Purposed in the Spirit

Did Paul Err by Going to Jerusalem? A Scriptural Resolution

A standalone study resolving whether Paul's journey to Jerusalem in Acts 19-21 was disobedience or the fulfillment of his own calling — revised after peer review, with the weight of every argument stated.

Copyright 2026

Distribution of this study as is in its entirety is permitted & encouraged.

Author: John Lobota

Research Assistant: Claude Cowork

papertiq@bellsouth.net

Table of Contents

Introduction.....4

Why this study exists, both readings stated at full strength, the prior question underneath them, the weighting scale this study uses, and its considered position stated up front.

Chapter 1 — A Commission That Already Named Jerusalem.....9

Who Acts 9:15-16 was actually spoken to, Christ's own words directly to Paul at Acts 26:16-18, and why an early vision sending him first to the Gentiles does not exclude Jerusalem.

Chapter 2 — "I Must Also See Rome": The Language of Divine Necessity.....11

The Greek behind "purposed in the spirit," the counter-instances stated plainly, Luke's use of "must," and the two uses of that word that are not Paul's.

Chapter 3 — The Verses This Study Used to Pass Over.....17

Acts 20:16, Acts 20:24, Acts 20:28-32, and what Romans 15 says the journey was actually for.

Chapter 4 — The Hardest Verse: Acts 21:4.....21

What the verse says, Luke's own parallel at Acts 11:28, Agabus, and two scenes elsewhere in scripture that stage the same situation.

Chapter 5 — Warning, Verdict, and What Came After.....25

The Lord's words at Acts 23:11, what scripture does when a servant of God errs, and the King Saul objection answered on its own ground.

Chapter 6 — The Fruit Question.....29

What genuinely changes after Acts 19:20, what does not, the loss of Asia in 2 Timothy 1:15, and the rule that binds both readings equally.

Chapter 7 — What Came Out of It.....33

Paul's own verdict from inside the imprisonment, and why the revelation that followed is corroboration rather than evidence.

Chapter 8 — The Prior Question: Can Suffering Be Inside God's Will?.....35

The premise underneath the whole dispute, the verses offered for it, and the verses against it.

Chapter 9 — The Strongest Case Against This Study's Position.....38

Where the opposing reading is strongest, a better-located candidate for an actual misstep, and what would change this study's mind.

Closing — The Considered Position, and What Remains Open..... 40

What this study holds, at what weight, and the three questions it cannot close.

Appendix — Weight of Each Argument..... 41

Every argument in this study, what it establishes, what the other reading fairly answers, and how much weight it carries.

Sources Consulted..... 44

The method, tools, and background research behind this study, and how each was weighed against scripture itself.

Scripture Index..... 45

Every scripture cited across this study, in canonical order, with the chapter and section where it appears.

Anchor Passage

> **Acts 19:21** *After these things were ended, Paul purposed in the spirit, when he had passed through Macedonia and Achaia, to go to Jerusalem, saying, After I have been there, I must also see Rome.*

This study asks a single, direct question and refuses to answer it by preference: when Paul went up to Jerusalem after saying this, and was arrested there, was he stepping outside what God had called him to do, or stepping directly into it?

The whole "Who Is Paul?" project is governed by 1 Corinthians 1:31 — "he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord" — and that governs this closing study most of all. The question here is not whether Paul was admirable. It is whether a specific, real, and long-debated reading of Acts 19-28 is what the text actually says.

This is the fourth version of this study, and it is a substantial rewrite rather than a polish. An earlier version was reviewed by a careful reader who holds the opposite position and who pressed it hard across two rounds. Several of his objections were correct, and the arguments they overturned have been removed or rebuilt rather than defended. Others were answerable, and the answers are now in the text. Where this study now states a conclusion, it also states what the other reading can fairly say against it, and how much weight the point should carry. That apparatus is described in Introduction §B and collected in the Appendix.

Introduction

A. The Question This Study Was Asked to Settle

A widely taught reading of Acts 21 holds that Paul made a serious, avoidable mistake: warned repeatedly by the Holy Spirit not to go to Jerusalem, he went anyway, out of stubbornness or misplaced zeal, and reaped roughly five years of imprisonment as the direct consequence. On this reading he repented quickly, God mercifully brought fruit out of the wreckage, but the churches of Asia were lost to him and the mobility of his ministry was ended.

It is not a fringe reading. It has been argued in print by serious, careful expositors, and it deserves a serious, careful answer rather than a dismissive one. This study takes it up directly, runs every relevant verse from Acts 19:21 through Acts 28:31 against this library's own standing method, and states a conclusion — but only after showing the actual textual work, and only with its own weight marked.

Weighing it. Nothing is at stake in this section but the framing.

B. How This Study Weighs Its Own Arguments

This library's standing method already requires every claim to be flagged for its epistemic status — direct scriptural statement, constructed inference, or extra-biblical corroboration. This study extends that with a five-step scale, applied to every argument it makes, and then applied again in the Appendix to the arguments on the other side.

Direct statement. Scripture says it in so many words. The only question is what the words mean.

Strong inference. It follows closely from what scripture says. An alternative reading exists but has to strain against the text to get there.

Reasonable inference. It is the more natural reading of the evidence, but an honest reader working carefully can take it the other way without doing violence to anything.

Corroboration only. It is consistent with this study's position — but it would be roughly as consistent with the opposite position, so it adds confidence without adding proof. It may be stated; it may not be leaned on.

Neutral. It is commonly cited by one side or the other and genuinely settles nothing.

Every section below ends with a short **Weighing it** note giving that section's rating and naming what the opposing reading can fairly answer. Readers who want only the summary can read the Appendix, where all of it is collected in one table.

