# The End of Paul’s Third Missionary (Acts 21:1-36)

* Paul and his missionary team end the Third Missionary Journey in Jerusalem. In this section, one can observe Paul’s determination to go to Jerusalem, while seemingly everyone around him wants the apostle to avoid venturing into a lion’s den.
* This is also the third "we" section of Acts (21:1-18), the first two are (16:10-17; 20:5-15) and the last two are (27:1-37; 28:1-16).
* This section also is of theological importance because it focuses on Paul's passion as an echoing of Jesus' passion. Note the similarities between Luke's accounts of Jesus' trip to Jerusalem and Paul's. Both stories involve a plot by the Jews and handing over to the Gentiles. There were triple predictions along the way of suffering in Jerusalem in both cases. Both Jesus and Paul steadfastly resolved to go there despite opposition, and both resigned themselves to God's will.2 Luke probably told his story as he did to help the reader appreciate the similarities between Jesus and Paul in order to authenticate Paul's ministry[[1]](#footnote-2).



# Day One

## Paul sails from Miletus to Tyre (21:1-6)

* Vs. 1-3~ *“When we had parted from them”*, ‘parted’ used here could mean “someone tearing themselves away from someone else.” Chapter 20 conveys a very difficult goodbye for Paul and his team, here Luke expresses that difficulty by using this verb to carry the illustration further.
* “We ran a straight course to Kos” This island is in the Aegean Sea, west of Halicarnassus (modern Bodrum). *The next day we went to Rhodes and from there to Patara. Rhodes*, another island off the southwest coast of Asia Minor, also had a capital city with the same name.
  + This journey followed the conventional pattern for small ships in antiquity, which was ‘to hug the coastline as much as possible and put into port each night when the winds died down’. *Patara* was on the mainland and in earlier days was the port of Xanthos, the chief city of Lycia. This is where Paul and his party left one ship and joined another, large enough for *crossing over to Phoenicia*, a journey of some 400 miles (644 km.).*Phoenicia* was a narrow coastal strip on the Mediterranean Sea, which was annexed by Rome in 64 bc and incorporated into the province of Syria. *After sighting Cyprus and passing to the south of it, we sailed on to Syria*. Luke now uses the provincial name for their destination and concludes his precise account of the sea journey with the landing at *Tyre*. There the ship was to *unload its cargo*, which explains the lengthier stay in this port. Tyre was an ancient trade center, the most notable settlement on the Phoenician coast, which was made a free city under the Romans.[[2]](#footnote-3)
* V4 ~ Although Paul was hurrying to reach Jerusalem, ‘if possible, on the day of Pentecost’ (20:16), he and his missionary team had made such good time on their journey that they were able to stay with the believing community in Tyre “[*a]fter looking up the disciples, we stayed there seven days;)*.The church in that city was probably founded as a result of the outreach to Phoenicia mentioned in 11:19 (cf. 15:3).[[3]](#footnote-4)
* “And they kept telling Paul throught the Spirit not to set foot in Jerusalem.” These believers are warning Paul not to go to Jerusalem. But there is a phrase here that has puzzled commentators “through the Spirit.” The warning was done through the Spirit and \*spoiler alert\* Paul sets his sights on Jerusalem and does not heed the words of these believers.
  + The questions are what does this phrase mean? And did Paul disobey the Spirit’s prompting?
  + Some have viewed this passage as meaning that their “spirit” meant their “emotions.” These precious believers loved Paul and did not want anything to happen to him. While this is true, this is not what the text shows us.
  + In fact, if one takes the text at face value, it is clear that this seems to be a divine utterance from the Spirit. The Greek is very clear on this. “Through the Spirit” … this was revealed by the Spirit.
  + So, how does one make sense of this? Did Paul disobey the Spirit’s prompting? Did the Spirit not want Paul to go to Jerusalem?
  + In the previous chapter (20:22-23), the Spirit is the one that is driving Paul to Jerusalem, does this mean now that the Spirit is giving Paul a contradictory message? Of course not. The Spirit was driving Paul to Jerusalem and at the same time the Spirit’s warning serves as a preview for the apostle of the hardship and imprisonment that he will have to endure for the sake of Christ.
  + This message from these precious believers was not at all difficult for Paul to accept. “Paul certainly never sought out difficulty. He had no martyr complex. On the other hand, he accepted suffering as a part of his witness and often alluded to this in his letters.”[[4]](#footnote-5) The words of the Tyrians are best understood as part of Paul’s preparation for the difficult events in Jerusalem. “The Spirit’s role is best seen as informing them of those coming hardships for the apostle. Their very natural reaction was to urge him not to go[[5]](#footnote-6). Their failure to deter him only heightens the emphasis on Paul’s firm conviction that God was leading him to Jerusalem and had a purpose for him there.”[[6]](#footnote-7)
* Vs. 5-6~ Luke relates the departure of Paul and his associates and the farewell from the Tyrian believers. When the seven days were completed, Paul and his companions left the city and continued their travel. Luke draws a vivid picture of the farewell scene: all the disciples assembled with the travel party and escorted them from the city to the harbor.Luke specifies that wives and the children came along as well, highlighting the close bonds that had developed between Paul, his companions, believers from Asia Minor, Greece, and Macedonia, and the families of believers in Tyre during the seven days.
  + “As in Miletus, Paul and the believers knelt down (see on 20:36) and prayed, surely for a good outcome of the journey to Jerusalem, for strength in view of the trials that lie ahead, and for God’s blessings for the Tyrian believers. After they said good-bye to each other, Paul and his companions boarded the ship while the Tyrian believers returned (lit.) “to their own place”, i.e., to their homes.”[[7]](#footnote-8)

