

**THE EFFECT OF PETER'S ATTITUDE  
TO CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP IN ANTIOCH  
AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY CHURCH  
LEADERS**

**Oladosu, Samson Bisi (PhD)**

Department of Islamic, Christian and Comparative  
Religious Studies, Kwara State University, Malete, P.M.B  
1530, Ilorin, Kwara State  
[sambisidosu61@gmail.com](mailto:sambisidosu61@gmail.com)  
07033249214

And

**Abodunrin, Michael Olusegun**

United Missionary Church of Africa Theological College, Ilorin  
[mikebodunrin@yahoo.com](mailto:mikebodunrin@yahoo.com)  
08038134819

**Abstract**

The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians has been exposed to critical scrutiny by exegetes and biblical scholars, especially on Paul's reaction to Peter's attitude on Christian fellowship in Antioch as recorded in Galatians 2:11-13. Could Paul's reaction be interpreted as rude noting the position of Peter in the early Church or could it be regarded as God's means of rebuking Peter and not the personality of Paul? Analyzing the attitude of Peter and the effects it had on the fellowship, should more importance be laid on protecting Peter's personality or save a fellowship from wrangling situation? The research employed exegetical method. The major challenge the church faces even from her inception is disunity, therefore, the work recommended that in order to avoid unnecessary arguments and factionalisation in the Christian church, the leaders should concentrate more on the work of salvation which Jesus had wrought and de-emphasize tradition taking the lead of the Church.

**Keywords:** Peter, Slip, Attitude, Paul, Exegetes

**Introduction**

The Epistle of Paul to Galatians has been opened to critical study over the years. What attracts the critical examinations by scholars is the nature of the epistle- in defense of Paul's Gospel and Apostleship.<sup>1</sup> More importantly is lack of detailed information on the matters addressed in the epistle. The only source of information of the incident in Antioch as recorded in Galatians 2:11-13 is Paul. There is no document we can access to give Peter's version of the story which would have assisted more in giving sober judgment. This may have led to the various interpretations of the passage Galatians 2:11-

13. For instance, Ebionites have interpreted the passage to set attack on Paul for being rude to higher authority. Marcion on the other hand had interpreted it to set attack on Peter for being a coward and prove the direct antagonism of Christianity to everything Jewish. Celsus and Porphyry have used it to accuse Peter and Paul for their shameful quarrel, which was not healthy for the growth of the church. Tertullian in his interpretation opines that Paul over-reacted to Peter's action. Clement of Alexandria claims that the Cephas referred to is not Cephas the Apostle who was a disciple of Jesus, but is one of the seventy Apostles who shared the same name with Peter. Origen, Chrysostom and Jerome are of the opinion that the record was like a deliberate staged play to condemn the Judaizers. Augustine of Hippo considers it as a case of the higher claim to truth over rank and office.<sup>2</sup>

One major issue that led to the reaction of Paul as the passage reflects is the separation of Peter, other Jewish Christians in Antioch and Barnabas from table-fellowship with Gentile Christians. One wonders why that should be a case with Peter in particular, one who was an eyewitness of the challenges Jesus faced with religious traditionalists and how Jesus down-played tradition in the face of obeying God's word (see Mt. 15:2-6; Mk. 7:3-13; Mt. 9:10-13; Mk 2:16; Lk. 5:30; 15:2; Mt 12:1-10). It may also sound surprising that Peter after the Joppa experience would withdraw from what he was convinced of doing. What could have led to this action of his towards the Gentile Christians in Antioch? What effect did his action have? And what implications, could be suggested that, his action may have had in the church at Antioch? Then, how does this apply to the contemporary church leaders.