This apparatus exists because the previous version of this study did not have it, and suffered for the lack. Two of its arguments were stated more strongly than the evidence allowed, and a reviewer found both. The remedy is not to argue more carefully in private; it is to publish the weight along with the claim.

Weighing it. Method, not argument.

C. The Case That Paul Was Wrong, Stated at Full Strength

A study that answers a weakened version of its opponent is worth little. Here is the opposing case as its careful advocates actually make it, in their own emphases, with nothing softened.

1. He sailed past the city he had given three years to.

> **Acts 20:16** *For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost.*

Ephesus was where Paul spent three years, and from which "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:10). Why would a man under divine necessity bypass the most fruitful base of his ministry to keep a calendar date?

2. He said the Spirit told him what was coming, and he named his own willingness to die.

> **Acts 20:22-24** *And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: Save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me. But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.*

God does not want His people in chains. If He did, on this reading, He would have to say why — and He never does. The plain sense is that the Holy Ghost was warning Paul off, and Paul's answer was not "God told me to go" but "I am ready to die." Set that beside Gethsemane, where Jesus said "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me" (Luke 22:42), and Paul's eagerness looks like something other than godliness.

3. He warned the Ephesians that wolves were coming, and then left.

> **Acts 20:29-30** *For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.*

Paul foresaw the flock being devoured and went to Jerusalem anyway. God's order is to His own people first (Galatians 6:10); Paul reversed it, trading the believers of Ephesus for the unbelieving Jews of Jerusalem.

4. When he would not listen to God, God sent more and more people.

Tyre's disciples spoke "through the Spirit" (Acts 21:4). Agabus came down from Judaea and bound his own hands and feet (21:10-11). Then everyone present joined in: "both we, and they of that place, besought him not to go up to Jerusalem" (21:12). That escalation is exactly how God works with a believer who is off the mark — first directly, then through a few, then through many.

5. The fruit changes, and the change is measurable.

Luke's growth statements run 2:43-47, 5:14, 6:7, 9:31, 12:24, 16:5 and 19:20 — and the last of them is Acts 19:20, "So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed." After that there are no more. Acts ends not with the church multiplying but with one man in a rented house. Before Acts 20, angels open prison doors (Acts 5:19; 12:7-11; 16:26); after it, an angel comes only to say the ship's company will survive. Before, thousands believe; after, "some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not" (Acts 28:24).

6. And Asia was lost.

> **2 Timothy 1:15** *This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.*

Acts 19:10 says all Asia heard. 2 Timothy 1:15 says all Asia turned away. Something went wrong between those two sentences, and the reading that Paul was right does not explain it.

7. Underneath all of it: God's stated will for His people is good.

Health, freedom, life. Not chains. If God wanted Paul bound, scripture would have to say so plainly and say why, because it would cut against everything God had been doing for His people through the first nineteen chapters of Acts.

Weighing it. This section makes no argument of its own; it states the other one. Every numbered point above is answered somewhere in this study, and three of the seven are answered only partly. Points 1, 2, 5 and 6 were not addressed at all in the previous version of this study. That was a real failure and it is corrected here.

D. The Case That Paul Was Called to This

Its footing is broader rather than narrower. Christ's own words to Paul at his commissioning already name a Jewish audience, kings, and suffering (Acts 26:16-18; 9:15-16). Paul's own language across Acts 19-23 is the language of necessity, and — decisively — that same word of necessity is spoken twice about this journey by God Himself, once by the Lord and once by an angel (Acts 23:11; 27:24). Luke's account distinguishes what the Spirit revealed from what Paul's companions concluded from it (Acts 21:4 against 21:12), a distinction Luke draws the same way elsewhere (Acts 11:28). The journey had a stated and corporate errand, announced in writing before Paul set out (Romans 15:25-32). And where scripture records a servant of God going wrong, it says so — David, Samson, Saul's kingship, Peter at Antioch, and Paul himself in this very chapter (Acts 23:5). Here it says nothing.

Weighing it. A summary of arguments made below, at the weights assigned there.

E. The Prior Question Underneath Both

Two rounds of argument over this passage produced a discovery worth stating at the front rather than burying: **the dispute is not really about Acts 21.**

Almost every disagreement traced back to a single prior question, which neither side had named:

Can suffering, imprisonment, or death be inside God's will for a believer — or is it evidence, on its face, that the believer has stepped outside it?

Grant the second answer and the Acts 21 conclusion follows almost automatically, and no amount of Greek will move it: Paul ended in chains, therefore Paul erred. Grant the first and most of the opposing objections lose their force at once, because the imprisonment stops being self-evidently a verdict.

Chapter 8 takes that question up directly. It is placed late because it needs the textual work first, but a reader who wants to know where the real disagreement lies should know now that it is there, and not in the grammar of Acts 19:21.

Weighing it. The identification of the crux is a **strong inference** from the shape of the debate rather than a claim about any verse. Chapter 8's handling of the question itself is rated there.

F. Method

Same method as every study in this library (*Research-Method.md*): the King James Version as the base text, every claim flagged for its epistemic status, and this library's own four-step Resolution Procedure for a text that appears to cut against a position otherwise well established — is the translation the best available rendering; is the text secure across the manuscript tradition; does the verse's force depend on a later editorial comma or clause break; and what do context and grammar actually require. Acts 21:4 is run through exactly that procedure in Chapter 4, not assumed either way going in.

Three disciplines have been added to that method for this version, each because the previous version failed at it:

Constructions are verified element by element. Where this study says two verses share a Greek construction, both have been checked against the interlinear including prepositions — not merely article and noun. The previous version claimed a "word for word" parallel that does not exist, and Chapter 2 §A has been rebuilt around what the text actually shows.

