

Exegetical Notes for Galatians 2:11-14

KEY

- ATR** = Robertson, A.T. *Word Pictures in the New Testament*. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1933.
- BAG** = Bauer Arndt and Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*.
- Bruce** = F.F. Bruce. *The Epistle to the Galatians: a Commentary on the Greek Text. New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1982.
- Calvin** = John Calvin. *Calvin's Commentaries: Galatians*.
- Carson, Moo, Morris** = D.A. Carson, Douglas Moo, Leon Morris. *An Introduction to the New Testament*.
- CNTOT** = Beale and Carson, Eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*.
- Cole** = R. Alan Cole. *Tyndale New Testament Commentaries: Galatians*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1988.
- Comfort** = Philip W. Comfort. *New Testament Text and Translation Commentary*.
- Dunn** = James D. G. Dunn. *The Epistle to the Galatians: Black's New Testament Commentary*. London: Continuum, 1993.
- Erdman** = Charles R. Erdman. *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- George** = Timothy George. *Galatians. Vol. 30. The New American Commentary*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994.
- Gill** = John Gill. *Gill's Commentary on the Bible*.
- Jerome** = Raymond Edward Brown, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, and Roland Edmund Murphy. *The Jerome Biblical Commentary*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1996.
- Keener** = Craig S. Keener. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*.
- Lexham** = Douglas Mangum, and Derek R. Brown. *Galatians: Lexham Bible Guide*. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012.
- Lightfoot** = J.B. Lightfoot. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations*. 4th ed. *Classic Commentaries on the Greek New Testament*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1874.
- Luther** = Martin Luther. *Commentary on Galatians*.
- MacArthur** = John MacArthur. *MacArthur New Testament Commentary: Galatians*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1987.
- Metzger** = Bruce M. Metzger. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*.
- Ryken** = Philip Graham Ryken. *Galatians: Reformed Expository Commentary*. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 2005.
- Schaff** = Philip Schaff. *Saint Chrysostom: Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. Vol. 13. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series*. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1889.
- Schreiner** = Thomas R. Schreiner, *Galatians, Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2010.
- Simeon** = Charles Simeon. *Horae Homileticae: Galatians-Ephesians. Vol. 17*. London: Holdsworth and Ball, 1833.
- Spence-Jones** = H. D. M. Spence-Jones, Ed. *Galatians. The Pulpit Commentary*. London; New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1909.
- Stott** = John Stott. *The Message of Galatians*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1971.
- Strauss** = Lehman Strauss. *Devotional Studies in Galatians and Ephesians*. New York: Loizeaux Brothers, 1957.
- Spurgeon** = C.H. Spurgeon. *Galatians: Spurgeon Commentary – Spurgeon Commentary Series*. (Elliot Ritzema, Ed.). Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2013.
- UBS** = Arichea, Daniel C., and Eugene Albert Nida. *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. UBS Handbook Series. New York: United Bible Societies, 1976.
- Utley** = Robert James Utley. *Paul's First Letters: Galatians and I & II Thessalonians*. Vol. Volume 11. Study Guide Commentary Series. Marshall, TX: Bible Lessons International, 1997.
- Wallace** = Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Wiersbe = Warren Wiersbe. *The Bible Exposition Commentary*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996.

Witherington = Ben Witherington. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on St. Paul's Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998.

Wright1 = Wright, N.T. *Paul for Everyone: Galatians and Ephesians*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.

Wright2 = Wright, Tom. *Paul for Everyone: Galatians and Thessalonians*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2004.

Vincent = Vincent, Marvin Richardson. *Word Studies in the New Testament*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1887.

Wuest = Wuest, Kenneth S. *Wuest's Word Studies from the Greek New Testament: For the English Reader*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Wycliffe = Pfeiffer, Charles F., and Everett Falconer Harrison, eds. *The Wycliffe Bible Commentary: New Testament*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962.

Parsing Verbs and Declining Nouns

Verbs:

ποιμανατε (ποιμαινω = to tend, shepherd || Verb: Aorist Active Imperative, Second Person Plural).

ἀποκαλυπτεσθαι (ἀποκαλύπω = to reveal, disclose || Verb: Present Passive Infinitive).

Nouns (gender before case):

πατηματων (παθημα = suffering || Noun: Neuter Genitive Plural).

Participles (gender before case):

μελλουσης (μελλω = to be about to || Participle: Feminine Genitive Singular Present Active).

Adjectives (gender before case):

(ἐπιεικης = gentle, kind || Adjective: Masculine Dative Plural).

Independent Personal Pronouns:

ἡμιν (ἐγω = I || First Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Dative Plural).

ὑμιν (συ = you || Second Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Dative Plural).

αὐτῷ (αὐτος = He, Him || Third Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Masculine Dative Singular).

Demonstrative Pronouns (gender before case):

(τουτο = this || Near Demonstrative Pronoun: Neuter Nominative Singular).

Reflexive Pronouns (only masculine and feminine - the genitive is the lexical form as there is no nominative case):

(ἐμαυτου = myself || First Person Reflexive Pronoun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

(σεαυτου = yourself || Second Person Reflexive Pronoun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

(ἐαυτου = himself, herself, oneself || Third Person Reflexive Pronoun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

Relative Pronouns:

(ὃς = who/that, of whom, to whom, whom [referring to people]; that/which, of which, to which, which [referring to things] – Translation depends on case || Relative Pronoun: Masculine Nominative Singular)

Sentence Structure

Sentence

Subordinate Clause

11 Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς
when but came Cephas

Prepositional Phrase

εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
to Antioch

Prepositional Phrase

κατὰ πρόσωπον
to face

[Sentence]

αὐτῷ ἀντέστην,
his I opposed

Subordinate Clause

ὅτι
because

Participial Clause

κατεγνωσμένος
condemned

[Subordinate Clause (continued)]

ἦν.
he was

Sentence

Prepositional Phrase

12 πρὸ
before

Infinitival Clause

τοῦ

Segment Clause

γάρ
for

[Infinitival Clause (continued)]

ἔλθεῖν τινας
came certain people

Prepositional Phrase

ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου
from James

Prepositional Phrase

μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν
with the Gentiles

[Segment Clause (continued)]

συνήσθιεν·
he used to eat

Subordinate Clause

ὅτε
when

[Sentence]

δὲ
but

[Subordinate Clause (continued)]

ἦλθον,
they came

[Sentence (continued)]

ὑπέστειλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν
he withdrew and separated himself

[Subordinate Clause (continued)]

φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς.
was afraid of those of the circumcision

Sentence

[Sentence]

13 καὶ
and

Segment Clause

συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ [καὶ] οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι,
joined in hypocrisy with him also the rest of the Jews

Subordinate Clause

ὥστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει.
so that even Barnabas was carried away with them in hypocrisy

Sentence

[Sentence]

14 ἀλλ'
but

Subordinate Clause

ὅτε εἶδον
when I saw

Subordinate Clause

ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν
that not being straightforward

Prepositional Phrase

πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,
with the truth of the gospel

[Sentence (continued)]

εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾶ
I said to Cephas

Prepositional Phrase

ἔμπροσθεν πάντων·
in the presence of all

Subordinate Clause

εἰ σὺ
if you

Participial Clause

Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων

a Jew are

[Subordinate Clause (continued)]

ἔθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς,
like a Gentile and not like a Jew live

Dialogic Frame

πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις
how the Gentiles can you try to compel

Infinitival Clause

ἰουδαῖζειν;
to live like Jews

* Albert L. Lukaszewski and Mark Dubis, *The Lexham Syntactic Greek New Testament* (Logos Bible Software, 2009), Ga 2:11–15.

11 But when
Cephas came to Antioch
I opposed him to his face
because he stood condemned.

12 For
prior to the coming of certain men
from James,

he used to eat with the Gentiles.

But when
they came,
he began to withdraw
and separate himself,
fearing those of the circumcision.

13 And the rest of the Jews
joined him
in hypocrisy,
so that
even Barnabas
was carried away
by their hypocrisy.

14 But when
I saw
that they were not acting straightforward
concerning the truth
of the gospel,

I said to Cephas
in the presence of all:

“If you, being a Jew,
live like a Gentile
and not like a Jew,

how [is it that] you compel
the Gentiles
to live like Jews?”

TRANSLATION, OUTLINE AND CENTRAL PROPOSITION

GREEK TEXT (NA27):

11 Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.
12 πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον,
ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς. 13 καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ
καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. 14 ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον
ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾷ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων·
εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν;
15 Ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἀμαρτωλοί·

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

11 But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned.
12 For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But
when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.
13 And the rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy, so that even Barnabas was carried away by
their hypocrisy. 14 But when I saw that they were not acting straightforward concerning the
truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all: “If you, being a Jew, live like a
Gentile and not like a Jew, how [is it that] you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?”

PASSAGE SUBJECT/THEME (what's t/passage talking about): Paul confronts Peter

PASSAGE COMPLEMENT/THRUST (what's the passage saying about what it's talking about):
about his hypocrisy regarding Gentiles and the Gospel.