### **The Man Peter**

The Apostle Peter may have been the most outspoken of the twelve apostles in the ministry of Jesus on earth. He certainly became one of the boldest witnesses for the faith. His beginnings were certainly humble in origin. He was born by Jona and his mother's name was never mentioned, about 1 B.C. and died sometime around A.D. 67.<sup>3</sup>

Peter was originally named Simon, which appears in the Grecized form of *συμεων* only in Acts 15:14. Elsewhere it appears as the Greek name *σιμων* in Matthew 17:25, Mark. 1:16, 29f, 36; Jesus was the one who changed Peter's name. Peter means "rock" or literally Petra. He was a Galilean fisherman and was the brother of Andrew. The brothers came from the village of Bethsaida (Jn 1:43, 12:21). Peter was married. He was also a follower of John the Baptist. Peter, like all humans before their calling, was a sinful man. In fact he was ashamed of his sinfulness in the presence of Jesus Christ (Lk. 5:6-8). Peter was perhaps the very first disciple that Jesus called along with His brother Andrew.<sup>4</sup>

Fishermen at that time were gruff, unkempt, vile, shabbily dressed, and often used vulgar language. The fishermen of the first century were full of vigour and had boisterous tempers. This is perhaps why James and his brother John were called the Sons of Thunder (Mark 3:17). Theirs was a rough life since fishing was a very physically

demanding job. They must have been somewhat fearless too because some of the storms that came quickly upon the Sea of Galilee were fierce and furious. They often caught the fishermen by surprise and could easily capsize the 20 to 30 foot boats they used.<sup>5</sup>

Peter was always putting his foot in his mouth but one thing one could say about Peter was that when Jesus told Peter and Andrew to “follow me” they simply walked away and left everything they had without a second thought (Luke 5:9-1). Consider the fact that this meant that they left everything – all of their fishing boats, their fishing nets, and all the accessories that came with their trade.<sup>6</sup>

As mentioned earlier, Peter was among the first disciples called by Jesus and was frequently their spokesman – for good or bad. One thing that he is credited with is the special insight that he had concerning Jesus’ identity. Peter was the first to call Jesus the Son of the Living God – the Messiah (Mk 8:29, Lk 9:20, Mt 16:16-17). When Jesus called him, Peter knew that He was of God and felt unworthy to be in Jesus presence (Luke 5:6-8). Even so, Jesus did not hesitate and told Peter and Andrew that He would make them “fishers of men” (Mark 1:17).

Peter was bold but often times in the wrong. Once he even rebuked the Lord and said that he was willing to die for Jesus even though at the arrest and trial of Jesus he denied Him three times (Mt. 16:21-22). Jesus loved the disciples and knew which of those whom would remain loyal to Him and those who would betray Him (Judas Iscariot). Peter was an eyewitness to the many miracles that Jesus did and also witnessed the Shekinah Glory along with John and James in the Transfiguration. This was where Jesus’ humanity was peeled back to reveal the glory of His Divinity (Matt. 17:1-9).

Peter was the first one to preach on the day of Pentecost after the coming of the Holy Spirit and he was the first one to proclaim Christ to a Gentile. He was one of the boldest apostles of all. He willingly suffered persecution, imprisonment, beatings, and even rejoiced at the fact that he was worthy to suffer disgrace for the Lord’s sake (Ac.5:41).

In the days leading up to Peter’s death, almost all of the apostles had been martyred. Did Jesus actually predict Peter’s death by crucifixion when He said that “when you are old you will stretch out your hands, and another will dress you and take you where you do not want to go” (John 21:18-19)? The church historian Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius state that Peter’s was stretched out by his hands, he was dressed in prison garb, he was taken where no one wanted to go (a crucifixion), and was crucified. He was said to be crucified upside down because he felt unworthy to be crucified in the way that the Lord Jesus Christ had been.<sup>7</sup>

From an arrogant, cocky, man of thunder, he became a humble, willing, obedient servant of the Lord even to death. He rejoiced in that day of his death, knowing that he would be reunited with his beloved Saviour. This was a lifetime of 65 years – of which his last forty would be devoted to proclaiming the gospel of Jesus Christ.<sup>8</sup>

### Background to Galatians 2:11-13

There is no doubt that Paul the Apostle wrote to the churches in Galatia. There is uncertainty about who the Galatians were because the name could be used both for the descendants of Gallic tribe-Gaul and could also be used to refer to the Roman Province and the residents. But this uncertainty does not feature in the epistle because it is explicit in the epistle that the non-Jews were in view as in 4:8.<sup>9</sup>