No claim is made that a word is never used loosely. The previous version said Luke uses *dei* "nowhere loosely." That is falsified by four verses in Luke's own hand, which are quoted in Chapter 2 §D.

Arguments from outcome are ruled out in both directions. Good fruit following an act does not prove the act was obedient; diminished fruit following an act does not prove it was disobedient. The previous version broke this rule in its own favour, and Chapter 7 §C has been demoted accordingly. Chapter 6 §F holds the opposing reading to the same standard.

Weighing it. Method, not argument.

G. Stated Up Front, Then Argued

This study's considered position, argued in full below and not merely asserted here: **Paul's journey to Jerusalem was not a lapse from his calling but an outworking of it.** It was named as a necessity before he set out, stated twice in God's own voice afterward, carried a stated errand to the believers at

Jerusalem, and is never once assigned fault anywhere in scripture — in a narrative that assigns fault to Paul freely on other matters, including inside this very episode.

Acts 21:4 is real, and this study does not explain it away. It reads it precisely, and distinguishes — as Luke's own second report at Acts 21:12 already does — between what the Spirit revealed and what alarmed companions concluded from it.

But this study does not claim the question is closed. Three things remain genuinely open, and they are named in the Closing rather than buried: whether an unrecorded repentance could sit between Acts 21:14 and 23:11; whether the purification of Acts 21:23-26 was itself a misstep; and how much weight the change in Acts's own texture after 19:20 should carry.

Weighing it. The position as a whole is offered as a **reasonable inference**, resting on two **direct statements** (Acts 23:11; 27:24) and one **strong inference** (the absence of any verdict where scripture normally supplies one). It is not offered as a conclusion no careful reader could reach differently.

Chapter 1 — A Commission That Already Named Jerusalem

A. Three Names, One Sentence — and Who Was Spoken To

The question of whether Jerusalem belonged to Paul's calling has to start where the calling is first stated:

> **Acts 9:15-16** *But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel: For I will shew him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake.*

An accuracy point first, because the previous version of this study got it wrong. **These words are spoken to Ananias, about Paul — not to Paul.** The previous version called this "the very sentence that commissions him," which is not true, and a reader checking it would find that out immediately. What the verse gives is Christ's own statement of Paul's commission, delivered to the man sent to him; Paul's own account confirms Ananias then relayed it (Acts 22:14-15).

With that corrected, what the sentence says still stands. Three audiences are named, not one: "the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel." Most treatments of Paul's calling stop at the first and pass quickly over the other two, though they are stated with equal weight, in the same breath, by the same voice. "Kings" is not fulfilled anywhere in Paul's missionary journeys among the churches; it is fulfilled in Acts 24-26, before Felix, Festus and Agrippa. "The children of Israel" names a Jewish audience distinct from the Gentile churches, and its fullest expression in Acts is the temple, the Sanhedrin and the Jerusalem crowd of Acts 21-23. And the word for what this commission would cost is the word this study traces throughout: "he must (*dei*) suffer for my name's sake."

A second correction. The previous version said the "kings" clause "is fulfilled **only because** Paul was arrested at Jerusalem." That reasons backward from what happened to what was required, which is precisely the move this library's method is supposed to catch. The prophecy names the audience; it does not specify the route. Paul could in principle have come before kings by some other road. What can be said is narrower and still useful: **the arrest is the route Acts actually records**, and the necessity of that route is stated later in God's own voice rather than in this study's reconstruction (Chapter 2 §E).

Weighing it: reasonable inference. That Jerusalem's own audience and the legal process are named in Paul's commission is a **direct statement**. That their presence in the commission bears on the Acts 21 journey is a **reasonable inference** — the opposing reading can fairly answer that a commission naming an audience says nothing about when or by what means Paul should approach it, and that Paul had already preached to Jews in every city he entered. This chapter establishes that Jerusalem was not excluded from Paul's calling. It does not establish that this particular journey was commanded.

B. Christ's Own Words, Spoken Directly to Paul

Because §A's verse is spoken to Ananias, the stronger form of the same argument is a passage the previous version did not use at all — Paul's sworn courtroom account of what Christ said to him directly:

> **Acts 26:16-18** *But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.*

Two things in verse 17 repay attention. "**The people**" is Israel — so a Jewish audience is named in Christ's own direct words to Paul, not only in the words given to Ananias. And "**delivering thee**" presupposes danger among both audiences: a promise of rescue is not given to a man who will face nothing.

This last point has been turned against the study, and fairly, so it is worth meeting here. If Christ promised to deliver Paul "from the Gentiles," does Gentile custody not contradict the promise? It would, if deliverance meant exemption. But count what actually happens in the chapters under dispute. Paul is rescued from the temple mob (Acts 21:31-32); from the scourging, by his citizenship (22:25-29); from the council, "lest Paul should have been pulled in pieces" (23:10); from a forty-man ambush, by his nephew and four hundred and seventy soldiers (23:16-24); from a second ambush plot (25:3); from the soldiers' plan to kill the prisoners (27:42-44); and from the viper (28:3-6).

The promise of Acts 26:17 is not suspended during this period. It is kept, densely, seven times over. What changes is its character: Paul is delivered *through* danger rather than *out of* custody.

Weighing it: strong inference. That Christ's direct words to Paul name a Jewish audience and presuppose danger is a **direct statement**. That the seven rescues of Acts 21-28 constitute the promise being kept is a **strong inference** — the opposing reading can answer that deliverance into four years of chains is a thin sort of rescue, and that Paul's own earlier escapes were out of danger rather than through it. What cannot fairly be said, on the text, is that God stopped delivering him.