PASSAGE MAIN IDEA (central proposition of the text): Paul Reproves Peter the Pillar

CENTRAL PROPOSITION OF THE SERMON: Paul's apostolic authority is proven in the reproof
of Peter in Antioch

SERMONIC IDEA/TITLE: "Hypocrisy, Gentiles, and the Gospel" (Parts 1 and 2)

SERMON OUTLINE:

I. Paul's Fourth Defense: Correcting Cephas in Syria (2:11-14)

- A. The Context (11a)
- B. The Circumstance (11b-12)
- C. The Consequence (13)
- D. The Crux (14a)
- E. The Comment (14b)

II. Acts 15 and the Jerusalem Council

A. Closing the circle as it relates to Acts 9-15 and Galatians 1-2

III. Observations and Application

- A. "Illegal Procedure" (Should Paul Have Publicly Rebuked Peter?)
- B. "Wide Right" (Even the Best of God's People Blow It)
- C. "We're Not the 72 Dolphins" (There's No Perfect Church)
- D. "Offsides" (Our Sin Affects Others)
- E. "Out of Bounds" (The Danger of Hypocrisy)
- F. "Tight Coverage" (Sanctified Stubbornness)
- G. "Coachable" (Are We Humble and Teachable?)
- H. "Staying In Bounds" (The Narrow Path of the Gospel)

HISTORICAL/CULTURAL/GRAMMATICAL CONTEXT

In 2:11-14 Paul gives (but likely doesn't complete – issue of where his quotation should end) his 4th defense of his 1:11-12 thesis. The main point is that he rebuffed Peter over the latter's hypocrisy in regard to the gospel. The details leave many questions (“there is a lot that is unclear about his narrative” writes Moo [p. 141]).

George summarizes/paraphrases Paul's entire defense of chapters 1-2:

After God called me to be an apostle, I did not even go to Jerusalem for several years. When I finally did get there, it was only for a brief get-acquainted visit with Peter, although I also bumped into James, who was present as well. After this my preaching ministry took me far to the north, to Syria and Cilicia. During this time the Christians in Judea only received hearsay reports about my work although they praised the Lord for what he was doing through me. It was well over a dozen years later when I went to Jerusalem again, this time to talk with the leaders there about how we could collaborate most effectively in the work of world evangelization. James, Peter, and John stood shoulder to shoulder with me against some false brothers who intruded into our meeting and tried to force my young friend Titus, a Gentile convert, to be circumcised. Of course, I didn't budge an inch on this crucial issue, and when the dust had cleared, the pillar apostles and I sealed our agreement with a cordial embrace. Given this outcome, you can imagine how disappointed I was when Peter came to Antioch and engaged in a kind of behavior that I knew belied his own convictions. Not even Peter, great as he is, could resist the pressure to back away from his earlier commitment to Christian liberty. So I had to oppose him publicly because in this case, no less than during my second visit to Jerusalem, the truth of the gospel was at stake. [George, 168]

Having set forth the issues and alternatives that would dominate his Letter to the Galatians, Paul now began in earnest to develop the first major section of the epistle, a historical overview of his conversion, call, and ministry prior to his evangelistic work in Galatia. This long autobiographical account runs from 1:11 through 2:21 and is itself divided into three discrete subsections: Paul's early Christian experience and his first encounter with church leaders in Jerusalem (1:11–24), the summit meeting between Paul and the Jerusalem leaders over the scope and sphere of his missionary work (2:1–10), and the confrontation with Peter at Antioch leading to the central pronouncement of justification by faith (2:11–21).

These verses contain the longest and richest autobiographical material we have from the pen of Paul. They supplement in significant ways what Luke said about Paul's background, conversion, and early missionary activity. This entire section and the prominence it holds in the structure of Galatians, occupying as it does nearly one-fourth of the book, underscore the fact that Christianity is a historical faith. It is based upon certain specific, irreversible, and irreducible historical events. Jesus was born during the imperial reign of Caesar Augustus. He was crucified under Pontius Pilate, he rose again on the third day, and was taken up into heaven forty days later. Christianity is not a philosophy of life, or yet a set of moral precepts, or a secret

code for mystical union with the divine. At its core Christianity is the record of what God has once and for all done in the person and work of his Son, Jesus Christ. Among these mighty acts of God, we must include the calling of the apostle Paul, for it too belongs among the foundational events of salvation history.

What this means and why it was such a hot issue in Galatia we will seek to uncover in our study of the verses that follow. Suffice it to say here that nowhere in this long historical section does Paul tell us how he felt about the events that happened to him. We can certainly speculate about this matter, imagining, for example, that he must have been greatly surprised at the appearance of the risen Christ near Damascus, or greatly angered by the false brothers who were trying to subvert the principle of Christian freedom, or deeply hurt and betrayed by Peter, who in a tense situation compromised what Paul knew were his real convictions. But the point of the narrative is not to focus on Paul's personal experience or subjective feelings, however interesting such a disclosure would be to us. Rather it is to set forth the objectively given revelation of God in and through Paul, the expressed purpose of which was to serve the furtherance of the gospel (Gal 1:16).

Galatians 1–2, then, establishes a historical context for the expressly theological content of Gal 3–4, which issues in turn in the ethical outcome of Gal 5–6. From the beginning, however, the theological issue is paramount, as we have seen already in the introductory verses. In the historical narrative also Paul was concerned not merely to recount the story of his life but to relate how “the truth of the gospel” (2:14) had manifested itself in his life story.

Paul was not quoting in these verses from his personal spiritual diary; unlike Augustine, he was not given to reminiscence and left behind no “Confessions of St. Paul.” Rather he surveyed his life and selectively recounted certain incidents in order to make a theological point. The theological thrust of his presentation is seen in the fact that the historical narrative flows almost imperceptibly into his theological exposition. Thus it is unclear whether 2:15–21 constitutes the conclusion of his declaration to Peter (as the NIV has it with quotation marks around the entire passage) or the commencement of his special address to the Galatians on the theme of justification.

In any event, the entire historical narrative is evidently intended as a prolegomenon to the central thesis that “a man is not justified by observing the law, but by faith in Jesus Christ” (2:16). The polemical tone we have encountered in the early verses of chap. 1 continues to dominate Paul's rehearsal of his life and ministry here. Clearly he was responding to a certain representation of his career that his opponents had disseminated among the Galatian churches. If, as seems likely, these agitators had close ties to Jerusalem Christianity, they may well have represented themselves as the true ambassadors of the mother church there while depicting Paul as a renegade evangelist, one whose authority was wholly derived and subordinate to the Jerusalem apostles. Paul, they perhaps claimed, had totally distorted the message of these great church leaders while they, on the other hand, offered a pure replication of it.

Thus Paul was concerned to clarify his relationship to the church at Jerusalem, and especially to Peter and James. Each of these leaders is mentioned three times in the first two chapters. First, just a few years after his conversion Paul paid a “get acquainted” visit to Peter and James in Jerusalem (1:18–19). Then, well over a decade later, he encountered them again at Jerusalem in a strategic conference related to his missionary work among the Gentiles. And, finally, he confronted Peter at Antioch in a crisis over table fellowship prompted by certain individuals affiliated with James. We will have to examine more closely what these verses tell us about Paul’s relationship to the church at Jerusalem and its leaders. It is clear, however, that Paul wanted to assert his apostolic independence over against Peter, James, and all other human intermediaries. [Timothy George, Galatians, vol. 30, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994), 105–107.]

The two key themes in this passage are the truth of the gospel and the unity of the church. In a moment of crisis Paul found it necessary to stand adamantly, stubbornly, uncompromisingly against the heretical doctrine and illicit demands of the false brothers. It would have been easy for Paul to say: “Oh, come now; circumcision is no big deal. Let’s compromise on this issue in order to save face and win friends here in Jerusalem.” By such an approach he might well have spared himself a confrontation, but he would thereby have forfeited the cause of Christian freedom. At the same time, Paul greatly valued the unity of the church and sought to strengthen it in every way possible. We have much to learn from this episode in the life of the early church as we seek to be faithful stewards of the missionary challenge confronting us today.

First, we can develop a pattern of cooperation around the truth of the gospel. This is not an ecumenism of convenience; Paul could not work together with the false brothers, even though they claimed to be fellow Christians, because their theological position was antithetical to the gospel message itself. However, Paul was eager to work closely together with other Christian leaders who shared with him a common commitment to the good news of salvation through Jesus Christ.

Second, the apostles found it necessary to distribute the work of evangelization by a practical division of labor. Today 1.3 billion persons in the world have never heard the name of Jesus for the first time. Evangelical, Bible-believing Christians cannot afford to fight turf wars over comity agreements and missionary zones. No one person, ministry, missions agency, or denomination can cover all the necessary bases. We must be ready to stand together and work collaboratively with Great Commission Christians everywhere in the unfilled task of world evangelization.