# **Day One- Questions**

1. What is implied in the phrase “when we had parted from them”?
2. What does the phrase ‘through the Spirit’ mean?
3. Why did Paul and his fellow missionaries knelt down and prayed with these precious believers? What did it communicate to them?

# Day Two

## From Tyre to Caesarea to Jerusalem (21:7-16)

After describing their voyage to Caesarea, Paul and his missionary team encounter a couple of characters that are familiar to the reader. One of them, a prophet, foretells Paul’s future arrest and deliverance into the hands of the gentiles.

* V. 7~ Paul’s company sails to Ptolemais and stays for a day. This seaport was located about twenty-five miles south of Tyre on the Mediterranean’s southern Phoenician coast. It was almost eighty miles north of Jerusalem and the population included both Jews and Christians. After arriving to the city, Paul met with the believers of the city. We are not told how the church came to be there, but obviously other missionary activity has brought the gospel there. “It was previously known as Acco (Judg. 1:31; medieval Acre).”[[8]](#footnote-9)
* Vs. 8-9 ~ After spending a day in the city of Ptolomais, Paul and his crew go to Caesarea, which was thirty-two miles south of that city. Caesarea was considered the port city of Jerusalem, built by Herod the Great to service the Judean province.
  + Paul was very familiar with the church in this city (Acts 9:30; 18:22). Luke also identifies Philip, the evangelist further by stating that he “was one of the seven,” referring to those was were appointed by the Jerusalem church to organize the support ministry for the widows in the congregation (Acts 6).
  + It was probably in Caesarea that Paul had met Philip the evangelist, since **Acts 8:40** says: “But Philip found himself at Azotus, and as he passed through he kept preaching the gospel to all the cities until he came to Caesarea.” Most likely Philip stayed there and developed a ministry in that city[[9]](#footnote-10).
  + This very Philip becomes Paul and the team’s host. So, they lodged there for several days.
  + Verse 9 gives us some information as to Philip’s household, “had four virgin daughters who were prophetesses.” There are some interesting facts about this statement:
    - Most likely these young women were young teenaged girls. “Palestinian Jewish women usually married fairly young, between the ages of twelve and eighteen.”[[10]](#footnote-11)
    - The tense indicates that there were prophesying habitually.
    - Their silence is puzzling in view of the prophesy regarding Paul.
* Vs. 10-11~ Agabus previously had gone from Jerusalem to Antioch to foretell the famine of A.D. 46 (11:26-27). Now he came down to Caesarea and prophesied Paul's arrest in Jerusalem (cf. Mark 9:31; 10:33; John 21:18). He illustrated his prediction graphically, as several Old Testament prophets had done (cf. 1 Kings 11:29-31; Isa. 20:2-4; Jer. 13:1-7; Ezek. 4). "This is what the Holy Spirit says" is the Christian equivalent of the Old Testament's "Thus says the LORD." His revelation came as no surprise to Paul, of course (v. 4; 9:16). Perhaps another reason that Luke emphasized these prophecies was to prove to his readers that Paul's arrest and its consequences were part of God's foreordained will for the church's expansion (1:1-2; cf. Mark 10:33).[[11]](#footnote-12)
