into Pisidia in AD 74. Those who lived in subsequent generations did not realize, therefore, that south and north Galatia were part of the same province when Paul wrote the letter, and this may explain the dominance of the north Galatian hypothesis historically.

Support for the South Galatian Theory

Though I favor a south Galatian destination, the supporting arguments are not clear enough to remove doubt. We are reminded here of the tentativeness of the historical task since we lack enough information to reach a secure conclusion. If Paul wrote to south Galatia, then he likely wrote to the churches evangelized in Acts 13 – 14. Here I focus on some of the remaining arguments supporting a south Galatian destination, but I note some of the weaknesses of these arguments as well.

22. *Ibid.*, 242.

23. Indeed, it has been argued that Paul developed his

view of the law extraordinarily early. See Seyoon Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

(1) Some support a south Galatian hypothesis by noting that Paul wrote in Greek, which was not the mother tongue of the north Galatians. This argument is not a strong one, however, since Greek was the lingua franca of the Greco-Roman world. In what other language would Paul write to communicate with all the Galatians?

(2) Paul normally uses Roman imperial terms when there are geographical references, and hence “Galatians” would refer to the Roman province of Galatians. Again, this observation, though true, does not prove a south Galatian destination, for the north Galatians were part of the province of Galatia as well.

(3) Acts 16:6 and 18:23 do not refer to the the founding of churches in north Galatia. Though it is possible that Paul established churches in north Galatia, we have no firm evidence that he did so, whereas we know that he planted churches in south Galatia. Furthermore, the reference to Phrygia may simply designate the ethnic area of Galatia that Paul traveled through according to Acts 16:6. This may be supported by the one article for both the Galatian and Phygrian region. In any case, both Acts 16:6 and 18:23 may not even report on any travels of Paul to north Galatia.

(4) Paul refers to Barnabas as if the Galatians know him personally (Gal 2:13), and we know that Barnabas traveled with Paul when the south Galatian churches were evangelized (Acts 13 – 14).²⁴ There is no indication, however, that Barnabas ever evangelized the north Galatian churches, and hence the personal reference seems superfluous. We must admit, however, that the argument presented here is from silence. Paul refers to Barnabas in 1 Cor 9:6, and yet we have no evidence that Barnabas visited Corinth either. Barnabas may have visited north Galatia, though there is no record of the visit.

(5) Acts 20:4 implies that the south Galatian churches contributed to the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem (cf. Rom 15:25 – 28; 1 Cor 16:1 – 4; 2 Cor 8:1 – 9:15), but nothing is said about a contribution from north Galatian churches. It must be noted, however, that this also is an argument from silence, for it is possible that north Galatian churches participated, though it remains unmentioned.

(6) Some have pointed to the enthusiastic reception given to Paul at Lystra, where he was acclaimed as the Greek god Hermes (Acts 14:11 – 18), and the statement that Paul was received as an angel of God in Gal 4:14. This is surely a thin reed on which to base an argument, for in the same text in Acts the people turned against Paul and stoned him! Further, it seems difficult to believe that Paul recalled the people hailing him as the Greek god Hermes when he said that the Galatians received him as a messenger of Christ. According to Acts, Paul and Barnabas were dismayed that they were celebrated as gods. The response of the people was not identified as a mark of spiritual insight.

(7) Paul concentrated on main cities and trade routes in his evangelism, and north Galatia was far from these main trade routes. Once again, this argument is

24. So Riesner, *Paul's Early Period*, 288 – 89.

not compelling, for Derbe and Lystra were not large cities, and Ancyra and Pessinus in north Galatia were some of the most important cities in Asia Minor.

(8) The Jewish-Christian missionaries who opposed Paul would more likely have traveled to the nearer south Galatia than to the more inaccessible north Galatia.²⁵ Once again, however, it is difficult to determine what zealous proponents of a theology antagonistic to Paul would do. We must admit that they may have been motivated to travel to north Galatia as well.

(9) Peter's lapse in Galatians (2:11 – 14), it is claimed, makes better sense before the apostolic council of Acts 15 (AD 48),²⁶ for some think it unlikely that Peter would fail after matters were ironed out at the apostolic council in Acts 15. This argument has some merit, for it seems less likely that James would send messengers to the church after the council in Acts 15. Still, history is full of surprises, and debates have ensued after formal agreements many times in history. Further, we know that human beings are prone to fail and to live hypocritically even after formal agreements have been reached.