Finally, the word about caring for the poor points to the dual necessity of both a propositional and an incarnational dimension to the life and mission of the church. Paul steadfastly refused to divorce conversion from discipleship. His mission included both a social and an evangelistic responsibility. If he gave priority to the latter over the former, it was because he sensed so keenly the eternal destiny of every person he met and shuddered to think of the dire consequences of spurning Christ’s invitation to eternal life. Still, he knew, as we must, that the gospel he preached was addressed to living persons, soul and body, in all of their broken humanity and need for wholeness. [Timothy George, Galatians, vol. 30, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994), 166–167.]

It has been suggested that the criticisms of Paul's gospel, to which he makes reference in vv 11–12, have controlled the structure of most of the letter. In v 11 his gospel is accused of being *κατὰ ἄνθρωπου*, while in v 12 it is said to be derived *παρὰ ἄνθρώπου*. Both these criticisms, it is suggested, are now to receive detailed rebuttal, but in reverse order: in 1:13–2:21 Paul shows that his gospel was not derived *παρὰ ἄνθρώπου*, and in 3:1–6:10 he argues that it is not *κατὰ ἄνθρωπον*. The bulk of the letter could then be viewed as an elaborate chiasmus (see BDF 477 [2] summarizing J. Jeremias, 'Chiasmus in den Paulusbriefen', ZNW 49 [1958], 145–156, especially 152f.). [F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians: a Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1982), 89.]

Paul's thesis statement for this entire section is found in 1:11-12:

11 For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. 12 For I neither received it from man, nor was I taught it, but I received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ.

What follows is Paul's defense of his thesis:

Verse 13 – Paul's life as an unregenerate Jew

Verse 14 – His accomplishments as a Pharisee

Verses 15-16 – His conversion to Christ and his calling to preach the gospel to the Gentiles

All of that by a direct revelation from Jesus Christ (Damascus Rd. and following).

Paul is establishing his apostolic credentials.

16b I did not immediately consult with flesh and blood, 17 nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me; but I went away to Arabia, and returned once more to Damascus.

Paul's defends his thesis (13-17) by first est. that his conversion was dramatic and miraculous. It was independent of the Jerusalem Apostles; it came by direct revelation from Christ. After he was converted, he didn't rush to Jerusalem to consult with the Apostles there.

He's addressing the Judaizers' contention that he was 2d rate to those in Jerusalem or was under their authority. Cf. 2:1-2.

Review . . .

Vv. 11-12 – Thesis

Vv. 13-17 – First Defense of His Thesis

Vv. 18-24 – Second Defense (“then”).

2:1-10 ("then") - marks Paul's 3d defense.

2:11 "but" - here begins Paul's 4th defense.

This section ends either at v. 14 or it continues to the end of the chapter.

Paul's overall purpose in 1:13-2:14 is to assure the Galatians that they have indeed "received" (see 1:9) the true gospel. "Gospel" language is, of course, central in the rebuke passage of verses 6-9; but it is also central in verses 11-12, which set forth the thesis that Paul argues in 1:13-2:14, and it crops up repeatedly in the subsequent argument (1:16,23; 2:2,5,7,14). "The truth of the gospel" (2:5,14) is Paul's focus in this section. But the Galatians received this gospel from Paul; and so, to have confidence in the gospel, they must also have confidence in the messenger who proclaimed that gospel to them. The truth of the gospel and Paul's credentials as an authoritative messenger of that gospel are therefore woven together in this part of the letter. [Moo]

It can be shown that the thesis stated in vss. 11-12 is the main one underlying the narratio, as Matera does with the following outline: (1) 1:11-12 the theme announced—the Gospel is not of human origin; (2) 1:13-17—first proof that Paul received the Gospel through a revelation of Christ; (3) 1:18-20—second proof—that the Jerusalem church didn't commission Paul; (4) 1:21-24—third proof—that those in Judea glorified God because of Paul; (5) 2:1-10—fourth proof—Paul defended his Gospel at Jerusalem; (6) 2:11-14—Paul defended his Gospel at Antioch. All this is meant to show Paul's consistency and the divine character and origin of his message. His life has been a public demonstration of the Gospel of grace. [Witherington, 90-91]

T. George writes:

Having set forth his thesis of the nonhuman origin of the gospel in the two preceding verses, Paul began a demonstration of its truth in terms of five historical proofs derived from his own life and ministry: (1) Nothing in Paul's religious background could account for his acceptance of the gospel (1:13-17). (2) Paul was not commissioned by the Jerusalem church (1:18-20). (3) Those Paul formerly persecuted glorified God because of the change wrought in him (1:21-24). (4) Paul's apostolic work was recognized by church leaders at Jerusalem (2:1-10). (5) Paul defended the gospel against Peter's vacillation at Antioch (2:11-14). Following this extensive historical excursus, Paul summarized the central theme of his letter (2:15-21) and then reminded the Galatians of how God had worked among them at his first preaching of the gospel in their midst (3:1-5). Thus the entire historical section of the letter moves from Paul the persecutor to Paul the preacher; it is the record of "the way of the gospel from Damascus to Galatia."

Paul's main point in vv. 13-14 was to show that there was nothing in his religious background and pre-conversion life that could have in any way prepared him for a positive response to the

gospel. Quite the contrary. His early career and lifestyle were shaped by a confident attachment to the strictest traditions of Judaism, which in turn had led him to take up arms against the believers in Jesus. Paul assumed that the Galatians already knew something about his past life as a persecutor; he was reminding them of something they already had heard about. Doubtless they had heard this from Paul's own lips, for, unlike many public figures, he was never one to conceal the shameful deeds that marred his past life.

Paul spoke frequently and graphically of his campaign of persecution against the Christians. He told of how he had pursued them, like a bloodhound, from city to city, arresting both men and women, throwing them into prison, voting for their execution, and further harassing them even to the point of death (Acts 22:4; 26:9). Paul gave this witness not to brag on the misdeeds of his pre-Christian life, as some converts are wont to magnify their sinful past more than their rescue from it, but in order to hold high the sovereign initiative of God in reversing the murderous track of his career. Paul always spoke of this part of his life with great sorrow and shame, considering himself the "least of the apostles" (1 Cor 15:9) because he had "persecuted the church of God" (Gal 1:13). [Timothy George, *Galatians*, vol. 30, *The New American Commentary* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1994), 113–114]

EXCURSUS 2: LUTHER AND CALVIN ON PETER AND PAUL:

Galatians, like Romans, is a book that has created shock waves throughout the history of the church. As is well known, Martin Luther had a love affair with Galatians, referring to it as "my own epistle to which I have plighted my troth; my Katie von Bora," Katie being his beloved wife.¹⁵⁸ Near the end of his life Luther commented on plans to publish a complete edition of his writings in Latin: "If they took my advice, they would print only the books containing doctrine, like Galatians."¹⁵⁹ Luther, in fact, lectured repeatedly on Galatians and published two major commentaries on the epistle: one in 1519, just on the eve of his break with Rome, and the other in 1535 (revised in 1538), a work that reflects years of struggle and hard-won victories for the doctrine of justification by faith. Concerning this important book, H. D. Betz has written: "Luther's commentary is more than a scholarly commentary upon Galatians. It is a recreation of Galatians in the sixteenth century. Luther speaks as Paul would have spoken had he lived at the time when Luther gave his lectures."¹⁶⁰ Luther's younger contemporary, John Calvin, was, if anything, a more penetrating biblical scholar than even the great German Reformer. He himself was not unaware of his great abilities as can be seen from this comment from the dedicatory epistle to his commentary on Galatians, published at Geneva in 1548: "Of my commentaries I shall only say that perhaps they contain more than it would be modest in me to acknowledge."¹⁶¹ Both Luther and Calvin dealt at length with the Antioch episode, applying the lessons learned therefrom to their own pastoral and confessional contexts in the sixteenth century.

In the Galatians commentaries of Luther and Calvin we can hear the echo of a major patristic dispute over Paul's treatment of Peter at Antioch. Jerome, following Origen, proposed the theory that Peter merely pretended to compromise his convictions in order to give Paul the opportunity to correct him in a feigned, well-staged pretense of his own. This interpretation, which was followed by Erasmus in the sixteenth century, derived from a dubious reading of the

Greek words *kata prosopon*, “I opposed him to his face.” Jerome read this to mean “I opposed him to outward appearances,” that is, I made a show of opposing him, presumably in order to turn the situation into an occasion for clearly articulating the doctrine of justification. Augustine disagreed strongly with Jerome’s interpretation of this incident, noting that Paul had put himself under an oath (1:20) to assure the accuracy of his historical narration. In the period of the Reformation, Erasmus and other Roman Catholic commentators followed Jerome on this point while Luther and Calvin echoed Augustine.