  + This was not so much a warning on Agabus’s part as a prediction. Unlike the Christians of Tyre, he did not urge Paul not to go. Rather, he told him what was in store for him. This was all the more certain when one considers the nature of such prophetic acts in the Old Testament. The act itself set into motion the event it foretold. It established the reality of the event, the certainty that it would occur.Agabus’s act prepared Paul for the events to come and assured him of God’s presence in those events.[[12]](#footnote-13)
* V. 12~ His travel companions and the Christians in Caesarea *(we as well as the local residents)* took the warning of Agabus seriously and “began begging him not to go up to Jerusalem.” They were moved by a loving concern for Paul’s welfare and by the force of the prediction to express themselves in this way (cf. Mk. 8:31–32). Indeed, they implied that the prophecy would come true only if Paul insisted on completing his journey. Luke includes himself among those who did not at this stage share Paul’s commitment to the pathway of suffering and captivity.[[13]](#footnote-14)
* V. 13~ The grief displayed by Paul’s friends had the effect of pounding at his *heart* as they attempted to dissuade him. But for himself Paul was quite prepared not merely for what was prophesied but also for possible death at Jerusalem. It was not that there was any virtue in such sufferings for their own sake, but only if they were accomplished on behalf of the name of Jesus, i.e. as a necessary part of Christian service.[[14]](#footnote-15)
* V.14~ Luke writes that Paul could not be dissuaded. Luke ought to have known that at the end of his Ephesian ministry Paul had expressed his desire to go to Jerusalem (19:21). When he finally left Troas on his way south and east, Paul was in a hurry, for he had only one desire: to be in Jerusalem before Pentecost (20:16). “Within sixty-five miles of his destination, Paul could not be persuaded to change his mind. He remained obedient to his Lord. Although he was apprehensive, he, like his Master, set his face in the direction of Jerusalem.”[[15]](#footnote-16)
  + Luke relates the final reaction of the community of believers in direct speech. They accept “the Lord’s will,” who will do what he will do in his wisdom and grace. They respond to Paul’s determination not with resignation,[[16]](#footnote-17) but with the acknowledgement that it is the Lord’s will that Paul will be arrested in Jerusalem. Their submission to God’s will agrees with the conviction of the early Christian church, reflected throughout Luke’s narrative in Acts, that it is the crucified, risen, and exalted Lord who directs the mission of his followers, who empowers their witness, and who gives them courage to suffer.[[17]](#footnote-18)

# **Day Two- Questions**

1. Who is Philip? Trace a bit of his story.
2. What did Agubus say to Paul? What did it cause in the hearts of Paul’s companions and friends?
3. What does the phrase, “The will of the Lord be done!” mean? How can we put this into practice in our own lives?