C. An Order Already Visible: Why Paul Left Jerusalem Before He Could Return To It

A fair objection belongs here, addressed rather than avoided: didn't the Lord in fact tell Paul to leave Jerusalem and stay away?

> **Acts 22:17-18, 21** *And it came to pass, that, when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance; And saw him saying unto me, Make haste, and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem: for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me. … And he said unto me, Depart: for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles.*

This is a real vision and this study does not minimize it, but it belongs to a different moment entirely: the earliest days after Paul's conversion, before any of the three journeys, before a single Gentile church had been planted. Read alongside the three-part commission, it reads not as a permanent ban on Jerusalem but as the commission's own order — the Gentiles first, since Jerusalem in that hour would not receive him.

It was objected, in review, that this passage is simply part of Paul's story and proves nothing for either side. That is close to right, and the section has been retitled to present it as an objection answered rather than a point scored.

But one detail inside it does bear on the larger question, and neither side had noticed it. In the verses between 18 and 21, **Paul argues with the Lord** — "Lord, they know that I imprisoned and beat in every synagogue them that believed on thee" (22:19) — and the Lord simply repeats the instruction: "Depart" (22:21). Luke is entirely willing to show Paul resisting a divine instruction and being overruled, and to show it in Paul's own mouth in a public speech.

That is worth holding onto. When the question later becomes whether Luke would record Paul overriding the Spirit, the answer is that Luke has already done exactly that once, plainly, and did not soften it.

Weighing it: reasonable inference, and partly a concession. As an answer to the objection, the section is a **reasonable inference** — the opposing reading can say the vision shows Jerusalem was never Paul's assignment and that its early date changes nothing about that. The observation about Acts 22:19-21 is a **direct statement** of what the text does, though what it implies for Acts 21 is only **corroboration**: Luke's willingness to record one such scene does not guarantee he would record another.

In Short

Christ's own words at Paul's conversion — given to Ananias in Acts 9:15-16 and to Paul directly in Acts 26:16-18 — already name a Jewish audience, kings, danger, and suffering. That establishes that Jerusalem was not excluded from Paul's calling; it does not by itself establish that this journey was commanded, and this study does not claim it does. The early vision of Acts 22:17-21 explains the order of Paul's ministry rather than permanently barring Jerusalem from it, and contains, in passing, a plain instance of Luke recording Paul resisting the Lord and being overruled.

Chapter 2 — "I Must Also See Rome": The Language of Divine Necessity

A. Purposed in the Spirit: What the Greek Does and Does Not Show

The previous version of this study built a case here that does not survive checking, and the correction has to come before the argument.

"Paul purposed" translates *etheto* — the middle-voice aorist of *tithemi* (Strong's G5087, "to set, to place"), the middle voice carrying the sense of setting something for oneself, resolving. What follows, "in the spirit," is **ἐν τῷ πνεύματι** (*en to pneumati*) — preposition, definite article, noun, and no possessive.

The previous version claimed this construction recurs "word for word, three verses later" at Acts 20:22, "bound in the spirit." **That is not correct, and the claim is withdrawn.** Acts 20:22 reads δεδεμένος τῷ πνεύματι — a bare dative with **no preposition**. It is a similar phrase, not the same construction, and it is a chapter later, not three verses. Mark 2:8, which the previous version used as the contrast case, is also a bare dative (τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ) — which makes it structurally *closer* to Acts 20:22 than to Acts 19:21.

That leaves one genuine observation from the old argument, and it is worth keeping at its real size: **Mark 2:8 shows that when a New Testament writer wants a person's own private spirit read unambiguously, the possessive is available and gets used.** Acts 19:21 has no possessive. That is a real absence. It is not, on its own, decisive.

The argument that does hold is different in kind, and stronger. It does not rest on one word recurring between two speakers — it rests on **how Luke himself uses this exact phrase**:

> **Luke 2:27** *And he came by the Spirit into the temple: and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him after the custom of the law,*
>
> **Luke 4:1** *And Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness,*

Both are **ἐν τῷ πνεύματι** — the identical construction to Acts 19:21, preposition and all, in Luke's own hand. In both, the Spirit is unmistakably the divine Spirit. In neither is there any verb of speech: no one hears words. And in Luke 4:1 the leading goes directly into forty days of hardship.

That is a usage pattern by the same author, which is a different and far better class of evidence than a lexical match. It answers the objection — fairly raised — that matching a single Greek word between two speakers is the same move used to argue Jesus is God from "before Abraham was, I AM." It is not the same move. A word occurring twice proves nothing; an author's settled idiom is evidence about that author.

Set that beside how Luke writes the other kind of Spirit-statement in this same stretch — Acts 20:23 ("the Holy Ghost witnesseth"), 21:4 ("said to Paul through the Spirit"), 21:11 ("Thus saith the Holy Ghost") — every one attached to a verb of speech or witness, delivered through other people, reporting content from outside. The pattern is consistent enough to name: **ἐν τῷ πνεύματι with no verb of speech marks Spirit-prompted movement; "the Holy Ghost" plus a verb of saying marks an outward, verbal word given through someone else.**

This library has already worked out the category this points to, in *Save Yourselves From This Untoward Generation* (Chapter 2) and the *Holy Spirit "He or It" Pronoun Study*: not God the Giver speaking audibly from outside, and not bare unaided human ambition either, but the gift of holy spirit already resident within the believer (Acts 2:38), operating from within — compare Romans 8:14, "as many as are led by

the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God," a leading that works through a believer's own will rather than against it.