Behind the flimsy exegesis of Jerome was the dreaded shock of believing that this passage could mean what it says, namely, that so weighty an apostle as Peter could be upbraided so brazenly—even by another apostle! In Luther’s day Peter was even more highly regarded, not only as a pillar apostle but also as the first pope, the visible head of Christ’s church on earth. But Luther insisted that even an apostle could err. In the same year in which his first commentary on Galatians appeared (1519), Luther debated publicly with John Eck at Leipzig over the issues of church tradition and religious authority. In the course of that debate he declared, for the first time so boldly, that popes could be wrong and had been wrong, that church councils could err and had erred, that only Holy Scripture alone (*sola scriptura*) could be appealed to as the normative authority in matters of faith and practice. Thus Paul was correct to have challenged Peter so openly since far more than personal pride or ecclesiastical position was at stake: “This is the issue at stake here: Either Peter must be severely rebuked, or Christ must be removed entirely. Rather let Peter perish and go to hell, if need be, than that Christ be lost.”¹⁶² [LW 26.119.]

Luther drew two corollaries from this episode that have important implications within his larger theological perspective: the fragility of faith and the priority of revelation over reason. The fact that so great a leader as Peter could fall is evidence that the church itself is at once both righteous and sinful. As Luther put it, we must pray the Lord’s Prayer every day, “Forgive us our sins.” Luther called justification by faith “the most important doctrine of Christianity,” but he realized how constantly it is being threatened and undermined from every side. “I am making such a point of all this to keep anyone from supposing that the doctrine of faith is an easy matter. It is indeed easy to talk about, but it is hard to grasp; and it is easily obscured and lost. Therefore let us with all diligence and humility devote ourselves to the study of Sacred Scripture and to serious prayer, lest we lose the truth of the gospel.”¹⁶³ Luther realized also that the stand Peter took at Antioch could well be justified on the basis of human reasoning, although it stood in flat contradiction to the doctrine of grace mediated by special revelation. The polarity between law and gospel, which dominates Luther’s discussion here, comes into play as he speaks of the gospel leading us into “the darkness of faith.” Luther seized on Paul’s abrupt “No!” to Peter at Antioch to reinforce his construals of the either/or of law versus gospel and reason versus faith. As he put it in one of his most memorable one-liners: “As soon as reason and the law are joined, faith immediately loses its virginity.”¹⁶⁴

Turning to Calvin’s treatment of the Antioch episode, we find him characteristically giving close attention to the implications of church order and discipline in this passage. Whereas Luther accepted the traditional identification of Gal 2:1–10 with the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15, Calvin opted for the famine visit of Acts 11 as the occasion for Paul’s meeting with the

pillar apostles. Noting the prominence of James in the listing of the pillars, he commented, “And as a people must not lack a pastor, so the assembly of pastors requires a controller (moderator).”¹⁶⁵

Here, as elsewhere, Calvin too eagerly read a proto-presbyterian polity back into the New Testament. However, Calvin, no less than Luther, found in Peter’s inconsistency a repudiation of papal authoritarianism. Since Peter was called the apostle of the circumcision, the pope, to rightly claim the possession of his primacy, should “assemble churches from the Jews.” Paul’s public chastisement of Peter was not simply a personal rebuke, Calvin averred, but rather a matter of church discipline. “The aim is that their sin may not, by remaining unpunished, do harm by its example. As elsewhere (1 Tim 5:20) Paul expressly says that this should be observed in regard to elders, because the office they hold makes their bad example more harmful. It is especially useful that the good cause which concerned them all should be frankly defended in the presence of the people, so that Paul might make it quite clear that he did not shrink from the light.”¹⁶⁶

The burden of Calvin’s comments focused on the primary issue at stake: the righteousness of God received through grace alone. Although elsewhere Calvin could speak (as Paul did) of the law in a positive sense as the guiding principle of Christian behavior, he recognized that in this context the “works of the law” included not only its ceremonial aspect but the law in its entirety. “Paul was worried not so much about ceremonies being observed as that the confidence and glory of salvation should be transferred to works.” For this reason Calvin rejected the “semi-righteousness” medieval Catholic theologians taught that human beings could merit as a first step toward justification. He defended Luther’s use of sola, by grace alone, by faith alone, by Christ alone. Thus on the core issue of how one obtains a right standing before God, Calvin stood together with Luther in his advocacy of a theology of either/or: “Consequently we have to ascribe either nothing or everything to faith or to works.”¹⁶⁷ [George, 183–186]

2:11 EXEGESIS

GREEK TEXT:

Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.

Ὅτε δὲ (Ὅτε = when || Adverbial Conjunction).

ἦλθεν (έρχομαι || Verb: Aorist Active Indicative, 3S).

Κηφᾶς (Κηφᾶς || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular).

εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, (Ἀντιόχεια || Noun: Feminine Accusative Singular).

κατὰ πρόσωπον (πρόσωπον || Noun: Neuter Accusative Singular).

αὐτῷ (αὐτός = He, Him || Third Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Masculine Dative Singular).

ἀντέστην, (ἀνθίστημι = to oppose, resist || Verb: Aorist Active Indicative, 3S).

ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος (καταγινώσκω = to condemn, convict || Participle: Masculine Nominative Singular Perfect Passive). Only here and 1 John 3:20-21.

ἦν. (εἶμι || Verb: Imperfect Active Indicative, 1S).

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned.

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face because he stood condemned. (Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν.)

Antioch, the major city in Syria, from where Paul started his first missionary journey (13:1–3). Today known as “Antakiya”. In Paul’s day Antioch was noted for its splendor and political importance. In the 6th c. the city burned and was hit by 2 devastating earthquakes. It fell to the invading forces of Islam in 7th c. along with Jerusalem and Alexandria.

We don't know a definite date for Peter’s arrival in Antioch. May have been before his miraculous deliverance from prison (Acts 12:17) and the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15:1–35). Syrian Antioch may have been the third largest city of the Roman Empire, with an estimated population of 250,000. The Jewish population may have been 25,000. [as cited by Schreiner, 138]

During the New Testament period Antioch was the third largest city in the Roman Empire and boasted a population of more than half a million. Its political importance derived from the fact that it served as the capital city of the Roman province of Syria. A series of Roman emperors beginning with Julius Caesar lavished attention and resources upon this “Rome of the East,” furnishing it with theaters, aqueducts, public baths, a great basilica, and a famous colonnaded main street adorned with a marble pavement and vaulted stone roofs.¹⁴⁰

The Jewish community formed a significant segment of the city's population, numbering some sixty-five thousand during the New Testament era. The Jews at Antioch were generally tolerated by the Roman overlords but were occasionally harassed and persecuted there as in other large cities throughout the empire. Less than ten years before the clash between Peter and Paul, the emperor Caligula (A.D. 37–41) had instigated a virulent attack against the Jews of Antioch. During this crisis many Jews were killed and their synagogues burned. The same kind of harassment was being carried out in Palestine as well and may account for the overly zealous attitude of many Jewish Christians there concerning issues of circumcision, food laws, and adherence to worship in the temple. [George, 170–171]

“Ὅτε δὲ = implies that this section stands in contrast with 2:1-10. “In Jerusalem Peter and I agreed as to the nature of the gospel, but in Antioch....”

Chronology: this visit of Peter to Antioch took place between the “famine relief visit” of Acts 11:27-30 (i.e. 2:1-10) and the writing of Galatians – but before the events of Acts 15. Perhaps shortly after Paul and Barnabas returned from their 1st miss. journey. Why was Peter there? We don't know. Perhaps to see firsthand what was being reported about the fledgling Gentile church. Perhaps because of the persecution of Herod Agrippa I (AD 43-44) connected with Acts 12:17 which says that Peter “went to another place” during that time. Did he go to Antioch? Was it earlier, right after the first miss. journey?

Since the previous paragraph had him in Jerusalem we may suppose he came from Jerusalem.

Make sense that this visit took place after the account of 2:1–10. If 2:1–10 is identified with the famine relief visit of Acts 11:27–30, then the Antioch event likely would have preceded the Jerusalem Council of Acts 15. “Peter’s defection on this issue makes more sense previous to the Jerusalem Council . . .” [Schreiner, 138–139]

Antioch = home base for first expansion of Christianity outside of Palestine. Believers first called “Christians” there.