Some Jewish Christians who came from Jerusalem to set confusion in relation to the process of becoming a Christian (by circumcision) initiated the main problem of the Galatians. Paul's concern centres on his relationship with the Jerusalem leadership earlier to address the issue of identity that is, becoming a Jew in order to qualify to be a proper Christian (see 2:3, 1:12-2:14).<sup>10</sup> This indicates that the problem had been on for some time and had been addressed at a council in Jerusalem where the Church reached a consensus in regards to the subject matter (Acts 15). Hence, in this epistle Paul describes the purpose of the Jewish Christians that came to trouble them in terms of zeal (1:13-14), wishing to shut them out (4:17) and wishing to boast in their flesh (6:13), all of which show the prominence of Torah. The works of the law which are more emphasized are circumcision, food laws and Jewish feast-days (2:3-6, 12-16; 4:9-10). It was on his argument on the food laws that he reiterated the incident in Antioch

### Antiocheian Church's Set-up

Before we move on to examine the incident in Antioch in Galatians 2:9-11, it will be necessary to consider certain elements that characterized the church at Antioch such as the city, residents, and Christian residents in Antioch. This will enable us to have a good background to analyze the incident without bias.

Antioch from Greek *αντιοχεια* was an ancient and large cosmopolitan city of Syria on the site of the modern Antakya in Turkey which preserves the name. It was founded by Seleucus in 300 BC and named after his father Antiochus. It was a royal city of the Seleucid kings. The city was a Greek military colony and the population was made of the neighboring indigenous people so that it became one of the largest cities of the Hellenistic-Roman world. During the Roman rule, it was made a free city and the capital of the province of Syria. At this time, it became a famous intellectual center, and this lasted up to the emergence of Christianity. Antioch was one of the famous theological schools of the 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> centuries. This implies that the residents at Antioch were exposed to civilization to some considerable measure, hence relating with them must require some measure of understanding too.<sup>11</sup>

Antioch first appears in the New Testament in Acts 11:19ff. The Christian community was founded by fugitives from the persecution of the Christians in Jerusalem which followed the death of Stephen. The fugitives initially had the Jews in mind to be the audience of their preaching, but some Greeks eventually accepted the gospel and this resulted into remarkable success of the preaching of the fugitives, so that the Jerusalem community had to send Barnabas to the city as in Acts 11:26, and later, Barnabas sent for Paul to come down to Antioch as in Acts 11:26.<sup>12</sup>

It was in Antioch that the followers of Jesus were first addressed as Christians in Acts 11:26, the origin of which is not certain. It must be noted that the church at Antioch was rated to be the next after the Jerusalem Church and this suggests how large and important it was. In the Gentile communities, it was the largest and perhaps this made the church so rich that she could gather generous subvention for the Jerusalem Church, which was sent through Barnabas and Paul as in Acts 11:27-30. The strength of the church and the level of her independence is explicit in her decision to send Barnabas and Paul on missionary Journey (Acts 13:1ff), without consulting the Jerusalem Church, and when Barnabas and Paul returned, they reported to the Antioch Church and not to Jerusalem Church (Acts 14:26ff).<sup>13</sup>

### Historic-Critical Analysis of the Incident in Antioch

As earlier discussed, the problem of identity had been addressed in the Jerusalem Council and the consensus reached, as stated in the epistle under study, include: Firstly, "that we should be for gentiles" which implies that the leadership of Jerusalem Church had acknowledged and recognized the grace in Paul (the thought of grace given is characteristic of Paul; he often refers to the grace he himself had received- Rom. 12:3; 1 Cor. 3:10; Eph. 3:2,7 etc) and that the grace of preaching, whether to the circumcised or the uncircumcised is provided by the same Lord as is reflected in 2:7. At the recognition of this grace, James, Cephas<sup>14</sup> and John "who were reputed to be pillars" (*οι δοκουντες στυλοι ειναι*) gave to them "right hand of fellowship" (*δεξιας εδωκαν εμοι και βαρναβα κοινωνιας*). Referring to a person as a pillar was naturally familiar imaging the person as a strong support. But the "pillars" as it appears here is frequently used in the LXX to refer to the supports of the tabernacle and pillars of the Temple (see 1 Kings 7:15-22; II Kings 23:3). It is probable therefore that the three individuals were considered to be "Pillars in the Temple" as in Revelation 3:12 not just ordinary pillars.<sup>15</sup>