Weighing it: reasonable inference — downgraded from the previous version's implicit claim of near-certainty. Luke's usage at 2:27 and 4:1 is a **direct statement** of how Luke writes. That Acts 19:21 carries the same sense is a **reasonable inference**, and §B below gives the honest reasons a careful reader could decline it.

B. The Counter-Instances, Stated Plainly

A study that waits for a reviewer to find the weaknesses in its own grammar has not done its work. Three are stated here.

First: Acts 20:22 is a bare dative, not the same construction. It can still be read the same way, since Greek datives of this kind commonly carry the sense without the preposition — but this study can no longer call it a parallel and will not.

Second: Luke uses a bare dative of a man's own spirit, without a possessive.

> **Acts 18:25** *This man was instructed in the way of the Lord; and being fervent in the spirit, he spake and taught diligently the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John.*

"Fervent in the spirit" is ζέων **τῷ πνεύματι** — article, no possessive. Commentators divide over whether this means Apollos's own spirit or the Spirit of God. It is a bare dative rather than ἐν plus dative, so it does not break the specific pattern §A rests on. But it is the nearest counter-instance in Luke's own writing and an honest study names it rather than hoping no one looks.

Third: translators are divided at Acts 19:21 itself. The KJV has "the spirit," lowercase; so does the NASB 1995. Editions and margins differ over whether to capitalize, and some note "in his spirit" as the alternative. **This study does not treat the rendering as settled and should not have implied otherwise.** The grammar genuinely permits both, and a reader who takes it as Paul's own inward resolve is not doing violence to the Greek.

What this study does claim is narrower: that read against Luke's own use of this exact construction elsewhere, and against the absence of the possessive that Mark 2:8 shows was available, the divine reading is the more natural one. That is a claim about probability, not about proof.

Weighing it: this section is a concession, not an argument. It lowers the ceiling on §A. A reader persuaded by the three points here should treat Chapter 2 §A as **corroboration only** rather than as a load-bearing argument — and the position in this study would survive that, because its weight rests on Chapter 2 §E and Chapter 5, not here.

C. Paul's Own Language of Planning — and the Romans 15 Complication

Paul demonstrably uses the ordinary language of personal planning about his own movements. Writing to Rome, using a third Greek verb for "purpose" (*protithemai*, G4388), he says plainly that a plan of his own did not come off:

> **Romans 1:13** *Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you, but was let hitherto, that I might have some fruit among you also, even as among other Gentiles.*

Writing to Corinth, defending a changed travel plan, he uses an ordinary word of reasoned decision (*bouleuomai*, G1011) twice in one sentence and does not deny that he purposes things by his own deliberation — only that his deliberation is untrustworthy:

> **2 Corinthians 1:17** *When I therefore was thus minded, did I use lightness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be yea yea, and nay nay?*

And when he lays out ordinary travel plans elsewhere, he holds them openly contingent:

> **1 Corinthians 16:7** *For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit.*

The previous version of this study drew a contrast from this: Acts 19:21 stands out because it *lacks* the provisional language, so the "must" is the language Paul reserves for a settled purpose.

That contrast has to be weakened, and the reason is a verse the previous version quoted without noticing what it was. It cited Romans 15:32 as a generic example of Paul's provisional style:

> **Romans 15:32** *That I may come unto you with joy by the will of God, and may with you be refreshed.*

But Romans 15:32 is not a generic example. **It is the closing clause of the passage in which Paul announces this very journey** (Romans 15:25-31, quoted in Chapter 3 §D). So the study's own proof-text for "Paul talks provisionally about ordinary plans" turns out to be Paul talking provisionally about the Jerusalem trip's own sequel.

The honest version of the contrast is therefore narrower: Paul held the journey's **sequel** — Rome, and then Spain — open to God's will, while stating the journey itself, and the necessity of Rome, without qualification. That is still a real distinction, and it is visible in the same passage. It is a considerably smaller one than the previous version claimed.

Weighing it: reasonable inference, materially reduced. The opposing reading can fairly answer that a man may state his own intention flatly and still be wrong about it, and that the absence of "if the Lord permit" at Acts 19:21 is a thin thread. It is. This section is retained because the distinction is real, not because it carries much.

D. Dei: How Luke Uses "Must," and Where He Does Not

"I must also see Rome" translates the Greek impersonal verb *dei* — "it is necessary," "it must be." Across Luke's two-volume work, he reaches for this word again and again at the hinge-points of God's unfolding plan: Jesus of His own mission at twelve ("wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business," Luke 2:49) and of His coming suffering ("the Son of man must suffer many things," Luke 9:22; "ought not Christ to have suffered these things," Luke 24:26, same root); of Paul's commission ("how great things he must suffer for my name's sake," Acts 9:16); and of Paul's own preaching ("we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God," Acts 14:22).

The previous version then said Luke uses this word "nowhere loosely." That is false and is withdrawn. *Dei* occurs roughly a hundred times in the New Testament and carries ordinary obligation as readily as divine necessity — in Luke's own hand:

> **Luke 13:14** *And the ruler of the synagogue answered with indignation, because that Jesus had healed on the sabbath day, and said unto the people, There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day.*
>
> **Acts 19:36** *Seeing then that these things cannot be spoken against, ye ought to be quiet, and to do nothing rashly.*
>
> **Acts 25:10** *Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar's judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest.*

So the word alone proves nothing. And the objection that follows from this is fair and has to be granted: **a man may say "I must" because he sincerely believes he is under a divine charge, and be mistaken about it.** Paul's own use of *dei* at Acts 19:21 cannot settle whether Paul was right.