Persecution against t/CH in Jer. multiplied their witness (Acts 8:4). Some of those who scattered went north to Antioch, where they witnessed first to the Jews and then to the Gentiles. When the church in Jerusalem heard of the revival in Antioch, they sent Barnabas, “a good man, full of the Holy Spirit and faith” (Acts 11:24), to assist the new believers there. “Barnabas in turn traveled to Tarsus where he recruited Paul, whom he had earlier introduced to the Jerusalem church leaders, to join him in the work of the ministry at Antioch. Thus Barnabas was a kind of personal go-between reaching out to Paul and the Gentile believers on the one hand and to Peter, James, and the Jerusalem church on the other. This fact may explain, although not justify, his disappointing defection from Paul during the height of the Antioch incident.” [George, 171]

Paul is not interested here in relating the biography of his relationship with Peter, nor is he trumpeting himself as superior to Peter. Rather, he refers to his rebuke of Peter because it proves the independence and authority of his gospel. Paul did not reprove Peter because of a personal pique against him or because he suddenly lost his temper.⁷ He reprimanded him

because he was condemned before God for his actions.⁸ Some early church fathers interpreted Peter's sin here as feigned, so that Peter pretended to be doing wrong so that Paul could correct him and all would be instructed.⁹ Clement of Alexandria suggested the Cephas mentioned here was not the apostle Peter.¹⁰ Such interpretations are desperate attempts to salvage Peter's reputation. It is better to acknowledge that even apostles sinned and fell short of God's glory. [Schreiner, 139]

Calvin speaks of:

. . . the absurdity of the interpretation given by Jerome and Chrysostom, who represent the whole transaction as a feigned debate, which the apostles had previously arranged to take place in presence of the people. [Calvin]

Cf. Chrysostom in *Homilies on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and Philemon* [Vol. 13. A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, First Series (Philip Schaff)] where he argues that the confrontation was all a ruse to give a lesson to those present. (demonstrates that the ECF's were often very poor exegetes). Luther writes: "Jerome, who understood not this passage, nor the whole epistle for that matter, excuses Peter's action on the ground 'that it was done in ignorance.'"

At the same time, this is a reply to another calumny, that Paul was but an ordinary disciple, far below the rank of an apostle: for the reproof which he administered was an evidence that the parties were on an equal footing. The highest, I acknowledge, are sometimes properly reprov'd by the lowest, for this liberty on the part of inferiors towards their superiors is permitted by God; and so it does not follow, that he who reprov's another must be his equal. But the nature of the reproof deserves notice. Paul did not simply reprove Peter, as a Christian might reprove a Christian, but he did it officially, as the phrase is; that is, in the exercise of the apostolic character which he sustained.

This is another thunderbolt which strikes the Papacy of Rome. It exposes the impudent pretensions of the Roman Antichrist, who boasts that he is not bound to assign a reason, and sets at defiance the judgment of the whole Church. Without rashness, without undue boldness, but in the exercise of the power granted him by God, this single individual chastises Peter, in the presence of the whole Church; and Peter submissively bows to the chastisement. Nay, the whole debate on those two points was nothing less than a manifest overthrow of that tyrannical primacy, which the Romanists foolishly enough allege to be founded on divine right. If they wish to have God appearing on their side, a new Bible must be manufactured; if they do not wish to have him for an open enemy, those two chapters of the Holy Scriptures must be expunged. [John Calvin, comment on Galatians 2:11]

The chief argument on which Jerome rests is excessively trifling. "Why should Paul," says he, "condemn in another what he takes praise for in himself? for he boasts that 'to the Jews he became as a Jew.'" (1 Corinthians 9:20.) I reply, that what Peter did is totally different. Paul

accommodated himself to the Jews no farther than was consistent with the doctrine of liberty; and therefore he refused to circumcise Titus, that the truth of the gospel might remain unimpaired. But Peter Judaized in such a manner as to “compel the Gentiles” to suffer bondage, and at the same time to create a prejudice against Paul’s doctrine. He did not, therefore, observe the proper limit; for he was more desirous to please than to edify, and more solicitous to inquire what would gratify the Jews than what would be expedient for the whole body. Augustine is therefore right in asserting, that this was no previously arranged plan, but that Paul, out of Christian zeal, opposed the sinful and unseasonable dissimulation of Peter, because he saw that it would be injurious to the Church. [Calvin, comment on Galatians 2:11]

Those who believed that Peter and Paul were at odds with each other after this – and Luke in Acts tries to paper over those differences (Tubingen School of the 19th c.) - to the point that they had different views as to the Gospel. But the differences here are related to conduct, not theology.

ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος (καταγινωσκω = to condemn, convict || Participle: Masculine Nominative Singular Perfect Passive). Only here and 1 John 3:20-21. Not condemned as in eternal (cf. 1:8-9) but guilty or culpable. Peter was guilty of sin, the sin of hypocrisy and misrepresenting the gospel.

2:12 EXEGESIS

GREEK TEXT:

πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστειλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς.

πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν (ἐρχομαι || Verb: Aorist Active Infinitive).

τινας (τις || Masculine Accusative Plural Indefinite Pronoun).

ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου (Ἰακώβος || Noun: Masculine Genitive Singular).

μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν (ἔθνος || Noun: Neuter Genitive Plural).

συνήσθιεν· (συνεσθιω = to eat with || Verb: Imperfect Active Indicative, 3S). Iterative Imperfect.

ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, (ἐρχομαι || Verb: Aorist Active Indicative, 3P).

ὑπέστειλεν (ὑποστειλλω = to withdraw || Verb: Imperfect Active Indicative, 3S). Inceptive Imperfect.

“Ὑποστέλλειν only here in Paul. It means, originally, to draw in or contract. Thus of furling sails, closing the fingers. Middle voice, to draw or shrink back from through fear. Hence, to disassemble or prevaricate. There seems to be no special reason for making it either a military metaphor, as Lightfoot, or a nautical metaphor, as Farrar. See on Acts 20:20.” [Vincent, 101–102]

καὶ ἀφώριζεν (ἀφορίζω = to separate || Verb: Imperfect Active Indicative, 3S). Inceptive Imperfect.

ἑαυτὸν (ἑαυτοῦ = himself, herself, oneself || Third Person Reflexive Pronoun: Masculine Accusative Singular).

φοβούμενος (φοβεω = to fear || Participle: Masculine Nominative Singular Present Middle/Passive).

τοὺς (ὁ || Definite Article: Masculine Accusative Plural).

ἐκ περιτομῆς. (περιτομῆ || Noun: Feminine Genitive Singular).

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, fearing those of the circumcision.

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

For prior to the coming of certain men from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. (πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν·)

“Certain ones ... from James,”¹⁴ the Lord’s brother, arrived in Antioch. Most likely they came to Antioch because James had instructed them to do so. Apparently news had reached Jerusalem about the actions of Peter and other Jewish Christians in Antioch. What message did James entrust to his emissaries? Did they convey it accurately to Peter?¹⁵ Presumably they expressed concern about Peter and other Jews eating with Gentiles, fearing the consequences that would follow from not observing OT food laws. We can imagine that James and other Jewish Christians in Palestine would be troubled upon hearing that Peter and his friends were abandoning dietary regulations. Such news would have been scandalous to unbelieving Jews in Jerusalem, and it presumably troubled many Christian Jews in the homeland as well.

Still, it overreads the evidence to conclude that James demanded that Peter cease eating with the Gentiles since Paul does not criticize James here but only Peter. Indeed, Paul had just written that James agreed with his gospel (2:1–10). We must finally confess uncertainty about what James told the couriers to say. [Schreiner, 140]

Later at the Jerusalem Council, James, writing to the believers in Antioch, referred to certain persons who “went out from us without our authorization and disturbed you, troubling your minds by what they said” (Acts 15:24). It is likely then that the “men from James” were zealous members of the ultra-right wing party within the Palestinian movement. [George, 175–176]

The words eat with are from *sunesthio* (συνεσθιο). The verb is in the imperfect tense. The preposition *sun* prefixed to the verb implies close fellowship or cooperation. The tense of the verb tells us that it was a practice of Peter to eat with the Gentiles. The preposition speaks of the fact that in the act of joining in their meals, not only in the Christian love-feast which was connected with the worship program of the local church, but also in their homes, Peter was on terms of the greatest intimacy. The love-feast was recognized as the bond of fellowship in the infant church. [Wuest, Ga 2:12]

Common meals was a hallmark of early Christian fellowship (cf. the Love Feast and other examples). That goes back to both Jewish and Greco-Roman culture:

Moreover, Jewish religious life consisted of partaking in sacrificial meals in the Jerusalem temple. Philo indicates that the Jews believed there was a special connection between God and the worshipers who partook of the sacrificial meal (Spec. Leg., 1:221). Early Christians retained several of these components, but with their own modifications. The largest modification was the worship of Jesus as the divine Son of God. Because the Jews were monotheistic, the thought of worshiping apart from the one true God was strongly condemned. Hurtado notes, “the inclusion of Christ as recipient of religious devotion was not intended by early Christians as recognizing another god” (*At the Origins of Christian Worship*, 70). [Benjamin Espinoza, “Early Christian Worship,” ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012)]

Another component of Graeco-Roman worship was the concept of a sacred meal. This is perhaps the one point of similarity between Christian worship and Graeco-Roman devotion. The sacred feasts were a meaningful experience for Graeco-Roman worshipers and an expression of communal piety. These feasts tended to be festive and energetic, and participants consumed an inordinate amount of food and drink (Hurtado, *At the Origins of Christian Worship*, 26). Graeco—Roman worshipers generally held feasts to commemorate a city’s particular deity. Again, early Christians opposed participation in such feasts, which Paul labeled, “the cup ... and table of demons” (1 Cor 10:20–21). [Ibid.]

