

**“An Antiquated Exegetical Convention”?
Ὅτε Δὲ and Paul’s Chronology of the Incident at Antioch in Galatians**

Brent Niedergall

Abstract

Did Paul’s disagreement with Peter over table fellowship between Jews and gentiles (Gal. 2:11–14) occur before or after Paul’s visit to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus (Gal. 2:1–10)? Most modern scholars read Paul’s narrative in chronological order, understanding that the incident at Antioch happened after Paul’s visit to Jerusalem. However, several scholars such as Gerd Lüdemann have claimed the opposite, arguing that ὅτε δὲ in Galatians 2:11 does not continue Paul’s ongoing chronological narrative. To evaluate the merit of Lüdemann’s claim, we must see if ὅτε δὲ ever introduces an event inserted into a narrative that does not follow preceding narrative information in chronological sequence. Marshalling evidence from Ancient Greek literature, this paper will seek to make an exegetical contribution to research on Paul’s perspective of social tensions between Jews and gentiles by either ruling out Lüdemann’s grammatical claim or putting it back on the table for further consideration.

Introduction

Paul narrates two discrete historical episodes in Galatians 2. The first episode occurred in Jerusalem. Paul, in response to divine revelation, returned to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Titus (Gal. 2:1–10). There he met with “those who seemed influential” (Gal. 2:2, 6)—a group that included James, Peter, and John (Gal. 2:9), seeking approval of his gospel message to the gentiles. Paul reports that he received their approval.¹

¹ For the purposes of this paper, it makes no difference whether Galatians 2:1–10 should be identified with Acts 15 or Acts 11:28–30. On the potential impact this decision makes on an overall chronological

The second episode (Gal. 2:11–14) occurred in Antioch. Paul confronted Peter for his hypocritical behaviour regarding gentile interaction (Gal. 2:13). At first, Peter ate with gentiles. But when “certain men” from James arrived, Peter stopped eating with gentiles because he feared “those of the circumcision” (Gal. 2:12).

Given the agreement between Peter and Paul at Jerusalem, the disagreement at Antioch seems perplexing. Did Peter forget or misunderstand the resolution made at Antioch for Paul and Barnabas to take the gospel to the gentiles? In response to a perceived contradiction, some have suggested Paul does not present these events in chronological order. A trickle of scholars going back to Augustine has suggested that Paul’s narrative in Galatians 2 does not follow a chronological arrangement.² Augustine almost offhandedly comments that he was “more inclined to think” that “Peter did this [came to Antioch] before the meeting of that council at Jerusalem.”³ Centuries later, others developed this postulation much more. Proponents of the non-chronological reading have suggested multiple lines of argumentation, and there is a larger chronological question on the relationship between Galatians 2:1–10 and Acts.⁴ Other arguments and considerations aside, this paper will focus on only one claim used to advance the non-chronological view—Paul’s use of ὅτε δὲ in Galatians 2:11. Potential implications for such a shift include an adjustment to our understanding of Paul’s chronology

reckoning of Paul’s ministry, see Rainer Reisner, *Paul’s Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*, trans. Doug Stott (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 320.

² It is outside of the scope of this paper to consider the additional reasons why Zahn, Munck, and Lüdemann argue that the incident at Antioch occurred before the Jerusalem meeting.

³ Augustine, *Letters of St. Augustin* 82.2.11 (NPNF1 1:353).

⁴ Scholars differ on whether Gal. 2:1–10 refers to Acts 15 or Acts 11:27–30. For a recent bibliography of proponents for each view, see Gibson, Jack J., *Peter Between Jerusalem and Antioch: Peter, James, and the Gentiles* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 216 n. 2.

and perhaps even our dating of Galatians.⁵ Ultimately, the claim for a “chronological rearrangement”⁶ stands or falls on the pragmatics of these two tiny conjunctions.

Non-Chronological Reading Advocates

Most advocates of the non-chronological reading are twentieth-century French and German scholars. Theodor Zahn embraced a non-chronological reading, claiming “The common opinion that this [the incident at Antioch] followed the visit of Paul and Barnabas in Galatians 2:1–10 cannot be justified from the text.”⁷ André Mehat, holding to a non-chronological reading, claims regarding the connection between the episodes at Jerusalem and Antioch, “The link is logical, not chronological.”⁸ Gerd Lüdemann, commonly cited as one of the more recent defenders of the non-chronological position, asserts, “The view that the *hote de* in 2:11 continues the narrative (Oepke, 87–88) is just an antiquated exegetical convention that is unable to explain why *epeita* is not used.”⁹ According to these scholars, the incident at Antioch occurred before the meeting in Jerusalem.