The right hand fellowship- In Jewish custom, a right hand is given as a sign of acceptance, assurance, pledge, and at the conclusion of an agreement. The latter is confirmed by the parties to the agreement in this passage- Party 1: James, Cephas and John, Party 2: Paul and Barnabas. Although in Paul's thought generally, the idea of fellowship usually connotes condition of sharing some things including the Holy Spirit. However, here, handshake is implied to indicate the mutual agreements the two parties have made. It is also noteworthy that the "pillars" were considered to be superior based on the hierarchy of the church, hence their conclusion was stronger. The right hand fellowship was given to consolidate the division of responsibility- between the Gentiles and the Circumcised.<sup>16</sup>

Secondly, "that we should remember the poor". The verb *μνημονευομεν* meaning, "remember" gives a connotation of continuing the practice (it is in the present tense) and also implies that the remembrance of the "poor" *πτωχων* is not to be limited to those who had financial needs. But primarily the practice of the early church in selling off individual properties to cater for the needy indicates that the poor were those who lacked resources to maintain life.<sup>17</sup>

### The Incident at Antioch

Paul in verses 11-14 now makes his main point in 1:11-12 more explicit, emphasizing that his gospel was not derived from the Jerusalem leadership. He ascertained that all that the pillars had contributed was at the Jerusalem consultation recognizing the grace of God in him and Barnabas as Apostles for the Gentile mission. In respect with this fact, "Paul turns at once to the sequel": the agreement was not properly honoured subsequently in the incident at Antioch.

Juxtaposing the two events is abrupt, but it could be that he intended it that way so that he could set a contrast clearly between 2:9 where Cephas shook his hand on an agreement and 2:12 where it is made clear how the same person did otherwise in Antioch. It is implicit here that Paul was climaxing his defense of the gospel he preached on his faithfulness to the Jerusalem agreement even though Peter and others chose to breach the agreement.<sup>18</sup>

The sequence "he came" and "they came" to Antioch suggests that Paul was a representative of Antioch and one of the people that had been saddled the responsibility for the missionary work among the Gentiles which the Church in Antioch sponsored. This implies that Paul was a host of Peter at his visit. His reference to their coming does not refer them as strangers, unqualified or unwanted. Paul made reference to their coming in order to show how much of freedom they had in relating with the people and the realm of authority they had entered in Gentile mission which Paul was a representative.<sup>19</sup> The visit of Peter and others to Antioch cannot be described as official visit. It had been a regular practice not only in preaching but in table-fellowship. This may be as a result of the large Jewish colony in Antioch. The expression of Paul in confronting Peter "κατεγινωσμενος" as is rendered- "I opposed him to his face" shows that Paul was confident that he was on the right side and this is well reflected in Peter's condemnation. "Because he stood condemned" is not clear enough to know whether he was assuming that his audience would think right to know that Peter had acted wrongly, or that God himself condemned him, or that Peter was himself self-condemned especially in relation to the agreement in 2:6-10, or that Peter's conscience would prick him.<sup>20</sup> Even though the expression is not clear enough, the point is clear that there was a breach in contract and that is inconsistency on the part of Peter. This is clear in the next statement that begins with a conjunction "γαρ" meaning "for" to give the reason for the Apostle's verdict in verse 12. The time scale sounds unclear. For instance, for how long was it after the Jerusalem consultation before Peter came to Antioch? How long did he participate in table-fellowship with them before "certain men" came? Had the church in Antioch been practicing table-fellowship before the coming of Peter?<sup>21</sup> As much as we feel that certain things are hidden from us which are clear to the immediate audience, one could deduce possible solution in the general practice of the sacred obligation of hospitality to strangers in the ancient societies and the importance attached as an expression of acceptance.