# Day Three

### Paul’s approach and arrival in Jerusalem (21:15-20a) Part I

After every missionary tour, Paul returned to the church in Jerusalem. When Paul and Barnabas had completed the first tour, they went to Jerusalem to give a report at the council (15:1–2, 4, 12; Gal. 2:1–2). Although Luke is extremely concise in the narrative about the conclusion of Paul’s second tour, he seems to indicate that **Paul went up to Jerusalem** (18:22). And last, Paul came to the leaders of the church in Jerusalem to report what God had done during the third missionary journey.

“Even though Antioch became the mission center of the early church and commissioned men to bring the message of the gospel to the Gentile world, the church in Jerusalem occupied a leading, albeit diminishing, role.”[[18]](#footnote-19)

* Vs.15-16~ Jerusalem was about 65 miles southeast of Caesarea, which was a long two-day trip. Mnason evidently became a Christian early in the history of the church, perhaps on the day of Pentecost. He was a Hellenistic Jewish Christian from Cyprus, like Barnabas was. As such, he would have been more open to entertaining a mixed group of Jewish and Gentile Christians than many Hebrew Jewish Christians in Israel would have been. Apparently, he lived about halfway between Caesarea and Jerusalem.
  + “Paul finally achieved the first phase of his plan to visit Jerusalem and then Rome (19:21). In doing so he brought one chapter of his ministry to a close, and he opened another. His return to Jerusalem was an essential part of God's plan to send Paul to Rome. This plan unfolds in the rest of chapter 21. In all, Paul traveled about 2,700 miles on his third missionary journey (cf. 14:28; 18:22).”[[19]](#footnote-20)
* V.17~ After Paul and his team arrived in the city of Jerusalem, Luke writes, “the brethren received us gladly” This kind reception would essentially include hospitality for the whole Pauline team—including offering lodging in Jewish Christian homes to uncircumcised Gentile Christians (although Paul himself could have stayed with his nephew’s family—23:16). “This line thus has more significance than would normally strike the modern reader (see 10:28).”[[20]](#footnote-21)
* V.18~ On the following day he and representatives of the Gentile churches met with James (the Lord’s brother, see 15:13ff.) and the elders of the church in Jerusalem in a formal assembly (v. 18). James was still a recognized leader of the “mother church” in Jerusalem.
  + This is also the time that Paul is delivering the monetary gift that he had collected from the different churches in Europe and in Asia Minor, however, Luke does not make mention of this event. Commentators outline a slew of reasons as to why Luke seems to “forget” to narrate this important event especially, give the importance place on the collection by Paul himself (Rom. 15:25–32; 2 Cor. 9:12–15).[[21]](#footnote-22) However, I don’t think we can make a judgment as to the reason for leaving it out.
* V. 19~ Paul had a focused agenda, 1) Greeting, 2) Talk about the missionary work they had been doing throughout the Mediterranean.
  + At this meeting Paul described “one by one” or in detail –*Modern Language*: “recounted to them step by step” what the Lord had done among the gentiles.[[22]](#footnote-23)
  + The accomplishment of the mission is purposely credited to *God*: “whatever doubts might still linger in Jewish minds about the Gentile mission, it was guided and planned by God.”[[23]](#footnote-24)
* V. 20a~ “and when they heard it they began glorifying God;” This is an amazing response from the leadership at the Jerusalem church. Polhill writes, “On an earlier occasion—at the Jerusalem Conference—when Paul gave a report of his successful Gentile mission, it was met with stony silence (15:12f.). Now his report was received with greater enthusiasm. The elders “praised God” for the fruits of Paul’s work among the Gentiles (v. 20). At the Jerusalem Conference they had endorsed Paul’s ministry to the Gentiles, and so they naturally received the report of his missionary success with some elation.”[[24]](#footnote-25)

# **Day Three- Questions**

1. Why did Paul go to Jerusalem after every missionary trip? Why is that significant?
2. Why is verse 17 crucial to understanding the gospel? (Remember what happened in Acts 10!)
3. Why is verse 20a so significant to the advancement of the gospel? Compare it to what happened after the first missionary journey (Acts 15).