What remains is the concentration, not the word: at Luke's narrative hinges, this is his vocabulary. That is a matter of style and it counts for something. It does not count for much on its own — which is why the weight of this chapter sits in §E.

Weighing it: corroboration only. Downgraded from the previous version, where it functioned as a main argument. The opposing reading's answer — that Paul thought "I must" was divine when it was his own resolve — cannot be refuted from this word.

E. The Two Uses That Are Not Paul's

Here is where the argument from necessity actually rests, and the previous version underused it badly.

Twice, about this journey, *dei* is spoken **not by Paul**:

> **Acts 23:11** *And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.*
>
> **Acts 27:23-24** *For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, Saying, Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Caesar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee.*

The first is the Lord Himself, twelve verses after the arrest. The second is an angel, in the middle of the storm, **with God's own reason attached** — two hundred and seventy-six lives preserved (Acts 27:37, 44).

This defeats the word-matching objection directly, because two of the three uses are not Paul's words at all. Whether or not Paul was right to say "I must see Rome," God twice says that Rome is necessary. The question is no longer whether Paul's private conviction matched God's will; it is what to make of God stating the necessity in His own voice.

The objection to this is serious and is answered in Chapter 5 §E. It runs: God ratifying a course does not prove the course was His original intention — He gave Israel a king He had told them not to want. That objection is real, and Chapter 5 §E takes it on its own ground rather than dismissing it.

Weighing it: direct statement, with a live objection. That God twice names Rome as necessary is a **direct statement**. That this establishes the journey was God's will from the outset is a **reasonable inference** only, because the Plan B reading is available and coherent. Acts 23:11 is harder for that reading than 27:24, because it comes twelve verses after the arrest with no repentance recorded in between and it *commends* what Paul did at Jerusalem — but "no repentance recorded" is an argument from silence and is weighed as one.

F. Jesus's Own Journey to Jerusalem, and Luke's Echo

> **Luke 9:51** *And it came to pass, when the time was come that he should be received up, he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.*

This verse opens the long central section of Luke's Gospel; everything from here to the crucifixion is organized around this one resolve. It is a pattern Luke has already trained his reader to recognize: a deliberate, foreknowing purpose to go to Jerusalem, fully aware that suffering waits there, undertaken as the fulfilment of God's will rather than in spite of it. When the same author writes in his second volume that Paul "purposed… to go to Jerusalem," using the language of necessity immediately after, the echo is meant to be heard.

It was objected, fairly, that this echo proves neither obedience nor disobedience — that if Paul was right it parallels Christ's obedience through suffering, and if Paul was wrong it shows a man's zeal to suffer running past what God asked. **That objection is correct**, and the section is retained at the weight it deserves rather than the weight the previous version gave it.

Weighing it: corroboration only. A literary echo establishes that Luke framed the two journeys alike. It does not establish that God evaluated them alike.

G. Acts 20:22-23: Knowing, and Going Anyway

Before Paul reaches Tyre or hears Agabus, he tells the Ephesian elders exactly what he expects:

> **Acts 20:22-23** *And now, behold, I go bound in the spirit unto Jerusalem, not knowing the things that shall befall me there: Save that the Holy Ghost witnesseth in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me.*

Verse 22 is the inward state; verse 23 is the outward, verbal testimony, "in every city," through the mouths of others. Luke did not need two different phrasings to say one thing twice.

What is certain, and what both readings must account for: **Paul is not surprised.** He states in advance that the Holy Ghost has told him repeatedly, city after city, that bonds and afflictions are coming — and he goes. Whether that is a man walking knowingly into a called suffering or a man overriding a warning is exactly the question this study is about, and verse 23 by itself does not answer it.

Weighing it: neutral on the central question. This is a genuinely two-edged passage and the previous version treated it as one-edged. That the Holy Ghost's repeated testimony is *content* rather than *command* is a **reasonable inference** from its wording ("witnesseth… saying that bonds and afflictions abide me" — a statement of what awaits, not an instruction), and Chapter 4 §C shows Luke using the same shape elsewhere. But a reader who hears a warning in it is hearing something the words will bear.

In Short

The Greek of Acts 19:21 is less decisive than the previous version of this study claimed, and the false parallel with Acts 20:22 is withdrawn. What survives is Luke's own use of ἐν τῷ πνεύματι at Luke 2:27 and 4:1 — divine Spirit, no verb of speech, in one case leading directly into hardship — which makes the divine reading more natural without making it certain; Acts 18:25 and the translators' own division are stated against it. The word *dei* proves nothing on its own, and the claim that Luke never uses it loosely is withdrawn. The weight of the chapter rests instead on the two uses that are not Paul's: the Lord at Acts 23:11 and the angel at Acts 27:24, both naming Rome as necessary, the second with God's own reason attached.

Chapter 3 — The Verses This Study Used to Pass Over

The previous version of this study did not address Acts 20:16 or Acts 20:24, which are the two verses the opposing reading leans on hardest after Acts 21:4. A study that names itself a resolution cannot leave its opponent's best verses out. They are taken here in order, along with the passage that answers most of the surrounding argument and that no version of this study had used.

A. Acts 20:16 — Sailing Past Ephesus

> **Acts 20:16** *For Paul had determined to sail by Ephesus, because he would not spend the time in Asia: for he hasted, if it were possible for him, to be at Jerusalem the day of Pentecost.*

The objection is real: why would a man under divine necessity bypass the most fruitful base of his ministry to keep a date?

Three things can be said, and the first is a partial concession.

The stated reason is ordinary. Luke gives Paul's motive plainly — haste, to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost. That is a human calculation about a calendar. It is not framed as revelation, and this study will not dress it up as one. Paul made a scheduling decision.