Table-fellowship in Jewish context is a "sacramental character"- The host presents the meal, speaks blessing over it and shares it with others to partake in the blessing spoken over the meal.<sup>22</sup> There were food laws that governed Jewish eating as stated in Lev. 11; Deut. 14; Lev. 17:10-14; Deut 12:16,23-24, etc. These laws were to safeguard the purity

of the meal table. The Jews in diaspora who were purity conscious had to separate from table-fellowship. No wonder it was a great offense by the fact that Jesus ignored these laws ( e.g. Mk.2:16; Matt. 11:19; Lk. 14:12-24).

The major concern in the incident in Antioch is what made Peter to draw back and separated himself from the table-fellowship with Christians in Antioch not from unbelievers. The answer may sound simple as is expressed in the passage- simply because he feared those of the circumcision who came from James who represented James' position. As earlier noted, the practice of the Jews, as their custom allowed was not to eat with the gentiles. The Cornelius' episode reveals how importantly the practice was held even within the earliest Christian Movement (see Acts 10:14;11:3.8).

It is expedient to observe that many Gentiles in the early church were eager to cross the boundaries to some extent and were welcomed by the Jews. It does not seem in the passage under study that the proselytes were affected. From the argument of Paul, the uncircumcised were affected. In line with this, there are two possibilities in interpreting what upset the certain individuals from James as noted by Dunn- 1. That Peter and the other Jewish believers abandoned the food laws in its entirety so that their attitude to the food laws renders them as living like Gentiles. 2. That Peter and the others were sharing table fellowship with Gentile Christians on less clearly defined Jewish terms. In other words, they did not only welcome Gentiles to their tables but also accepting invitations to Gentiles' table without asking questions to find out if the Gentiles Peter and others were sharing with were proper proselytes.<sup>23</sup>

The latter seem to be more favourable because it is possible that there were considerable number of Gentile believers who were properly adopted into the faith as proselytes. Also, that there were many Jews in Antioch who would not just give up on their heritage even on food laws. Another significant possibility could be that Paul was trying to portray Peter's attitude in the light of the practice that started during the Maccabean and post-Maccabean period, a practice of factionalism where a sect would consider itself righteous than the other did. Some of these sects include the Pharisees and the Essenes who separated themselves from others in their table-fellowship in order to prove their faithfulness to the law as higher than others.<sup>24</sup>

### **Possible Reasons for Peter's Action**

Sharing table-fellowship with Gentiles at this time was not the first experience of Peter, he had enjoyed the fellowship with Cornelius, even though Cornelius was designated a God-fearing Gentile (Acts 10:2; 22, 35) and Titus too must have ate with Peter in Jerusalem. In view of this, one would wonder why Peter had to draw back from what he had been practicing.

Dunn would be right by saying that the Antioch incident, as is related to the agreement in Jerusalem is less than clear, but some deduction could be possible particularly on the food laws- there could be misunderstandings among the parties (Paul and James) to this agreement or differences in interpretation.<sup>25</sup> Paul may be trying to safeguard the right of the Gentile Christians and James people trying to safeguard the right of Jewish Christians

in Antioch to continue living as Jews and not be contaminated. This, perhaps made Peter and other believers get confused. The difference between Peter and James could simply be the difference in soft interpretation and hard interpretation of the Jerusalem agreement.<sup>26</sup> The position of John would have shed more light on the matter, but this is not mentioned in the passage.

It was also possible that Peter acted based on the current political situation which was volatile at this time marked by a sequence of weak procurators in Palestine and intermittent outbreaks of nationalist violence. In other words, loyalists attempted to mark out and maintain the boundary markers in order to distinguish their nation.<sup>27</sup>

It was also possible that after the agreement James who was representing the Jerusalem Church went back on the agreement and gave an apostolic decree negating the agreement, and perhaps this was what the emissaries of James brought with them which had led to the crisis in Antioch.<sup>28</sup>

If there is any reason to claim for the action of Peter, probably it would be that he recognized the demand by the James people that the Jewish believers should continue practicing as Jews, and perhaps Peter was convicted the result of which made him to withdraw (which Keener considers not to be the case).<sup>29</sup> If this is true, was that the reason why other Jewish believer and Barnabas withdrew too? If the reason was that, he was an Apostle for the Jews (circumcised) and he was expected to maintain the Jewish customs and practice, one would have expected that he would be consistent with that wherever he went and if he had to do otherwise, it should have been with genuine reason. Nevertheless, for whatever reasons, Paul in his reaction regarded Peter's action as perversion of the Gospel.