⁵ The relationship between Galatians 2:1–10 and Acts is the primary consideration every scholar attempting to date Galatians must grapple with. Craig Keener recognizes at least six positions. The two most popular positions are Galatians 2:1–10 is (1.) the famine visit referenced in Acts 11:30 and 12:25 or (2.) the Jerusalem Council referenced of Acts 15. If 2:1–10 is referencing the Jerusalem Council (ca. AD 48/49), then Paul must have written Galatians after that event. Craig S. Keener, *Galatians: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019), 8. Those preferring the non-chronological view tend to correlate Galatians 2:1–10 with Acts 15. In accord with my own summarizing question of “Given the agreement between Peter and Paul at Jerusalem, why then the disagreement at Antioch?,” it is easier to grant the Galatians 2 event the weight of Acts 15 if one allows for chronological rearrangement.

⁶ Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*, trans. F. Stanley Jones (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 58.

⁷ Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater* (Leipzig, 1907), 110

⁸ André Mehat, “‘Quand Kèphas vint à Antioch . . .’ que s’est-il passé Pierre et Paul?” *Lumière et Vie* 192 (1989), 33.

⁹ Gerd Lüdemann, *Paul*, 77. Albrecht Oepke, whom Lüdemann references, states “δὲ simply continues the narrative. T. [Theodor] Zahn and V. [Valentin] Weber try in vain to deny the following falls temporally behind the Apostolic Council.” Albrecht Oepke, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, rev. Joachim Rohde, Theological Handkommentar zum Nuen Testament 9, 3rd ed. (1973), 87–88. John Bligh, who discounts Lüdemann’s chronological claim, acknowledges that Paul’s language “does not necessarily imply temporal

Others make the non-chronological claim but omit explanation or support.¹⁰ Others, such as Matthias Schneckenburger, acknowledge the possibility of both the chronological and non-chronological reading, making claims such as this: “ὅτε δὲ can designate any time”—before or after the council described in Gal. 2:1–10.¹¹ While each scholar’s arguments merit individual attention, we will examine grammatical arguments used to support the non-chronological view.

Grammatical Claims for the Non-Chronological View

Lüdemann offers little grammatical explanation, but he does reference the issue raised by Zahn and Munck.¹² Zahn and Munck both present the same substance of a grammatical defense. According to Zahn, “There is no definite or indefinite chronological indication, such as that which linked all previous historical memories.”¹³ He notes Paul’s prior use of ὅτε δὲ in Galatians 1:15, which is followed by three statements introduced with ἔπειτα (“then”).

sequence. John Bligh, *Galatians: A Discussion of St. Paul’s Epistle*, Householder Commentaries 1 (London: St. Paul Publications, 1970), 178.

¹⁰ Hans-Joachim Schoeps includes in a footnote, “The incident at Antioch . . . probably occurred before the Apostolic Council [Gal. 2:1–10]. Hans-Joachim Schoeps, *Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church*, trans. Douglas R. A. Hare (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 19. Gustav Stählin also submits “What we have here is probably one of the not uncommon cases in which Paul does not follow a strict systematic or chronological order.” Yet, unfortunately, Stählin does not reference any other such cases. Gustav Stählin, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, NTD 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 209.

¹¹ Matthias Schneckenburger, *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte: Zugleich eine Ergänzung der neuren Commentare* (Bern: Bruck und Verlag von Chr. Fischer, 1841), 109. Johannes Munck and Josef Hainz are also open to both possibilities. According to Munck, “The text at least leaves open the question whether the clash in Antioch took place before or after the conference in Jerusalem.” Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, trans. Frank Clarke (Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1959), 100. Hainz also believes that a non-chronological order is “thoroughly possible.” Josef Hainz, *Ekklesia*, Biblische Untersuchungen 9 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1972), 121. Cited by Lüdemann, *Paul*, 125 n. 108.

¹² For support, Lüdemann also cites Quintilian’s advice on deviating from chronological order when presenting a defence before a judge. In *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian acknowledges, “Neither do I agree with those who assert that the order of our *statement of facts* should always follow the actual order of events, but have a preference for adopting the order which I consider most suitable” (4.2.83). See Lüdemann, *Paul*, 57–8.

¹³ Theodor Zahn, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, 110–11.

Because Paul introduces the incident at Antioch not with ἔπειτα, but with ὅτε δὲ, Munck claims “we have here a fresh beginning.”¹⁴ H. -M. Féret concurs, acknowledging that while ὅτε δὲ can both indicate chronological sequence and an absolute beginning, Paul would have used ἔπειτα to express a chronological sequence, as he did in 1:18, 1:21, and 2:1.¹⁵ According to Zahn, Munck, and Féret, Paul chose this phrase to avoid marking the incident at Antioch as a sequential event to the meeting in Jerusalem.

Mehat differs slightly in his argumentation, but his overall position strongly resembles that of Zahn, Munck, and Féret. Focusing on δὲ rather than ὅτε, he claims the conjunction is neutral when it comes to indicating chronological succession and is most probably adversative.¹⁶ He also reasons that if Paul intended to denote a chronological sequence, he would have indicated so with a Greek word for “later” or “afterwards.”¹⁷

Almost every modern commentary argues for or assumes Antioch chronologically follows Jerusalem. One notable exception is Steven Runge, who acknowledges the possibility of a non-chronological reading. He raises the possibility that this passage compares to other “sidebar-type comments” that include δέ, such as 1 Corinthians 1:16 and Galatians 1:20.¹⁸ While Runge believes Paul’s construction could be a legitimate instance of a non-

¹⁴ Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, 101.