# Day Four

### Paul’s approach and arrival in Jerusalem (21:20b-26) Part II

* v. 20b~ “… and they said to him, ‘you see, brother how many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed and they are all zealous for the Law;” The leadership of the Jerusalem church was conscious of the many believers that were ethnically Jewish and these were zealous for the law.
  + The phrase “zealous for the law” could mean that they had been influenced by the pharisaical position or perhaps “zeal” in observing the law.
  + Perhaps this could have been translated as “jealousy for the law. Peterson makes a good point, “ ‘Jealousy’ [or] honour paid to Torah, and therefore hostility towards any perceived derogation of that honor’. Since James later confirms the decision of the Jerusalem Council about Gentiles not being obliged to live under the law (v. 25), it would appear that this zeal for the law was with reference to the lifestyle of Jewish Christians.[[25]](#footnote-26)”
* V.21~ The second part of the elders’ speech mentions “reports” among Jewish believers that Paul is teaching Jewish believers who live among the gentiles to neglect the Mosaic law (v. 21).
* The elders first note the existence of some speculations regarding Paul. The reference of the third person plural of the verb “they have been told about you” is referring to the thousands of Jewish believers in Jerusalem and in Judea. Also, noteworthy is that the passive voice construction does not specify who has provided the information about Paul’s supposed “teaching” regarding the law.
  + Luke details three charges against Paul. (1) He teaches apostasy from the Mosaic law. (2) The next charge is that Paul abolishes circumcision. (3) He abolishes the Jewish customs.[[26]](#footnote-27)
  + Obviously, these charges were completely false. There is no evidence from Scripture that Paul had discouraged apostasy from the law, nor that circumcision was bad or that the Jewish customs must be abolished. However, Paul does speak of salvation by faith and not by law.
* Vs.22-24~ The elders propose a possible way in which the apostle Paul could by example validate that he was still true to the Jewish law.
  + There are four men who are under a vow. It seems here that they are under a Nazirite vow. This type of vow exemplified Jewish piety
  + “The four were nearing the end of the period of their vow and soon would be completing it with the customary ceremony in the temple. This involved cutting their hair and burning it as an offering. In addition, a number of costly sacrifices were required—a male and a female lamb, a ram, and cereal and drink offerings (Num 6:14f.).[[27]](#footnote-28)”
  + Paul obviously did not participate in this vow because the minimum period for this type of vow was 30-days. So, aside from purifying himself and paying their expenses, it is not altogether clear as to what Paul is to do.
  + However, this would be clear evidence that Paul is not against the law, nor is he abolishing the Jewish customs, but rather he is still loyal to the Torah
* “**Was Paul wrong in entering into this arrangement, which was a specific part of the Law?** For several reasons it may be said he was not:
  + (1) Paul himself had previously taken a Nazirite vow (Acts 18:18).
  + (2) Later he unashamedly referred to this incident before Felix (24:17–18).
  + (3) This action on Paul’s part only confirmed one of the principles of his ministry which was to become like a Jew to win the Jews, and to become like one under the Law to win those under it (1 Cor. 9:20).
  + (4) One of Paul’s goals for the Jerusalem trip, along with relief of the poor, was the unifying of Jews and Gentiles.
  + (5) Paul was not denying the finished work of Christ by offering animal sacrifices. The epistles Paul had already written by this time (Gal., 1 and 2 Thes., 1 and 2 Cor., Rom.) make it clear that such a denial was incomprehensible. He must have looked on these sacrifices as memorials. After all, this will be the significance of millennial sacrifices (Ezek. 43:18–46:24; Mal. 1:11; 3:3–4).
  + (6) Paul later asserted he did not violate his own conscience (Acts 23:1).[[28]](#footnote-29)” ~ Stanley D. Toussaint
* V. 25~ James and the elders repeated the former “ruling” regarding the instruction of Gentile converts. This was simply a point of explanation intended to highlight that the decision of the Jerusalem Council still stood (Acts 15:20, 29). Their advice to Paul on this occasion did not contradict their strong commitment to salvation by grace.
  + “The elders and the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem and Judea are not asking the Gentile Christians to become Jews—that was precisely the unanimous decision at the council. They are asking that Jewish Christians should not be made Gentile Christians, which would happen if they were asked to abandon circumcision and renounce other ritual stipulations of the law[[29]](#footnote-30)”
* 26~ A Jew would normally announce the completion of his vow to a priest, and then seven days later he would present his offerings (cf. Num. 6:13-20). The Law did not prescribe a week's wait, but it was customary. Paul accompanied the four men into the temple and underwent the rites of purification with them, because he was paying the expenses of their vow (see 1 Cor. 9:20).
  + “In Acts 21:26, we find that Paul, a Jew, offered sacrifices in the temple at the conclusion of his ministry before appealing to Caesar. He never trusted those sacrifices to make him clean in God's eyes. He argues throughout his letters that keeping the law is of no use. But he did strive to be viewed as clean in the culture's eyes. He viewed this as a helpful step in gaining a hearing for his faith in Christ.[[30]](#footnote-31)”