### **The Effect of Peter's Action**

Following the step of Peter who is considered as one of the reputed pillars of the early Church, (Gal.2:9) others acted the same way by withdrawing from fellowshiping with Gentile Christians. The other Jews mentioned here were not the emissaries; the Jewish Christians who were in Antioch were in view. "The other Jews" as used here may be derogatory referring to those that are from Palestine especially Judea having an identity showing that those who are of the same national stuff shared the same loyalty and practices.<sup>30</sup>

At this juncture, it is necessary to note that what could be considered as the effect of the withdrawal of Peter, Barnabas and other Jewish Christians from communal meal is not clear. Based on Paul's rebuke, there is no indication that Peter accepted the rebuke or not and we are not sure whether Peter and others repented and resumed the table-fellowship with Gentile Christians. But it is evident that their withdrawal had great effect on the Gentile Christians who were compelled to "Judaize". Their withdrawal also made Paul to distant himself from Jerusalem in 2:6 with Barnabas in Acts 15:36-41 and Antioch in Acts 28:22. It must be noted that these breaches were not permanent because Barnabas was recalled in I Cor. 9:6; Col.4:10 and Acts 28:22. Paul reconnected with Antioch about sixty years after in Rom. 15:26-27.

Paul considered the withdrawal of Peter as inconsistent with "the truth of the Gospel" which was secured, in Paul's understanding by the Jerusalem agreement. Hence, the action of Peter derailed other Jews from the truth of the Gospel and led to the increasing hostility during this period and beyond towards Paul by conservative Jewish Christians.

Whatever reason may have led to the action of Peter, the following could be noted against him: 1. That he acted as a weak "Pillar" 2. That he was inconsistent. 3. That he was a betrayer. 4. That he was afraid of "false brothers". 5. That his fear was not in order to encourage the Gentile Christians. 6. That he was drawing back gradually from what he was convinced of doing in the first place shows a measure of deception on his part- he was a hypocrite. 7. that he was denying the Gentile Christians the fellowship they have been enjoying with him. 8. He violated the unity of the Church as rightly put by keener.<sup>31</sup>

### The Implications for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Church Leaders

In view of the discussion above, it is important for us to see how it applies to the leaders of the contemporary church. According to Maxwell, a leader is someone who knows the way and leads the way.<sup>32</sup> The implication of not putting leading before knowing in his definition might be that it would be disastrous to have an ignorant person to lead so that he could learn or know. Some of the leadership traits or leadership qualities include honesty, forward-looking, competence, inspiring and intelligence. None of these should be missing in considering leadership qualities because the honesty in the leader determines his set goal, the goal determines his competency in executing and his competency inspires the group he leads and these amount to the level of his intelligence.

The major challenge the church faces even from her inception is disunity. There are many factors that have been proposed to have led to this major problem as discussed by interpreters of the history of the church, such as Eusebius as reviewed by Norman H. Baynes, in his work "Eusebius and the Christian Empire," *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London 1955) 168-172; Socrates of Constantinople also known as Socrates Scholasticus, as cited by Glanville Downey in his work: *The Perspective of the Early Church Historians and others*. The main factor this work concentrates on is the Church leadership in handling relationship between culture and Gospel. There are various denominational differences today, which emerged because of rigidity on the tradition of the church. Some of these traditions may not be substantiated with biblical facts. Some are mere adherence to the culture of the missionary who brought the faith to the community. A typical example is the experience of Africans with white missionaries.