But he did not avoid the Ephesians. He sailed past the port and summoned the elders to Miletus (Acts 20:17), then spent what reads as the most personal address in the book of Acts with them. Whatever Acts 20:16 shows, it does not show a man slipping away.

And the errand explains the date. Pentecost matters because the collection had to arrive at the feast, when Jerusalem was full and the poor saints' need was greatest — see §D below. Once the journey's actual purpose is in view, the haste stops looking like restlessness and starts looking like logistics.

Weighing it: a partial concession. That Paul's stated reason is ordinary human haste is a **direct statement** and tells mildly against reading every step of this journey as divinely dictated. This study's answer — that the errand explains the deadline — is a **reasonable inference**. The opposing reading can fairly answer that a collection could have been carried by others (as indeed Paul had once proposed, 1 Corinthians 16:3-4), and that the urgency was Paul's own.

B. Acts 20:24 — "Neither Count I My Life Dear Unto Myself"

This is the verse the opposing reading returns to most often, and it is worth quoting in full, in this library's base text, because the full sentence differs from how it is usually cited:

> **Acts 20:24** *But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.*

It is frequently quoted from a modern version as "I do not consider my life of any account as dear to myself," and the argument built on it is that this is a man devaluing what God values — that God wants His people alive and free, and that Paul here contradicts Him.

The KJV sentence does not stop where that quotation stops. The clause continues into a purpose: *so that I might finish my course with joy, and the ministry, which I have received of the Lord Jesus*. **Paul is not saying his life is worth nothing. He is ranking a** received** ministry above self-preservation, and naming its source in the same breath.

That structure matters, because it is the same structure Paul uses of the Ephesian elders eight verses later: the Holy Ghost *made* them overseers (Acts 20:28). A charge received is not a course chosen.

It has been answered, honestly, that the purpose clause *is* the error — that a ministry cannot be finished by a man who is dead or bound, so subordinating life to ministry is self-defeating. Chapter 8 §C takes that up as a question of principle, since it is the crux in miniature. Two things belong here:

Scripture praises this exact disposition in Paul, in a corporate decision. The Jerusalem council's own letter — the body of Christ deciding together, which is the standard the opposing reading itself invokes — describes Barnabas and Paul as "men that have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 15:26). If readiness to risk death is ungodly, that commendation is inexplicable.

And Paul had already been imprisoned repeatedly, and listed it as credential rather than failure:

> **2 Corinthians 11:23** *Are they ministers of Christ? (I speak as a fool) I am more; in labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft.*

That was written **before** the Jerusalem journey. If imprisonment is evidence on its face of being outside God's will, then most of Paul's ministry stands condemned — including Philippi, where the imprisonment produced the jailer's household (Acts 16:25-34) and ended in an earthquake that opened the doors.

Weighing it: strong inference on the reading of the verse; the principle remains contested. That the KJV sentence contains a purpose clause naming a received ministry is a **direct statement**, and quoting the verse without it changes what it says. That this makes Paul's disposition godly rather than reckless is a **strong inference**, supported by Acts 15:26 and 2 Corinthians 11:23. The opposing reading can still answer that a right disposition can be applied to a wrong journey — which is true, and is why this section does not claim to settle the larger question.

C. Acts 20:28-32 — Who Was Left in Charge of the Flock

The objection here is that Paul foresaw wolves and left anyway, shifting onto the elders a responsibility that was his.

> **Acts 20:28** *Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.*
>
> **Acts 20:29-30** *For I know this, that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.*
>
> **Acts 20:32** *And now, brethren, I commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them which are sanctified.*

Three observations from the passage itself.

The guardians were appointed by the Holy Ghost, not by Paul. Verse 28 says so in as many words. Reading verse 28 as Paul offloading a duty requires already believing that he was offloading it — the verse's plain statement runs the other way.

Paul commends them to God, not to himself (v. 32).

And the separation is final either way. "I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no more" (Acts 20:25). Paul's own stated plan was Jerusalem, then

Rome, then Spain (Romans 15:24, 28) — westward. Ephesus was behind him on any reading of his motives, so the question was never whether he would stay.

And the warning was heeded. Thirty-odd years later, the risen Christ's own assessment of that same church:

> **Revelation 2:2-3** *I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them which are evil: and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars: And hast borne, and hast patience, and for my name's sake hast laboured, and hast not fainted.*

The wolves came, exactly as Paul said. They were tested and found to be liars. Revelation 2:4's rebuke — that the church left its first love — is a real decline and should not be minimized, but it is not the collapse the objection requires.

Weighing it: strong inference. Acts 20:28's appointment of the elders by the Holy Ghost is a **direct statement**, and the responsibility-shifting reading is circular without independent support. Revelation 2:2-3 as evidence that the warning worked is a **reasonable inference** — the opposing reading can answer that Revelation 2:4-5 shows the candlestick under threat of removal, and that a church can resist false apostles while still declining.

D. Romans 15:25-32 and Acts 24:17 — What the Journey Was Actually For

This is the largest omission in every previous version of this study, and it bears on more of the opposing case than anything else in this chapter.

> **Romans 15:25-28** *But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things. When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain.*
>
> **Romans 15:30-31** *Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in your prayers to God for me; That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judaea; and that my service which I have for Jerusalem may be accepted of the saints.*

Paul confirms the same errand later, under oath, before Felix:

> **Acts 24:17** *Now after many years I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings.*

Three separate objections lose most of their force against this passage.