# **Day Four- Questions**

1. Why was the leadership so concern with the rumors regarding Paul?
2. Was Paul wrong in doing this ritual? Explain.
3. Have you ever experienced something like Paul for the gospel?

# Day Five

A near riot explodes for the apostle when Jews from Asia see him at the temple and accuse him of ‘teaching everyone everywhere against our people and our law and this place’ (vv. 27–28). This charge is a larger version of the one mentioned in v. 21. Paul is specifically accused of defiling the temple by taking Gentiles into the prohibited area, though Luke makes it clear that this was a distortion of the facts (v. 29). As in Ephesus (19:23–31), Paul’s opponents are successful in creating an uprising and his life is seriously at risk (vv. 30–31). Mention of ‘the whole city’ being aroused and in uproar against him suggests ‘rejection of Paul by Israel itself’.Only the intervention of the commander of the Roman troops in Jerusalem saves him from death (vv. 31–32).[[31]](#footnote-32)

### Paul’s arrest in the Temple (21:27-36)

* V.27~ According to the Law, the purification process required a cleansing on the third and on the seventh days (Num 19:2). Likely it was on the seventh day that Paul returned to the temple to complete the ritual (v. 27). He was spotted there by some Jews from Asia, who immediately began to stir up a crowd against him. Not surprisingly the opposition to Paul came from Asian Jews, probably some from Ephesus. Paul had spent three years in Ephesus and part of the time in their synagogue (19:8). They knew him well. In his Miletus address Paul alluded to plots the Ephesian Jews had already directed against him. Often Diaspora Jews were exceedingly strict in their observance of the Jewish ritual (see 6:9), and it may have been some of these same Asian Jews who had spread the rumors about Paul throughout Jerusalem (cf. v. 21).[[32]](#footnote-33)
* Vs. 28-29~ The blatantly false charges they brought against Paul were similar to those raised against Stephen (6:11, 13–14). When they accused Paul of bringing **Greeks into the temple area,** they were assuming a falsehood. Such an act in Jewish eyes would have **defiled** their **holy place**. “Gentiles were permitted into the court of the Gentiles but no farther. Two inscriptions have been found on a balustrade separating the court of the Gentiles from the rest of the temple area. These warned Gentiles, they would have themselves to blame for their deaths which would certainly ensue if they would proceed beyond the barrier (cf. Eph. 2:14).”[[33]](#footnote-34)
* “The possibility that Trophimus might have wandered of his own freewill into the forbidden area is about as likely as that somebody should wander into private rooms in the Kremlin for the purpose of sightseeing.[[34]](#footnote-35)”
* v.30- The report of Paul's alleged capital offense traveled quickly throughout Jerusalem and brought a mob of zealous Jews into the temple courtyard. "The whole city was provoked" is probably hyperbole. However, that was probably the sentiment in the city and especially around the temple.
  + Evidently the Jews dragged Paul out of one of the inner courts and into the court of the Gentiles. The doors that Luke referred to separate the court of the Gentiles from the inner courts that were accessible only to Jews. The priests now closed these doors to prevent the defilement of the inner courts by the tumult and bloodshed.[[35]](#footnote-36)