¹⁵ H. -M. Féret, *Pierre et Paul à Antioche et à Jérusalem* (Paris, 1955), 45. In Dupont’s extensive rebuttal to Féret’s work, he claims that Paul uses ὅτε δὲ when there is a change in subject and ἔπειτα when the subject remains the same. Jacques Dupont, “Pierre et Paul à Antioche et à Jérusalem” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 45 (1957), 53. Dupont’s claim seems to generally hold true, although the sample size is small and 1 Corinthians 15:46 is an exception in which Paul uses ἔπειτα when there is a change in subject.

¹⁶ Mehat, “‘Quand Kèphas vint à Antioch . . .’ que s’est-il passé Pierre et Paul?”, 33.

¹⁷ Mehat, 33. Mehat does not identify any specific Greek words, but perhaps he means μετά with the accusative as a marker of time or the adverbial use of ὕστερος.

¹⁸ Steven E. Runge, *High Definition Commentary: Galatians*, ed. Brannon Ellis, High Definition Commentary Series (Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2019), “Orienting the Events.”

chronological note, he concludes—based on the protracted length of the episode—that the possibility is unlikely.¹⁹

Semantics and Pragmatics of Δέ and Ὅτε

Christopher Fresch, in his analysis of papyri from the third to first centuries BC, concludes that the coordinating conjunction δέ functions as a “segmentation device.”²⁰ Fresch explains that “consistently, δέ appears to be used for structural purposes, explicitly marking out distinct segments within the discourse.”²¹ Paul’s use of δέ in Galatians 2:11 aligns with Fresch’s conclusion and also with Steven Runge’s claim that δέ signals “a distinct development in the story.”²²

The subordinated conjunction ὅτε introduces a temporal clause containing an aorist verb.²³ A temporal clause is subordinate to the main clause and indicates the “reference time with respect to which the main clause must be interpreted.”²⁴ The temporal particle ὅτε is a conjunction that normally appears with indicative verbs.²⁵ And while these verbs can be past,

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ For the terminology of “segmentation device” (or “chunking device”) see Christopher J. Fresch, *Discourse Markers in Early Koine Greek: Cognitive-Functional Analysis and LXX Translation Technique*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 77 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2023), 85.

²¹ Ibid., 59. Fresch adds that “δέ functions to close off or begin new sections (relative to its scope), encouraging the reader to process smaller, more manageable pieces of the discourse at a time.” He finds the same to be true in the Twelve of the LXX and cites scholarship making similar claims for Classical and Postclassical Greek. See pp. 60, 79–89.

²² Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 31.

²³ For more on temporal clauses, see Evert van Emde Boas et al., *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009), 536.

²⁴ Eugenio R. Luján, “Temporal Clauses,” in *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, ed. Georgios K. Giannakis (Leiden: Brill: 2014), 3:374.

²⁵ Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 214. The particle ὅταν (ὅτε + ἄν) often occurs with the subjunctive.

present, or future, the present is rare, and “the great bulk of the examples [in the NT] are in the past with the aorist indicative.”²⁶ In a temporal clause, this conjunction indicates simultaneity by either indicating that one point of time coincides with another time (translated “when,” in English) or that a period of time coextends with another period of time (translated, “as long as” or “while,” in English).²⁷ Heinrich von Siebenthal notes that the temporal clause specifies the time of the “‘situation’ referred to by the subordinate construction,” answering the question “When?.” He includes Galatians 2:11 as an example in which the “situation” of the subordinate clause is anterior to the “situation” of the main clause.²⁸ The anterior situation found in the subordinate clause is that Cephas came to Antioch. The situation of the main clause is that Paul opposed Cephas to his face.

Ancient Greek Evidence

What should we make of Paul’s use of ὅτε δὲ? And, hypothetically, if Zahn, Munck, Lüdemann, etc. are correct, do we encounter this phenomenon anywhere else? Can we identify other instances in Greek narrative in which ὅτε δὲ arguably prefaces the insertion of an earlier event? Ben Witherington’s claim sounds reasonable: the Galatians would expect the events “to be recorded in order unless there were signals in the text and strong reasons behind them for not doing so.”²⁹ Using a corpus-based analysis, I will examine the evidence

²⁶ A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 971.

²⁷ BDAG, s. v. “ὅτε.” See also Luján, “Temporal Clauses,” 374–75.

²⁸ Heinrich von Siebenthal, *Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019), 511–13. Wallace agrees that ὅτε “gives the time of the action. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 677. See also Andreas J. Köstenberger, Benjamin L. Merkle, and Robert L. Plummer, *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Syntax of the New Testament* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016), 414. They classify ὅτε as a temporal (“telling the time of”) subordinating conjunction.