The missionaries to Africa brought Christianity in their own culture and regarded most of African cultural values as pagan. Hence, this affects the practice of the faith and the interpretation of the scriptures by colonized Pastors, theologian and church leaders. As it relates to theologians, Adamo, in his analysis of what African biblical studies is, claims that an Africa study is contextual since interpretation is always done in a particular context noting some methodological characteristics.<sup>33</sup> These are only applicable today. The white missionaries trained and brain-washed many Pastors, Theologians and Evangelists with western methods before the principles proposed by Adamo and other Africa biblical scholars came in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century. The influence of these leaders can

still be felt until date so that some traditions that are upheld in Churches are western and do not help in understanding the scriptures the way it ought to be understood, causing rancor and arguments that lead to disunity. In respect of the point above Ukpong emphasized inculturation as a fundamental process of decolonization especially in interpreting the scriptures.<sup>35</sup>

### Conclusion

It must be noted that there is no way one can separate the culture of a people from the religion they practise. Even if the religion looks foreign, the people can better practice the religion in their own culture. This applies to Africa. Most concepts that appear in the Bible to be Jewish could be better understood in their own culture since it is all about the message.

Therefore, in order to avoid unnecessary arguments and factionalisation in the Christian church, this paper suggests that the leaders should concentrate more on the work of salvation which Jesus had wrought and de-emphasize tradition taking the lead of the Church. Emphasising tradition above the message may lead to drifting members to other churches and may lead to unnecessary proliferation of churches.

### Endnotes

1. Richard N. Longnecker, *Word Biblical Commentary: Galatians* (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1990), p. 71
2. *ibid*
3. Ernest Best, "Simon Peter" in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.), p. 695
4. John L. Mckenzie, "Peter" in *Dictionary of the Bible* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1978), p. 663
5. *ibid*
6. Roland H. Bainton, *The Church of our Fathers* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950), pp. 14-15
7. *ibid*
8. John L. Mckenzie, "Peter" in *Dictionary of the Bible*, p. 667
9. Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary (New Testament) : Galatians* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1993), p. 98.
10. *ibid*
11. Paul Lawrence, "Antioch" in *The Lion Atlas of Bible History* (Oxford: Lion Hudson Plc., 2006), p. 100
12. Krister Stendahl, "Antioch of Syria" in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993
13. John L. Mckenzie, "Antioch" in *Dictionary of the Bible* London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1978
14. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: Galatians* U.S.A: United Bible Societies, 2007, p. 523. In 2:9 Ιακωβος και κηφας και Ιωαννης- Several witnesses, □chiefly western, replace the Aramaic name κηφας with the more familiar Greek name πετρος. This also reflects in 1:18 and 2:11. Instead of the Aramaic name κηθας, the Textus Receptus following D F G K L syr<sup>hxt</sup> goth Marcion Marius

- Victorinus Chrysostom, substitutes *πετρος* but *κηφας* is strongly supported by Codex Sinaiticus.
15. James D.G. Dunn, *Black's New Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Hendrickson Pub. Coy., 1993), 70
  16. F.F. Bruce, *International Greek Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Galatians* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1982), p. 106
  17. James D.G. Dunn, *Black's New Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Galatians* (London: Hendrickson Pub. Coy., 1993), p. 78
  18. George Eldon Ladd *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002), p. 390; also see Walter A. Elwell and Robert W. Yarbrough, *Encountering the New Testament: Corinthians and Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998), p. 132
  19. James D.G. Dunn, *Black's New Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Galatians*.p. 60
  20. *ibid*
  21. *ibid*
  22. *ibid*; Paul A. Holloway, "The Enthymeme as an Element of Style in Paul" in *JBL* Vol.120, No.2, 2001. P. 329- Paul employs the figure of enthymeme at least three times in his letter to the Galatians. The first occurs in 2:14, where it forms the thesis of his famous indictment of Peter at Antioch. Peter had joined Paul and Barnabas in eating with Gentile Christians until "certain ones from James" arrived, at which point he separated himself. Paul saw in this retraction a perversion of the gospel, and he confronted Peter with the following question: *ει συ Ιουδαιος υπαρχων εθνικως και ουχι Ιουδαιικως ζης , πως τα εθνη αναγκαζεις Ιουδαιζειν*. In this complex enthymeme Paul alleges as many as three contradictions in Peter's behavior: first, he is compelling Gentiles to live as Jews (*τα εθνη αναγκαζεις Ιουδαιζειν*); second, he is enforcing a standard from which he himself has just recently departed (*συ...ουχι Ιουδαιικως ζης*);and third, he has not held to this standard even though he is himself a Jew (*Ιουδαιος υπαρχων*)
  23. *ibid*
  24. Merrill C. Tenney, *New Testament Survey* (London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1964.), p. 109
  25. James D.G. Dunn, *Black's New Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Galatians*
  26. John Stott, *The Message of Galatians*, (Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), p 102
  27. H.D. Betz, *Galatians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), p. 97
  28. Donald Guthrie, "Galatians" in *New Century Bible* (London: Oliphant, 1969), p. 308
  29. Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary (New Testament) : Galatians*. P.367; this is more elaborate in Giuseppe Betori, "Luke 24:47: Jerusalem and the Beginning of the Preaching to the Pagans in the Acts of the Apostles" in *Luke and Acts* ed.Gerald O'Collins, S.J. and Gilberto Marconi (New York: Paulist Press, 1991), p. 100
  30. C .K. Barrett, *New Testament Essay* (London: SPCK, 1972), pp. 58-60; also see Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1990), p. 275
  31. Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary (New Testament) : Galatians.*, p. 367
  32. *ibid*
  33. David Tuesday Adamo, "what is African Biblical Studies?" in *Decolonization of Biblical Interpretation in Africa*. Ed. S.O Abogunrin. A Publication of Nigerian Association of Biblical Studies (Ibadan: NABIS., 2005), p. 17
  34. *ibid*