For ancient cultures with limited social entertainment, shared meals held a particularly important place in community life.

Old Testament. Shared meals served several functions throughout the Old Testament. For the people of Israel, shared meal practices provided strict social boundaries between God’s people and those outside. In ancient cultures, to eat a meal with someone meant that one was willing to

accept that person as family (and potentially accept in marriage). The strict food laws of Leviticus (Lev 11:1–47; see Deut 14:3–21), therefore, functioned to maintain separation between God’s people and the nations. Other shared meals brought various groups together (Gen 14:18; 26:28–30; 31:44–54; Exod 18:12; Josh 9:12–15; 2 Sam 3:20). Israel used banquets to celebrate victory in battle (Isa 61:6; Jer 12:9; Ezek 39:17–22). Likewise, shared meals, most often taking the form of regular Jewish festivals, were a celebration of God’s special relationship with His people Israel. In Judaism, similar to all ancient cultures, it was common for banquets to follow animal sacrifices, as can be seen clearly in the Passover feast (Deut 16:1–8). The prophets also foreshadow an eschatological banquet (Isa 25:6–8; Joel 2:24–28).

New Testament. The Gospel writers demonstrate that Jesus used shared meals strategically to challenge the Jewish system of social and religious exclusivity. In contrast to the practice of the Pharisees, Jesus’ open table fellowship bridged a variety of demographics. This radical boundary-breaking practice drew criticism from His opponents (Matt 11:18–19; Luke 7:33–34). By reclining at the table with various disreputable characters, Jesus was accepting them as equals in the newly defined kingdom of God (Mark 2:15–17; Matt 9:9–13; Luke 5:29–32). Similarly, Jesus challenged many of the Jewish purity traditions associated with mealtimes, shifting attention from outward cleanliness to inward purity (Mark 7:1–15). The Gospel of Luke focuses particular attention on the ancient meal motif, displayed most clearly in the Travel Narrative (Luke 10:38–42; 14:7–15, 16–24; 15:11–32; 19:1–9). Of course, Jesus’ most significant meal was the Eucharist (Matt 26:20–30; Mark 14:17–26; Luke 22:14–23). But at the same time, Jesus also introduced new meanings into the Jewish feast of Passover and the Graeco-Roman social institution of shared meals.

Paul only specifically mentions shared meals twice in his letters, in Gal 2 and 1 Cor 11, and both involve the issue of group boundaries. In Galatians 2, Paul challenges Peter’s refusal to eat with Gentiles, a point Paul uses to reinforce Jesus’ open table fellowship (Gal 2:11–14; compare Acts 10:9–23). In the Corinthian church, Christians were not using shared meals to build community, but were causing factions through impatience and drunkenness. Further, controversy surrounded these churches regarding how to handle meat sacrificed to idols (1 Cor 8:1–13), to which Paul emphasized common ethical concerns for unity (1 Cor 10:17). Paul seems to imply throughout his letters that shared meals were a regular occurrence at early Christian meetings, and would often include a much more diverse demographic than the typical, homogenous attendance at a Graeco-Roman shared meal. [David Brack, “Fellowship, Table,” ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2012)]

Ceremonial aspect of t/OT Law included dietary regulations: (1) Laws of ‘unclean’ foods (animals that could not be eaten) - Lev. 11; Deut. 14); (2) Laws of “ritual slaughter” that the blood be properly drained from the animal’s body (e.g. Lev. 17:10–14; Deut. 12:16, 23–4); (3) Laws requiring that food sacrificed in pagan temples not be eaten (4 Macc. 5:2; 1 Cor. 8–10); (4) Add preparations such as ritual hand washing. Then there are the rules that were added by the Jews under their own traditions. All of this made the entire subject of food, eating and drinking a matter of purity and Jewishness.

. . . the Maccabean crisis made the food laws a test case of national loyalty and religious faithfulness (1 Macc. 1:62–3; 2 Macc. 5:27). Typical of the period between the Maccabees and the first century CE was the glorification of various heroes and heroines, distinguished consistently by their loyalty and faithfulness in refusing to eat ‘the food of Gentiles’ (Dan. 1:8–16; Tobit 1:10–13; Judith 10:5; 12:1–20; Additions to Esther 14:17; Joseph and Asenath vii.1; viii.5) . . . [Dunn, 118]

Letter of Aristeas 142: “To prevent our being perverted by contact with others or by mixing with bad influences, [Moses] hedged us in on all sides with strict observances connected with meat and drink and touch and hearing and sight, after the manner of the Law.”

Jubilees 22:16: “Eat not with them . . . for their works are unclean.”

Acts 10:28 And he said to them, “You yourselves know how unlawful it is for a man who is a Jew to associate with a foreigner or to visit him; and yet God has shown me that I should not call any man unholy or unclean.

Note in this regard Daniel's example in Daniel chapter 1:8-12.

Eating with others was (and is) one of the most powerful symbols of *koinonia*. Missing in the family today (cf. families of the past generations).

Peter habitually (imperfect) used to eat with Gentiles; not only in fellowship with them, but perhaps also partaking of foods forbidden by the OT law.

Most likely Peter ate Gentile food during his visit with Cornelius. Such behavior would be troubling and even scandalous to most Jews. Jews who were devoted to their religion took seriously the admonitions regarding clean and unclean foods (Lev 11; Deut 14). For example, Daniel and his cohorts restricted themselves to vegetables and water so that they would not be defiled with the king's food (Dan 1:8, 10, 12, 16). . . . Peter's eating with Gentiles, which in my view involved the eating of unclean foods, would be offensive to most Jews, and we can understand why he was pressured to desist. [Schreiner, 140-41]

4 Macc 4:26 equates eating unclean food with renouncing Judaism (ἐξόμνησαι τὸν Ἰουδαϊσμόν).

Cf. Acts 10:9-11:18.

Mark 7:18–19 18 And He *said to them, “Are you so lacking in understanding also? Do you not understand that whatever goes into the man from outside cannot defile him; 19 because it does not go into his heart, but into his stomach, and is eliminated?” (Thus He declared all foods clean.)

Acts 11:2–3 2 And when Peter came up to Jerusalem, those who were circumcised took issue with him, 3 saying, “You went to uncircumcised men and ate with them.”

Cf. also the marriage supper of the lamb.

For more, see Schreiner, 141ff. “In Depth: Eating with Gentiles.”

But when they came, he began to withdraw and separate himself, (ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστειλλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν)

Jewish and Gentile Christianity and the struggles to maintain unity. Key issue in early Christianity.

Peter's guilt by disassociation.

As to the men “from James” (v. 12a), F.F. Bruce asks:

What was their message? It may have been something like this: ‘news is reaching us in Jerusalem that you are habitually practising table-fellowship with Gentiles. This is causing grave scandal to our more conservative brethren here. Not only so: it is becoming common knowledge outside the church, so that our attempts to evangelize our fellow-Jews are being seriously hampered’ (cf. T. W. Manson, *Studies*, 178–181). [Bruce, 130]

The word withdrew is from *hupostello* (ὑποστέλλω). This word was used frequently to describe strategic military operations. This suggests that it was part of Peter’s strategy in the circumstances with which he was faced. Polybius used this word of the drawing back of troops in order to place them under shelter. This suggests a retreat on the part of Peter from motives of caution. The tense is imperfect, indicating that Peter did not start his withdrawal from the Gentile tables at once, but gradually, under the pressure of their criticism. It gives a graphic picture of the Jerusalem apostle’s irresolute and tentative efforts to withdraw from an intercourse that gave offense to these visitors. The verb also was used of furling the sails of a boat. Peter, the former fisherman, was expert at that. Now, he was trimming his sails in a controversy that involved Jewish freedom from the Mosaic law which had been set aside at the Cross. [Wuest, Ga 2:12]

The word separated is from *aphorizo* (ἀφορίζω). It is also in the imperfect tense, speaking of a gradual separation. *Hupostello* (ὑποστέλλω) describes the partial withdrawal of Peter, and *aphorizo* (ἀφορίζω) the complete and final separation from the combined fellowship of the Jewish and Gentile meals, both the common meal eaten at the church, the love-feast, and the meals eaten at the homes of the Gentiles. The whole incident is characteristic of Peter. He was always the first to recognize great truths and the first to draw back from these truths. Witness his great confession of the deity of the Lord Jesus, and so soon after, his repudiation of the prediction of our Lord to the effect that He would soon die at Jerusalem and be raised again (Matt. 16:13–23); also his call to preach (Matt. 4:18–20), and his action of returning to his fishing business in stead of fulfilling his commission of preaching the gospel (John 21:3). [Wuest, Ga 2:12]

fearing those of the circumcision. (φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς.)

οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς is used a variety of ways (Acts 10:45; 11:2; Rom 4:12; Col 4:11; Titus 1:10). May refer to Jews in general (Rom 4:12); Jewish Christians (Acts 10:45; 11:2; Col 4:11). May refer to Jewish false teachers (Titus 1:10).