²⁹ Ben Witherington III, *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul’s Letters to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 149. Gibson also reasons, “Absent any textual indication, it is more natural to accept

from Classical and Post-Classical Greek to determine if the non-chronological claim has any merit and conclude with some observations on the use of ὅτε δὲ in narrative material.³⁰

The temporal construction ὅτε δὲ occurs 17 times in the New Testament, all but one of which prefaces an aorist verb.³¹ Douglas Moo is correct when he writes, “Every other occurrence of the phrase ὅτε δὲ in the NT introduces something that follows what comes before it.”³² The same is true for the Greek Old Testament. In Rahlfs’ edition of the Septuagint, ὅτε δὲ occurs only eight times, each occurrence prefacing an aorist verb and introducing something that follows in temporal sequence.³³ What then of other evidence? In what follows, I present my analysis of a broad sampling of literary texts, papyri, and inscriptions. A careful study of ὅτε δὲ, as it occurs in a temporal clause at the beginning of a sentence, reveals three common uses:

1. Mere temporal specification of an action
2. Resumptive repetition
3. Boundary marking (e.g., change of scene, new narrative unit)

Paul’s chronology, especially since Paul appears to be providing a biographical account in chronological order in his first chapter.” Gibson, *Peter Between Jerusalem and Antioch*, 218 n. 12.

³⁰ For this paper, I evaluated 290 occurrences of ὅτε δὲ as it appears in the LXX, New Testament, classical literature, Jewish and early Christian writings, documentary papyri, and inscriptions. For a complete list of sources considered, see “Appendix: List of Sources Considered.”

³¹ The temporal clause in Acts 12:6 contains the imperfect verb ἤμελλεν. Note also that NA28 critical apparatus lists five variant readings in the manuscript tradition that include ὅτε δὲ (Matt. 13:48; Mark 8:20; Luke 7:1; Acts 13:34; Jude 9). None of these variants introduce non-chronological material into a narrative. The temporal construction καὶ ὅτε occurs 26 times in the NT, none of which, to my knowledge, have generated arguments in favor of non-chronological readings in narrative.

³² Douglas J. Moo. *Galatians*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 145 n. 2.

³³ See Ezra 5:12; Esther 1:5; Judith 5:18; Tobit 2:1, 13; 8:1, 3; Dan. 6:5. Codex Sinaiticus also contains a variant reading in 1 Macc. 12:48 in which a scribe wrote ὅτε δὲ instead of ὅτι. This reading would not disrupt the chronology. For textual evidence, see Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, *Septuaginta: Editio Altera*, 2nd rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

My decisions to assign occurrences to each of these three categories involves some measure of subjectivity, but my overall purpose is to categorize a large number of occurrences and determine if any introduce non-chronological material within a narrative. In other words, an incorrect choice between mere temporal specification and resumptive repetition will not skew my overall conclusions. After examining these three categories of ὅτε δὲ uses, we can evaluate our exegetical options for interpreting the temporal sequence of Galatians 2:11.

Category 1: Mere Temporal Specification of an Action

By “mere temporal specification,” I mean only that the temporal clause beginning with ὅτε δὲ does not correspond with boundary marking (see next section). Albert Rijksbaron observes how a class of ὅτε-clauses “provides a temporal specification for isolated statements, that is, statements that do not form part of the surrounding narrative . . . the ὅτε-clauses usually follow the main clause.³⁴ There are many examples in which ὅτε δὲ provides temporal specification and, also, forms part of the surrounding narrative but does not mark a discourse boundary. I have grouped all such cases together under the category of mere temporal specification.

Mere temporal specification is the most frequent function of ὅτε δὲ in the New Testament. Matthew 21:34 serves as a representative example. After Jesus explains in v. 33 of his parable of the tenants how the master of the house planted a vineyard and went on a journey, he specifies in v. 35 when the master dispatched his servants to collect fruit from the

³⁴ Albert Rijksbaron, *Temporal and Causal Conjunctions in Ancient Greek: With Special Reference to the Use of ἐπεὶ and ὡς in Herodotus* (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1976), 136.

vineyard with the temporal clause ὅτε δὲ ἤγγισεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν καρπῶν (“And when the time for fruit drew near”).³⁵

We find an abundance of examples outside of the New Testament. Diodorus Siculus, after describing how the once beautiful Queen Lamia transformed into a ferocious beast and murdered children, tells how she was not a threat when inebriated: “But whenever [ὅτε δὲ] she drank freely, she gave to all the opportunity to do what they pleased unobserved.”³⁶ Here, δὲ has an adversative function, contrasting the safety that accompanied her drunkenness with the terror that accompanied her sobriety. Again, ὅτε δὲ merely provides temporal specification for an isolated or, in this case, recurring event.³⁷ The documentary papyri also offer a representative example of this use of ὅτε δὲ. In Dionysia’s letter to Theon dated 127 BC, she describes a chain of events in which a man named Neon seized Theon’s mattress. Dionysia, after obtaining the right to petition a city official for the mattress, narrates, “And when [ὅτε δὲ] he went down to confront me, having treated me terribly, it was decreed that it should be secured and stored in the public office until the moment you are present.”³⁸