(10) The failure to mention Timothy may indicate that the letter was written before the events of Acts 16, since Timothy is mentioned in every letter except Ephesians and Titus, but this again is an argument from silence.

(11) One of the stronger arguments for the south Galatian hypothesis is that Paul would not have neglected any of his visits to Jerusalem in Gal 1 – 2 since he wanted to demonstrate his independence from the Jerusalem apostles. If he omitted any visit, he would open himself to the charge that he failed to mention an occasion when he was influenced by the apostles in Jerusalem. If this is the case, then Gal 1:18 is equivalent to Acts 9:26 – 28, and Gal 2:1 – 10 is matched by the visit to Jerusalem in Acts 11:27 – 30 and 12:25.²⁷ On this reading the visit to Jerusalem recorded in Acts 15:1 – 35 is omitted in Galatians because the council described in Acts had not yet occurred when Paul wrote the letter.²⁸

We have seen above that the most serious objection to this scenario is that Acts 15:1 – 35 and Gal 2:1 – 10 are remarkably similar. At both meetings circumcision was debated and the apostles decided that circumcision was not required for the salvation of Gentiles. Is it possible that the same meeting took place on two occasions? Many defenders of the south Galatian hypothesis respond by emphasizing that the meeting in Gal 2:1 – 10 was of a different nature than the council in Acts 15. The former was a private meeting, while the latter was a public discussion.²⁹ In Acts we see official deliberations and a formal decision, while in Galatians we see

25. *Ibid.*, 286 – 87.

26. Schnabel, *Paul and the Early Church*, 1077. Hemer dates it in early 49 (*The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History*, 269).

27. In support of this view, see Schnabel, *Paul and the Early Church*, 987 – 92.

28. So Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 136.

29. Bauckham points out that the private agreement of Gal 2:1 – 10 flamed into controversy again ("James, Peter, and the Gentiles," 136 – 37). He says, "Agreements reached on such controversial issues — in many spheres of life — frequently have to be negotiated again and again" (136). And,

an informal and private judgment.³⁰ Further, south Galatian proponents claim that Paul would have informed the Galatians what the council decided if the events of Acts 15 had already transpired. Why would he refrain from informing the Galatians about such an important decision?

We must admit that untangling the knots in deciphering the destination of Galatians is difficult.³¹ It is possible that Acts 15:1 – 35 and Gal 2:1 – 10 record the same meeting from different perspectives. The debate over circumcision may have lasted several days or even longer, and we see a compressed summary of what occurred in both Galatians and Acts. Further, it is possible to hold to a south Galatian destination and to argue that Gal 2:1 – 10 and Acts 15:1 – 35 refer to the same event.³² One could argue that Paul did not record every visit to Jerusalem but only included visits in which he had significant private discussions with the apostles. Hence, he may not have included visits to Jerusalem where he was with the apostles in public settings. We notice in Galatians that he limits his description to a private meeting with Peter and James (Gal 1:18 – 19), and to his private meeting with James, John, and Peter (2:1 – 10).

Further, it is possible that the substance of what was decided by the apostolic council of Acts 15 is summarized in a compressed form in Gal 2:6. Paul does not cite an official document but declares that nothing was added to his gospel, showing that the apostles agreed with his theology. Paul, in other words, relayed the events of the meeting from his perspective.

Identifying the recipients of Galatians is important for Pauline chronology and history, but it is not determinative for the interpretation of the letter, and the meaning of the letter does not change dramatically whether we opt for a north or south Galatian hypothesis. On balance, it seems that a south Galatian hypothesis is preferable, and I incline towards Gal 2:1 – 10 = Acts 11:27 – 30/12:25, though, as noted, a south Galatian destination is possible with Gal 2:1 – 10 = Acts 15:1 – 35 as well.

“It is inherently very likely that such a crucially important and unavoidably controversial issue as the status of Gentile believers and their relationship with Jewish believers should have sparked recurrent controversy over many years and have been discussed on various occasions” (137). We know from history that the Council at Nicea did not end controversy over the Trinity and that issues that were “resolved” at Nicea continued to be debated for many years afterwards.

30. So Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic*

History, 247 – 51. But Lightfoot suggests there was a private meeting on the same occasion before the public conference (*Galatians*, 103).

31. So also Matera, who leans slightly toward the recipients being in southern Galatia. See Frank J. Matera, *Galatians* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 19 – 24.

32. So Moisés Silva, *Interpreting Galatians: Explorations in Exegetical Method* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 129 – 38.