Were those “of the circumcision” the same as the “men from James”? It may be that the men from James were Jewish believers from Jerusalem who may have looked down on interaction with Gentiles. Those “of the circumcision” may have been another group (Judaizers or Jews). Maybe the same group described by Luke in Acts 15:1 - *AND some men came down from Judea and began teaching the brethren, “Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved.”*

φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, ‘fearing those of the circumcision’. οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς may have various meanings according to the context: ‘the circumcision party’, i.e. Judaizers within the church (Acts 11:2; Tit. 1:10); the circumcised members of the church, i.e. Jewish Christians in a

non-partisan sense (Acts 10:45; Col. 4:11); circumcised people, i.e. Jews (Rom. 4:12b). Of whom was Peter afraid on this occasion? Not of his fellow-Jewish Christians in Antioch; they with him had been sharing table-fellowship with their Gentile brethren (cf. v 13, οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι); not even James's messengers (there is no reason for equating τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς with τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου) nor of James himself—he may have respected James's authority, but why should he be afraid of him? The people who inspire fear were the Jewish militants to whom James's message possibly referred. See for various views (G. Dix, *Jew and Greek* (London, 1953), 43ff.; J. Munck, *Paul*, 106–109 (he thinks that οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς were Gentile Christians); W. Schmithals, *Paul and James*, 66–68. Schmithals points out that 'Paul utters no word of criticism against either James's messengers or James himself' (68), although his interpretation of this fact is open to doubt. [Bruce, 131]

Other options:

In Gal 2:12 “those of the circumcision” could refer to Jewish Christians²⁹ or, alternatively, to Jews who were not believers.³⁰ Some who think they were Jewish Christians maintain that they are equivalent with the men from James.³¹ If this is the case, then Peter feared what James and his friends would say about his eating with Gentiles. Such a view is certainly possible but seems unlikely for two reasons. (1) It is doubtful that Paul thought James was responsible for Peter's lapse, even though concerns were likely raised about Peter's actions by James.³² (2) Such a view would require that Peter feared James, which seems unlikely.³³

Another possibility is that the circumcision party refers to Jewish Christians who were analogous to or even identical with the men of Antioch who required circumcision (Acts 15:1). Ellis says that “those of the circumcision are best understood as a faction of Jewish Christians.”³⁴ But why would Peter fear those whom Paul calls “false brothers” in Gal 2:4? In 2:1–10 Peter sides with Paul against them on the matter of circumcision, and if the account in Acts 15 refers to a later situation, Peter again opposes such Jewish “Christians.” Hence, it is difficult to believe that he feared such here.

Still another possibility presents itself: those of the circumcision refers to unbelieving Jews. Some identify them as politically active Jews who persecuted those who did not conform to their view of Torah.³⁵ It seems that in Acts 11:1–18 Peter did not fear Jewish Christians, who advocated circumcision. Instead, he explained to them why his actions were justified. But if those of the circumcision were unbelieving Jews who were persecuting Christians and who would intensify their persecution if Jewish Christians departed from the Torah, then Peter's fear seems more likely.³⁶ Perhaps the men from James arrived and said that the threat of persecution against Jewish Christians was increasing because of reports that Jewish Christians in Antioch were departing from food laws and eating with Gentiles.³⁷ Peter feared the consequences of his actions for fellow Jews, who were believers, and thus he ceased eating with Gentiles to protect Jewish believers in Christ and, perhaps, to prevent a schism among Jewish believers.³⁸ [Schreiner, 143–144]

O. Cullmann has observed that Peter's conduct in this situation was a throwback to his earlier pattern of vacillation and denial that marked his character during the earthly ministry of Jesus.¹⁴⁹ On three separate occasions Peter fell into serious trouble when his devotion to Christ was detracted by other factors. First, when he took his eyes off Jesus and began to look at the circumstances of the storm, he started to sink into the lake; then, when he took his eyes off

Jesus and started to focus on himself, in a moment of pressure he denied that he had ever known the Lord; and, finally, when he took his eyes off Jesus and began to look at other people, notably John, Christ had to recall him to the first imperative of discipleship, “Follow me!” (Matt 14:22–36; Luke 22:54–62; John 21:19–23). Here again at Antioch the rock man had become a wave. Again, he took his eyes off Jesus and became obsessed with external circumstances, his own personal position, and other people (“the men from James”). All of this led to the disastrous result of Peter’s “not acting in line with the truth of the gospel.” [George, 178]

2:13 EXEGESIS

GREEK TEXT:

καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ὥστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῆ ὑποκρίσει.

καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν (συνυποκρίνομαι = to join in hypocrisy || Verb: Aorist Passive Indicative, 3P).
αὐτῷ (αὐτός = He, Him || Third Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Masculine Dative Singular).
καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ (λοιπός || Adjective: Masculine Nominative Plural).
Ἰουδαῖοι, (Ἰουδαῖος || Noun: Masculine Nominative Plural).
ὥστε (ὥστε = so that || Conjunction).
καὶ Βαρναβᾶς (Βαρναβᾶς || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular).
συναπήχθη (συναπαγῶ = to lead away; [passive] to be carried away || Verb: Aorist Passive Indicative, 3S).
αὐτῶν (αὐτός = He, Him || Third Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Masculine Genitive Plural).
τῆ ὑποκρίσει. (ὑποκρίσις || Noun: Feminine Dative Singular).

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

And the rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy, so that even Barnabas was carried away by their hypocrisy.

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

And the rest of the Jews joined him in hypocrisy, (καὶ συνυπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι,)

The rest of the believing Jews.

Cf. 2 Tim 4:2 - by means of the hypocrisy of liars seared in their own conscience as with a branding iron.

Hypocrisy:

Hypocrisy hypocrisy, a term and idea that are primarily limited in the Bible to the NT writings. The Greek word transliterated into English as ‘hypocrite’ was used to denote an actor, one who performed behind a mask. Thus the popular understanding came to be that of persons who pretended to be something that they were not. It is interesting to note, however, that hypocrisy does not appear to be so limited in meaning in the NT. The term can sometimes denote general wickedness or evil, self-righteousness, pretense, or breach of ‘contract.’

The best-known passage in the NT describing hypocrisy is Matthew /Matt.* 23:1*/23, where self-righteousness and pretense are both in evidence (cf. also Matt. 6:2, 5, 16; 7:5; 15:7; 22:18; 24:51; Mark 7:6; Luke 6:42; 12:56; 13:15).

In Gal. 2:13, Paul accuses Peter, Barnabas, and other Jewish Christians of hypocrisy (RSV: ‘insincerity’). Although the term does not occur in Acts 5:1-11, the story reflects the seriousness with which the early church regarded hypocritical behavior. Perhaps the most frightening aspect of this sin is that one can enter the state of hypocrisy and not realize it (Matt. 7:21-23). J.M.E. [Paul J. Achtemeier, Harper & Row and Society of Biblical Literature, Harper’s Bible Dictionary (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985), 414]

Instances of: Jacob, in impersonating Esau and deceiving his father, Gen. 27. Jacob’s sons, in deception of their father concerning Joseph, Gen. 37:29–35. Joseph’s deception of his brethren, Gen. 42–44. Pharaoh, Ex. 8:15, 28, 29, 32; 9:27–35; 10:8–29. Balaam, Jude 11, with Num. 22–24. Delilah, the wife of Samson, Judg. 16. Jael, Judg. 4:8–21. Ehud, Judg. 3:15–25. Rabshakeh, 2 Kin. 18:17–37. Ahaz, Isa. 7:12 with vs. 17–25. Johanan, Jer. 42:1–12, 20, 22. Ishmael, Jer. 41:6, 7. The false prophets, Ezek. 13:1–23. Herod, Matt. 2:8. Judas, Matt. 26:25, 48; John 12:5, 6. Pilate, Matt. 27:24. Pharisees, Matt. 15:1–9; 22:18; Mark 12:13, 14; John 8:4–9; 9:24; 19:15. The ruler, Luke 13:14–17. Spies sent to entrap Jesus, Luke 20:21. Priests and Levites, Luke 10:31, 32. Chief priests, John 18:28. Ananias and Sapphira, Acts 5:1–10. Simon Magus, Acts 8:18–23. Peter and other Christians at Antioch, Gal. 2:11–14. Judaizing Christians in Galatia, Gal. 6:13. False teachers at Ephesus, Rev. 2:2. [James Swanson and Orville Nave, New Nave’s Topical Bible (Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, 1994).]

so that even Barnabas was carried away by their hypocrisy. (ὥστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει.)

Barnabas, who was a partner in Paul's ministry to Gentiles.