³⁵ Other examples of mere temporal specification in the New Testament can be found in Matt. 13:26; 21:34; Luke 15:30; Acts 8:12, 39; 11:2; 12:6; 21:5, 35; Gal. 1:15; 2:12; 4:4; Titus 3:4. For the LXX, see Ezra 5:12; Esth. 1:5; Jdt 5:18; Tob. 2:13; 8:3.

³⁶ *Diodorus Siculus*, 20.41 (Geer, Loeb Classical Library).

³⁷ For other examples, see also Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 2.6.20; 3.1.33; Clement of Alexandria, *Exhortations to the Greeks* 11; *Epistle of Barnabas* 5.9; *Life of Adam and Eve* 21.2; 33.3; *Acts of Philip* 28.7; 61.1; 126.2. For an example in which a sentence introduced by ὅτε δὲ follows a sentence introduced by ἐπειτα, see Hippocrates of Cos, *Epidemics* 5.20. Although predating Galatians by many centuries, it provides another example of a chronological narrative that uses both words in succession.

³⁸ P.Bad.4.48 (ed. F. Bilabel, 4:107–8). For an epigraphic example from late 2nd–early 3rd century BC, Panamara 226, ll. 11–14 records “When [ὅτε δὲ] he was priest for the second time, he served as priest also of Hecate at a time of need.” Translation from James. H. Oliver, *The Sacred Gerousia*, The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora (American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1941), 154. Also see IKret 3.4.9, l. 131 (and the identical IMagnMai 160, l. 103) for a lacunose example from 112/111 BC that seems to evidence mere temporal specification.

Category 2: Boundary Marking

The use of ὅτε δὲ in Galatians 2:11 goes beyond providing temporal specification by also marking a discourse boundary. In some instances, ὅτε δὲ introduces a new narrative unit consisting of new information. This function corresponds to Runge’s observation about temporal frames, which, in narrative texts, “are associated with discourse boundaries, such as changes of scene or pericope.”³⁹ Rijksbaron calls this function an absolute temporal adjunct that does “not contain any elements that refer back to the preceding context.”⁴⁰ Paul’s use of ὅτε, much like his use of the conjunction δὲ would signal a new development.

This use does not appear in the LXX and appears in the New Testament only in Galatians 2:11—our passage under consideration. For a representative example outside of the New Testament, we can look to the *Letter of Aristeas*. King Ptolemy welcomes the Septuagint translators and holds seven symposia in their honor. After a prayer before the meal, Aristeas records, “When, after an interval, an opportunity presented itself, the king asked him who occupied the first place at the table . . . how he should preserve his kingdom unimpaired to the last.”⁴¹ According to Benjamin Wright, this occurrence of ὅτε δὲ marks a major break and begins the first of the seven symposia, each comprised of a “self-contained unit.”⁴² This narrative unit follows in chronological order.⁴³ In my research, I discovered that

³⁹ Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 216. See also Egbert J. Bakker, “Boundaries, Topics, and the Structure of Discourse: An Investigation of the Ancient Greek Particle Dé,” *Studies in Language* 17.2 (1993).

⁴⁰ Rijksbaron, *Temporal and Causal Conjunctions in Ancient Greek*, 132.

⁴¹ *Letter of Aristeas* 187; Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Letter of Aristeas*, (London: SPCK, 1917), 60.

⁴² Benjamin G. Wright III, *The Letter of Aristeas: ‘Aristeas to Philocrates’ or ‘On the Translation of the Law of the Jews’* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015), 55.

⁴³ Other discourse breaks marked by ὅτε δὲ can be found in Aelian, *Historical Miscellany* 12.1; Aristotle, *Rhetoric to Alexander* 1427b.10; Parthenius of Nicaea, *Sufferings in Love* 8; Pausanias, *Descriptions of Greece* 10.32.4; Plato, *Laws* 956b.

the vast majority of ὅτε δὲ clauses occurring at discourse boundaries introduce chronologically arranged material, but there are exceptions. We will consider these after an explanation of the final function of ὅτε δὲ.