* Vs. 31-32~ As the city is in tumult, the report of this ensuing riot reaches the commander of the Roman troops stationed in Jerusalem. This commander is actually named as Claudius Lysias in Acts 23:26. “He plays an important role in the unfolding drama of the next few chapters.” The seriousness of the disturbance is indicated by the fact that the commander himself *took along some soldiers and centurions and ran down to them*. Roman troops were stationed in the Antonia Fortress, which attached the western part of the north wall of the temple area. Two flights of stairs led down into the outer court (see verses 35, 40). The garrison was doubtless well prepared for such events, since riots often took place at festival times, while the city was full of pilgrims. When the demonstrators *saw the commander and his soldiers, they stopped beating Paul*. The number of troops was sufficient to warn them that the riot could not continue in this way.[[36]](#footnote-37)
  + Constable writes, “This is the sixth time in Acts that Paul's ministry had ignited a public disturbance (See Acts 14:19; 16:19-22; 17:5-8, 13; 19:25- 34).”[[37]](#footnote-38)
* v. 33~ Since Paul was the obvious object of the crowd’s ire, Claudius Lysias immediately arrested him, binding him with two chains (v. 33).
  + The significance of the “two” chains is not altogether clear. Paul may have been handcuffed on both arms and chained to a soldier on each side, or he could have been bound hand and foot, as Agabus had predicted he would be (cf. 21:11). In any event, from this point on Paul was “in chains,” if not always literally so, at least in the sense that he was a prisoner to the very last word of Acts.[[38]](#footnote-39)
* V. 34~ Apparently, the crowd is not in agreement as to what Paul should be charged with. Some were probably shouting some religious charges, others perhaps personal vendettas, other alleged hearsay. It was a madhouse!
  + “The cacophony of voices and the confusion did not allow the military tribune to “get to the facts” (γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλές); i.e., he was prevented from obtaining factual, definite, certain information about Paul. Therefore, he decided that Paul should be brought into the Antonia Fortress for further interrogation (cf. 22:24). He ordered his soldiers, with Paul being bound with chains to two of them, to take the prisoner into the “barracks” (παρεμβολή), a term that describes a fortified camp but here refers to the barracks of the Roman troops stationed in the Antonia Fortress.[[39]](#footnote-40)”
* Vs. 35-36~ Stairs led up to the fortress from the city, both on its west side and from the temple courtyard on its south side. Probably the stairs in verse 35 were one of the two south stairways leading from the temple courtyard into the fortress.
  + “The fury of the Jews was evident in their desire to tear Paul apart immediately. Their cry ‘Away with him!’ recalls their words about Jesus some 27 years earlier (Luke 23:18; John 19:15; cf. Acts 22:22). Probably the Antonia Fortress was where the soldiers took Jesus for trial before Pilate. It was also the prison from which the angel had freed Peter (12:5).[[40]](#footnote-41)” ~ Thomas Constable

# **Day Five- Questions**

1. Read verse 28. Do you see the irony of the accusation? (hint~ purification vs. defilement)
2. Why were the temple gates shut? (30)
3. Why did they arrest Paul? Why was he bound with two chains?
4. Look at the whole passage. Do you see any resemblance between Jesus’ passion and Paul’s?
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