At this point Paul inserted what is perhaps the most poignant line in the entire epistle, “By their hypocrisy even Barnabas was led astray.” Even Barnabas! Paul’s sorrow and embarrassment over the defection of his close friend and colleague was still a painful memory as he related it to the Galatians. Barnabas had introduced Paul to the Jerusalem believers when others in that city thought he was still a persecutor in disguise. It was Barnabas who had sought out Paul in Tarsus and persuaded him to become a part of the ministry team at Antioch. Barnabas too had stood with Paul in Jerusalem when he defended the liberty of the gospel against the false brothers. And, of course, Barnabas had accompanied Paul on the first missionary journey when many Gentile believers were won to Christ and the churches of Galatia themselves were established. For “even Barnabas” to be carried away was a severe blow! [George, 176]

The effect of Peter’s withdrawal is now mentioned: the other Jewish members of the congregation, and even Barnabas, likewise began to dissociate themselves from the Gentile members. [UBS, 41]

Other translations:

The other Jewish brothers and sisters also started acting like cowards along with Peter; and even Barnabas was swept along by their cowardly action. [The Good News Translation]

The other Jewish Christians carried out a similar piece of deception, and the force of their bad example was so great that even Barnabas was affected by it. [JBP]

The use of this word to describe Peter's action and that of the rest of the Jewish Christians in Antioch implies that Paul still believed that they knew what was right, but that they were acting against their own convictions in the matter. Failure to act in accordance with one's convictions because of fear of what some persons might say certainly is "to act like a coward." In this sense the rendering of TEV is justified. [UBS, 41–42]

But now regarding Barnabas, and the fact that he was swept off his feet and carried away with their hypocrisy. It was bad enough for Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles and the champion of Gentile liberty from the law, to have Peter act as he did. But the hypocrisy of Barnabas was the cruel blow. With the single exception of Paul, Barnabas had been the most effective minister of the gospel in the conversion of the Gentiles. He had been deputed with Paul by the Antioch church to the council at Jerusalem as its representative. He had come back with the news that the position held by Paul and himself with regard to Gentile freedom from circumcision had been sustained by the Jerusalem apostles. Now, his withdrawal from social fellowship with the Gentiles, came with the force of a betrayal to Paul and the church at Antioch. The defection of Barnabas was of a far more serious nature with regard to Gentile freedom than the vacillation of Peter. Barnabas was Paul's chief colleague in the evangelization of the Gentiles, and now to have him play the hypocrite and deserter, was a bitter blow to the great apostle. This may well have prepared the way for the dissension between them which shortly afterwards led to their separation (Acts 15:39). Barnabas, the foremost champion of Gentile liberty next to Paul had become a turncoat. [Wuest, Ga 2:13]

2:14 EXEGESIS

GREEK TEXT:

ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾶ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων· εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν;

ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον (εἶδον || Verb: Aorist Active Indicative, 1S).

ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν (ὀρθοποδεω = to act rightly, to be straightforward || Verb: Present Active Indicative, 3P). “a straight path.” Hapax.

πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν (ἀλήθεια || Noun: Feminine Accusative Singular).

τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, (εὐαγγελίον || Noun: Neuter Genitive Singular).

εἶπον (εἶπον || Verb: Aorist Active Indicative, 1S).

τῷ Κηφᾶ (Κηφας || Noun: Masculine Dative Singular).

ἔμπροσθεν (ἔμπροσθεν = before, in the presence of || Preposition).

πάντων· (πάς || Adjective: Masculine Genitive Plural).

εἰ σὺ (σὺ || Second Person Independent Personal Pronoun: Nominative Singular).

Ἰουδαῖος (Ἰουδαῖος || Noun: Masculine Nominative Singular).

ὑπάρχων (ὑπάρχω = to be || Participle: Masculine Nominative Singular Present Active).

ἐθνικῶς (ἐθνικῶς = like a Gentile || Adverb).

καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς (Ἰουδαϊκῶς = like a Jew || Adverb).

ζῆς, (ζαῶ || Verb: Present Active Indicative, 2S).

πῶς τὰ ἔθνη (ἔθνος || Noun: Neuter Accusative Plural).

ἀναγκάζεις (ἀναγκάζω = to compel, force || Verb: Present Active Indicative, 2S). Same word as in 2:3.

ἰουδαΐζειν; (Ἰουδαΐζω = to live like Jews || Verb: Present Active Infinitive).

ENGLISH TRANSLATION:

But when I saw that they were not acting straightforward concerning the truth of the gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all: “If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how [is it that] you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?”

CONTEXTUAL, GRAMMATICAL, THEOLOGICAL, APPLICATIONAL ANALYSIS:

But when I saw that they were not acting straightforward concerning the truth of the gospel, (ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,)

“In this verse, Paul circles back to where this brief paragraph began: his public rebuke of Peter.” [Moo, 149]

ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον = implies that Peter and Barnabas arrived in Antioch while Paul was absent. When Paul arrived, he saw what was going on.

The word translated uprightly is from orthopodeo (ὀρθοποδεο). Orthos (ὀρθος) means straight, and pous (πους), which has the same root as the verb podo (ποδο), means foot, literally “to walk with straight feet,” thus “to walk a straight course.” It speaks of straightforward,

unwavering, sincere conduct in contrast to a crooked, wavering, and more or less insincere course such as Paul had said Peter and the other Jews were guilty of. [Wuest, Ga 2:14]

On “truth of the gospel” cf. 2:5.

One can deny with one's conduct the truth one professes with the lips (cf. sham Christians).

I said to Cephas in the presence of all: (εἶπον τῷ Κηφᾷ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων·)

We have the question of where the quotations marks end in the text from this point forward.

This controversy between the two apostles was so painfully unedifying to some later fathers of the church that they tried to remove the offence which it presented. Clem. Alex., Hyp. (apud Euseb. HE 1.12), distinguished the Cephas of this episode from the apostle. Towards the end of the fourth century there was an interesting exchange of correspondence between Jerome and Augustine on the subject. Jerome, in his commentary on Galatians, said that Paul actually believed that Peter's action was justified, but opposed it at Antioch ‘in order to soothe the minds of trouble-makers’ (ut quasi animos tumultuantium deliniret); Augustine took him to task for this, and gave his own more reasonable account of the matter. Jerome claimed the authority of others, especially Origen, for his interpretation. (See Augustine, Epp. 28.3; 40.3f.; 82.4ff.; Jerome, Ep. 112.4ff.) Had Jerome been right, Paul would have been at least as guilty of ‘play-acting’ as those whom he criticizes on this score. [Bruce, 133–134]

Was this an impromptu event or a more formal meeting called for this purpose?

“If you, being a Jew, live like a Gentile and not like a Jew, how [is it that] you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews? (εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῆς, πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν;)

When Peter was in Antioch/with Gentiles he lived as a Gentile from the perspective that he wasn't worried about Jewish dietary/purity laws.

“He did not focus on the boundary markers that separated Jews from Gentiles. Gentiles who believed in Christ were considered to be equally members of the people of God, and Peter placed no emphasis on Jewish distinctives like circumcision or food laws. He enjoyed table fellowship with Gentiles and ate their food, and hence implicitly taught that observing purity laws was irrelevant for belonging to the people of God.

The word “compel” (ἀναγκάζεις) forges a link with the false brothers of 2:3–5.52 We saw above that Peter, like the false brothers, endangered “the truth of the gospel.” Now we see that Peter is in effect compelling the Gentiles to become Jews to belong to the people of God, just as the false brothers tried to compel (ἠναγκάσθη, 2:3) Titus to be circumcised. Peter's actions, then, put him in the same category as the false brothers. He was deviating from the truth of the gospel and compelling Gentiles to adopt the Jewish law in order to be saved.

Still, Paul does not identify Peter as a false brother, for Peter was acting hypocritically, not in accord with his convictions. Those who tried to force Titus to be circumcised were not genuine

Christians, because they believed that one had to be circumcised to be saved. Peter, however, was a genuine believer, for his actions contradicted his beliefs. We have here another piece of evidence supporting the idea that Peter repented at Paul's rebuke, for if he did not, Paul would have considered him to be a false brother like those described in 2:3–5. It is clear from 1:18 and 2:1–10 (and later Pauline writings, as noted earlier) that Paul was convinced that Peter was a genuine Christian. Nevertheless, Paul severely reprimands Peter, for his behavior had the inadvertent effect of compromising the gospel, of suggesting that Gentiles had to observe the food laws to belong to the people of God. [Schreiner, 146–147]

Paul's confrontation is direct and to the point. 'Peter, you've been living like a Gentile, making no distinction between Jews and non-Jews. How can you now insist, as your behaviour is insisting, on Gentiles becoming Jews in order to become part of the inner circle of God's people?'

So far, the charge is simple inconsistency. Peter has been doing one thing one minute and the opposite the next. Paul is about to go on to develop the point with more theological scaffolding. But his fundamental point, which echoes down the centuries of church history as a warning to all who want to put on masks of respectability from time to time, is quite clear. All those in Christ must be who they truly are. You don't need masks or make-up in the kingdom of God. [Wright, 23]

The implication to Gentiles is that it's Christ + the law. Cannot be Christ plus anything. Solus Christus.