Category 3: Resumptive Repetition

A third use associated with a preceding ὅτε δὲ clause is *resumptive repetition*, which Phil Quick defines as “a discourse feature used to resume a previous topic, story line or theme line that has been interrupted by a span of information that is related but diverges for a short or long gap before being resumed.”⁴⁴ This corresponds to Rijksbaron’s claim that the second way that a preceding ὅτε-phrase can function is to serve as a continuative adjunct that “presents, on the basis of some earlier information, a new element in the story, which new element, in its turn, serves to locate in the, newly introduced, information of the main clause.”⁴⁵ Resumptive repetition with ὅτε δὲ occurs several times in the LXX and New Testament.⁴⁶

Outside of Scripture, we find an example of resumptive repetition in the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* 13.2. After the crowd collects the necessary wood, Polycarp prepares for martyrdom by burning. The introductory phrase, “But when [ὅτε δὲ] the pile was made ready” is background information prefacing Polycarp’s preparatory actions for martyrdom.

⁴⁴ Phil Quick, “Resumptive Repetition—Introduction to a Universal Discourse Feature,” *Linguistika* 14.26 (2007), 1. Resumptive repetition sometimes takes the form of what Stephen H. Levinsohn calls “tail-head linkage.” This type of repetition “in NT Greek involves the repetition, in an adverbial or participial clause at the beginning (the head) of the new sentence, of the main verb and other information that occurred in the previous sentence (the tail). This repetition may be thought of as a rhetorical device that slows the story down prior to the significant event or speech.” Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 197. See also Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 163–177. *Life of Adam and Eve* 40.3 repeats the main verb (κηδεύω) from 40.2 in a participial clause in 40.3.

⁴⁵ Rijksbaron, *Temporal and Causal Conjunctions in Ancient Greek*, 131.

⁴⁶ See Tbt. 2:1; 8:1; Dan. 6:5; Matt. 9:25; Acts 27:39; 28:16.

Another example of resumptive repetition can be found in *Acts of Thomas* 33.8. After a dragon uses its mouth to suck the venom out of a young man, we read “And when [ὄτε δὲ] the dragon had drawn out all of the poison into himself, the young man, standing up, stood, ran, and fell at the feet of the apostle [Thomas].⁴⁷ The ὄτε δὲ clause in Galatians 2:11 is not an instance of resumptive repetition, although the one found in Galatians 2:12 could be classed as such.

Examples of ὄτε Δὲ with Implications for Galatians 2:11

My search identified two occurrences of non-chronological material introduced with ὄτε δὲ. The first appears in a speech by Aeschines entitled “Against Timarchus” (345 BC). In this text, Aeschines reports that Arizelus, the father of Timarchus, dies, manages an estate, and dies again.

There were three brothers in this family, Eupolemus, the gymnastic trainer, Arizelus, the father of the defendant, and Arignotus, who is still living, an old man now, and blind. Of these, Eupolemus was the first to die, before the estate had been divided; next, Arizelus, the father of Timarchus. So long as [ὄτε δὲ] Arizelus lived, he managed the whole estate, because of the ill-health of Arignotus and the trouble with his eyes, and because Eupolemus was dead. By agreement with Arignotus he regularly gave him a sum of money for his support. Then Arizelus, the father of the defendant Timarchus, died also.⁴⁸

In this instance of boundary marking, ὄτε δὲ introduces a rather lengthy aside that extends beyond the quotation above, but also appears amid clear contextual signaling that these events occurred while Arizelus was alive. The second case, appearing in the third-century AD work *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* by Diogenes Laertius, is similar:

⁴⁷ Other examples of resumptive repetition appear in *Acts of Philip* 123.1; Appian, *Civil Wars*, 4.483; Athenaeus, *The Learned Banqueters*, 11.470d; XII.514c; Herodotus, *The Persian Wars*, 9.8; Hippocrates of Cos, *Epidemics* 2.5.85; Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesians War*, 2.55.3; Xenon, *Hellenica*, 3.25; Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 1.8.8; 2.6.12.

⁴⁸ Aeschines, *Speeches*, “Against Timarchus,” 101 (Adams, Loeb Classical Library).

The same authority, Apollodorus, states that Eudoxus of Cnidos flourished about the 103rd Olympiad, and that he discovered the properties of curves. He died in his fifty-third year. When [ὄτε δὲ] he was in Egypt with Chonuphis of Heliopolis, the sacred bull Apis licked his cloak. From this the priests foretold that he would be famous but shortlived, so we are informed by Favorinus in his *Memorabilia*.⁴⁹

According to this text, Eudoxus of Cnidos made a geometrical discovery, died, and had his cloak licked by a bull while in Egypt. In this second instance of boundary marking, ὄτε δὲ introduces a lengthy narrative unit that extends beyond the quotation above, but an individual's death signals the non-chronological ordering of these events. Neither of these examples fit Runge's classification of "side-bar-type comments"⁵⁰ since both are protracted narrative units. But, significantly, both examples offer clear contextual cues signaling their status as non-chronological material.