35. J.S. Ukpong, "Inculturation as Decolonization of Biblical Studies in Africa" in *Decolonization of Biblical Interpretation in Africa*. Ed. S.O Abogunrin. A Publication of Nigerian Association of Biblical Studies (Ibadan: NABIS., 2005), p. 32

### Bibliography

- Adamo, David Tuesday. "what is African Biblical Studies?" in *Decolonization of Biblical Interpretation in Africa*. Ed. S.O Abogunrin. A Publication of Nigerian Association of Biblical Studies. Ibadan: NABIS., 2005
- Bainton, Roland H. *The Church of our Fathers*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950.
- Barrett, C. K. *New Testament Essay*. London: SPCK, 1972.
- Best, Ernest "Simon Peter" in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Betori, Giuseppe "Luke 24:47: Jerusalem and the Beginning of the Preaching to the Pagans in the Acts of the Apostles" in *Luke and Acts* ed. Gerald O'Collins, S.J. and Gilberto Marconi. New York: Paulist Press, 1991
- Betz, H.D. *Galatians*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Bruce, F.F. *International Greek Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Galatians*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1982.
- Dunn, James D.G. *Black's New Testament Commentary: The Epistle to the Galatians*. London: Hendrickson Pub. Coy., 1993
- Elwell, Walter A. and Robert W. Yarbrough, *Encountering the New Testament: Corinthians and Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998
- Guthrie, Donald "Galatians" in *New Century Bible*. London: Oliphant, 1969.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1990.
- Holloway, Paul A. "The Enthymeme as an Element of Style in Paul" in *JBL* Vol.120, No.2, 2001.
- Keener, Craig S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary New Testament : Galatians*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1993.
- Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2002.
- Lawrence, Paul. "Antioch" in *The Lion Atlas of Bible History*. Oxford: Lion Hudson Plc., 2006.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Word Biblical Commentary: Galatians*. Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1990.
- Mckenzie, John L. "Antioch" in *Dictionary of the Bible*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1978
- Mckenzie, John L. "Peter" in *Dictionary of the Bible*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1978.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: Galatians* U.S.A: United Bible Societies, 2007,
- Stendahl, Krister. "Antioch of Syria" in *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993
- Stott, John. *The Message of Galatians*, Nottingham: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988.
- Tenney, Merrill C. *New Testament Survey*. London: Inter-Varsity Press, 1964.
- Ukpong, J.S. "Inculturation as Decolonization of Biblical Studies in Africa" in *Decolonization of Biblical Interpretation in Africa*. Ed. S.O Abogunrin. A Publication of Nigerian Association of Biblical Studies Ibadan: NABIS., 2005