Conclusion

My survey of 282 occurrences of ὄτε δὲ has found that only on rare occasion do these two words introduce a narrative segment in a different order than that which it occurred. Furthermore, the two instances that I did identify, one predating and one postdating the composition of the New Testament, contain overt signals that the material was non-chronologically arranged. In Galatians 2:11, Paul used ὄτε δὲ to mark a discourse boundary, but he did not overtly signal to his readers that he was presenting chronologically rearranged narrative material. Therefore, we can confidently discount Lüdemann's proposal for explaining Peter's puzzling behavior at Antioch. Peter certainly could have misapplied or misunderstood the resolution made at Jerusalem, or he could have succumbed to peer pressure. Paul's account in Galatians indicates that Peter's conduct in Antioch was wrong.

⁴⁹ Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 8.90 (Hicks, Loeb Classical Library).

⁵⁰ Runge, *Galatians*, "Orienting the Events."

Jews and gentiles could freely eat together.⁵¹ The true gospel does not require gentiles to live like Jews (Gal. 2:14).

⁵¹ For discussion on Jews and gentiles eating together, see deSilva, *The Letter to the Galatians*, 198–203; Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians*, 117–22; Keener, *Galatians*, 152–155; Schreiner, *Galatians*, 141–42.

Bibliography

- Augustine. *Letters of St. Augustin*. In vol. 1 of The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 1. Edited by Philip Schaff. 1886–1889. 14 vols. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Bakker, Egbert J. “Boundaries, Topics, and the Structure of Discourse: An Investigation of the Ancient Greek Particle Dé.” *Studies in Language* 17.2 (1993): 275–311.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. *Galatians: A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermeneia—A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Bilabel, F. *Veröffentlichungen aus den badischen Papyrus-Sammlungen*. vol.4. Heidelberg, 1924).
- Bird, Michael F. *An Anomalous Jew: Paul among Jews, Greeks, and Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Bligh, John. *Galatians: A Discussion of St. Paul's Epistle*. Householder Commentaries 1. London: St. Paul Publications, 1970.
- Burton, Ernest De Witt. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians*. International Critical Commentary. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1920.
- deSilva, David A. *Galatians: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Greek New Testament. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Epistle to the Galatians*. Black's New Testament Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.
- Dupont, Jacques. “Pierre et Paul à Antioche et à Jérusalem.” *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 45 (1957): 42–60.
- Emde Boas, Evert van, Albert Rijksbaron, Luuk Huitink, and Mathieu de Bakker. *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Féret, Henricus M. *Pierre et Paul à Antioche et à Jérusalem: Le “conflict” de deux apôtres*. Paris: Cerf, 1955.
- Fresch, Christopher J. *Discourse Markers in Early Koine Greek: Cognitive-Functional Analysis and LXX Translation Technique*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 77. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2023.
- Giannakis, Georgios K., ed. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill: 2014.
- Gibson, Jack J. *Peter Between Jerusalem and Antioch*. WUNT 345. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hainz, Josef. *Ekklesia*. Biblische Untersuchungen 9. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1972.

- Keener, Craig S. *Galatians: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2019.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., Benjamin L. Merkle, and Robert L. Plummer. *Going Deeper with New Testament Greek: An Intermediate Syntax of the New Testament*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2016.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. Translated by F. Stanley Jones. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Mehat, André. “‘Quand Kèphas vint à Antioch . . .’ que s’est-il passé Pierre et Paul?” *Lumière et Vie* 192 (1989): 29–43.
- Moo, Douglas J. *Galatians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Translated by Frank Clarke. Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1959.
- Oepke, Albrecht. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. Revised by Joachim Rohde. Theological Handkommentar zum Nuen Testament 9. 3rd ed. 1973.
- Oliver, James H. *The Sacred Gerousia*. The American Excavations in the Athenian Agora. American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1941.
- Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Rahlfs, Alfred and Robert Hanhart. *Septuaginta: Editio Altera*, 2nd rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
- Reisner, Rainer. *Paul’s Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*. Translated by Doug Stott. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Rijksbaron, Albert. *Temporal and Causal Conjunctions in Ancient Greek: With Special Reference to the Use of ἐπεὶ and ὡς in Herodotus*. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1976.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
- Runge, Steven E. *High Definition Commentary: Galatians*. Edited by Brannon Ellis. High Definition Commentary Series. Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2019.
- . *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.
- Schneckenburger, Matthias. *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte: Zugleich eine Ergänzung der neureun Commentare*. Bern: Bruck und Verlag von Chr. Fischer, 1841.
- Schoeps, Hans-Joachim. *Jewish Christianity: Factional Disputes in the Early Church*. Translated by Douglas R. A. Hare. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969.

- Siebenthal, Heinrich von. *Ancient Greek Grammar for the Study of the New Testament*. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2019.
- Silva, Moises. "Text and Language in the Pauline Corpus: With Special Reference to the Use of Conjunctions in Galatians." *Neotestamentica* 24.2 (1990): 273–281.
- Stählin, Gustav. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. NTD 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Wechsler, Andreas. *Geschichtsbild und Apostelstreit: Eine forschungsgeschichtliche und exegetische Studie über den antiochenischen Zwischenfall (Gal 2,11–14)*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 1991.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul's Letters to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*. Leipzig, 1907.

APPENDIX: LIST OF ANCIENT SOURCES CONSIDERED

Septuagint

| | | | |
|--------|------|-------------|-----------------|
| Ezra | 5:12 | Tobit | 2:1, 13; 8:1, 3 |
| Esther | 1:5 | Daniel | 6:5 |
| Judith | 5:18 | 1 Maccabees | 12:48 (v.l.) |

New Testament

| | | | |
|---------|--|-----------|---------------------|
| Matthew | 9:25; 13:26, 48 (v.l.), 21:34 | Galatians | 1:15; 2:11, 12; 4:4 |
| Mark | 8:20 (v.l.) | Titus | 3:4 |
| Luke | 7:1 (v.l.); 15:30 | Jude | 9 (v.l.) |
| Acts | 8:12, 39; 11:2; 12:6; 13:34 (v.l.); 21:5, 35; 27:39; 28:16 | | |

Loeb Classical Library

| | | | |
|------------------|--|-------------------------|---|
| Aelian | <i>Historical Miscellany</i> | Isocrates | <i>Discourses</i> |
| Aelius Aristides | <i>Orations, Testimonia</i> | John of Damascene | <i>Barlaam and Ioasaph</i> |
| Aeschines | <i>Against Timarchus</i> | Josephus | <i>Jewish Antiquities</i> |
| Anaxagoras | <i>Testimonia</i> | Longinus | <i>On the Sublime</i> |
| Appian | <i>Roman History</i> | Longus | <i>The Story of Daphnis and Chloe</i> |
| Aratus | <i>Phaenomena</i> | Lucian | <i>Dialogues of the Courtesans, Dialogues of the Gods, The Passing of Peregrinus Testimonia</i> |
| Archippus | <i>Testimonia and Fragments</i> | Melissus | |
| Aristotle | <i>Metaphysics, Meteorologica, On Coming-to-Be and Passing-Away, On Plants, On Sophisticated Refutations, On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, Politics, Prior Analytics, Problems, Rhetoric to Alexander</i> | Parthenius of Nicaea | <i>Sufferings in Love</i> |
| Athenaeus | <i>The Learned Banqueters</i> | Pausanias | <i>Descriptions of Greece</i> |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|---|
| Atomists | | Philo | <i>Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 2, 3, On the Decalogue, On the Eternity of the World, Who Is the Heir of Divine Things</i> |
| Basil | <i>Letters</i> | Philostratus of Athens | <i>The Life of Allonius of Tyana, Lives of the Sophists</i> |
| Clement of Alexandria | <i>Exhortation to the Greeks</i> | Philostratus the Elder | <i>Letters</i> |
| Demosthenes | <i>Orations</i> | Philoxenus of Leucas | <i>Fragments</i> |
| Dinarchus | <i>Against Aristogiton</i> | Plato | <i>Critias, Laws, Mathematical Works, Theatetus</i> |
| Dio Cassius | <i>Roman History</i> | Plotinus | <i>Enneads, Moralia</i> |
| Diodorus Siculus | <i>The Library of History</i> | Polybius | <i>The Histories</i> |
| Diogenes Laertius | <i>Lives of Eminent Philosophers</i> | Ptolemy | <i>Tetrabiblos</i> |
| Dionysius of Halicarnassus | <i>Roman Antiquities</i> | Quintus Smyrnaeus | <i>Posthomerica</i> |
| Epictetus | <i>Discourses, Fragments</i> | Sextus Empiricus | <i>Against the Ethicists, Against the Physicists</i> |
| Eusebius | <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> | Theophrastus | <i>De Causis Plantarum, Enquiry into Plants</i> |
| Galen | <i>On Hygiene, On the Constitution of the Art of Medicine</i> | Thucydides | <i>History of the Peloponnesian War</i> |
| Gellius | <i>Attic Nights</i> | Xenophon of Athens | <i>Anabasis, Cyropaedia, Hellenica, On Hunting</i> |
| Herodotus | <i>The Persian Wars</i> | Martyrdom of Polycarp | |
| Hesiod | <i>Catalogue of Women</i> | Select Papyri | <i>Official Documents, Private Affairs</i> |
| Hippocrates of Cos | <i>Diseases, Diseases of Women, Epidemics, Joints, Precepts, The Sacred Disease</i> | The Greek Anthology | |
| Homer | <i>Iliad</i> | | |

Papyri and Inscriptions

IKret 3.4.9
IMagnMai 160
P.Bad.4.48

P.Cair.Zen.2.59251
P.Neph.3
Panamara 226

Other Sources

Acts of Philip 28.7; 61:1; 123.1; 126.2

Acts of Thomas 17.1; 20:1; 22:4; 33.8;
41:1

Barnabas 5.9

*Letter of
Aristeas* 187

*Life of Adam and
Eve* 21.2; 33.3; 40.3

Martyrdom of
Polycarp 13.2

*Testaments of the
Twelve Patriarchs* 12.10