"He traded the believers of Ephesus for the unbelievers of Jerusalem." The journey's stated purpose was relief for *believers* — "the poor saints which are at Jerusalem," "accepted of the saints." It was a believer-directed errand carrying money from Gentile churches to Jewish ones, and Paul describes it as a debt the Gentiles owed. Whatever else it was, it was not an evangelistic gamble on unbelieving Jews.

"He was warned and refused to hear it." Paul named the danger himself, in writing, in advance — "that I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judaea." He did not need Tyre or Agabus to tell him what was coming. He had already told Rome.

"It was one man's decision, outside the body." Paul asked an entire church to "strive together with me in your prayers to God for me" over this specific journey. That is the opposite of acting alone.

Weighing it: direct statement, and the strongest section in this chapter. Everything above is what the verses say. The opposing reading's available answer is that a good errand can still be undertaken at the wrong time or against instruction — which is true, and which is why this section removes three objections without closing the central question. It should also be noted, in fairness, that Romans 15:32's "by the will of God" shows Paul holding the sequel provisionally (Chapter 2 §C).

In Short

Acts 20:16 records an ordinary human calculation about a calendar, and this study does not pretend otherwise — though the collection's deadline explains the date. Acts 20:24 in the KJV contains a purpose clause that the usual citation of it omits: Paul subordinates his life to a ministry he names as *received of the Lord Jesus*, a disposition the Jerusalem council itself commended in him (Acts 15:26) and which his own earlier imprisonments already exemplified (2 Corinthians 11:23). Acts 20:28 assigns the flock's oversight to elders the Holy Ghost appointed, and Revelation 2:2-3 shows them doing exactly what Paul's warning told them to do. And Romans 15:25-32 with Acts 24:17 gives the journey a stated errand to believers, a danger Paul named in advance, and an entire church enlisted in prayer over it.

Chapter 4 — The Hardest Verse: Acts 21:4

A. What the Verse Actually Says

The strongest single verse for the "Paul was wrong" reading is real, and this study states it in full rather than softening it:

> **Acts 21:4** *And finding disciples, we tarried there seven days: who said to Paul through the Spirit, that he should not go up to Jerusalem.*

Taken alone and read as a flat, unqualified command — "the Spirit said: do not go" — this verse would be difficult to reconcile with everything traced in Chapters 1 through 3. This study does not pretend otherwise. **On the surface, this verse favours the opposing reading**, and any resolution has to earn its way past it rather than around it.

Weighing it: this section concedes the point. The surface reading of Acts 21:4 is the opposing case's best ground.

B. Running It Through This Study's Own Resolution Procedure

This library's Harmonization principle holds that scripture cannot contradict scripture, and that an apparent contradiction signals a translation or understanding gap rather than an actual error — checked, not assumed, through four steps.

Translation. The KJV's rendering is a defensible translation of the Greek, and this study does not dispute it. **Text.** No significant manuscript variant is available here. **Punctuation.** The verse's force does not depend on an editorial comma. So three of the four steps yield nothing, and context and grammar carry the whole weight.

Two grammatical details, then the decisive one.

The verb translated "said" is **ἔλεγον** — imperfect, "they *kept* saying." That is a sustained, repeated human urging over the seven days, not a single delivered oracle.

And the phrase is **διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος**, "through the Spirit," describing the means by which the disciples came to speak.

Now Luke's own second report of the same episode, ten verses later:

> **Acts 21:12** *And when we heard these things, both we, and they of that place, besought him not to go up to Jerusalem.*

Luke's two reports of one episode use two different verbs for two different things. Verse 4 states what the Spirit did: it revealed something. Verse 12 states what the people then did with that revelation: they "besought him" — pleaded, entreated. **Nowhere does Luke have the Spirit itself issue an imperative to Paul directly.** What the Spirit gave was content; the imperative appears in verse 12 as the companions' own response to it, in their own voice.

Weighing it: reasonable inference. The imperfect ἔλεγον and the v.12 parallel are **direct statements** about the text. That they show the prohibition was the disciples' inference rather than the Spirit's command is a **reasonable inference** — and the opposing reading's answer is coherent: that the disciples spoke *by the Spirit* is exactly what verse 4 says, and a Spirit-prompted "do not go" is still a divine "do not go." This study does not claim that answer is unreasonable. It claims the reading below is more natural.

C. Luke's Own Parallel: Acts 11:28

The decisive support for §B is a verse neither this study nor its reviewer had used, and it involves the same prophet:

> **Acts 11:28** *And there stood up one of them named Agabus, and signified by the spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world: which came to pass in the days of Claudius Caesar.*

"Signified **by the spirit**" is **διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος** — the identical phrase as Acts 21:4, in Luke's own hand, about the same man. And what it introduces there is pure predictive content: a coming famine. **No command whatsoever.**

One detail worth noticing in passing, since this study's method requires it. The KJV capitalizes "the Spirit" at Acts 21:4 and leaves "the spirit" lowercase here at Acts 11:28 — but **the Greek is the same in both places.** Capitalization is a translator's judgement, not a feature of the text, and the reader who takes Acts 21:4's capital as evidence of a weightier utterance is reading the translators rather than Luke.

So when Luke writes διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, his own established usage is that the Spirit supplies *information about what is coming*. That is precisely what the surrounding verses at Tyre and Caesarea also supply — bonds and afflictions — and precisely what the companions then turned into an entreaty.

Weighing it: strong inference. Acts 11:28's wording is a **direct statement**, and one same-author parallel using the identical phrase about the identical prophet is materially better evidence than a bare appeal to context. The opposing reading can answer that one parallel is not a rule and that a phrase may introduce content in one place and a command in another. That is fair; but it now has to argue against Luke's usage rather than merely assert the surface reading.

D. Agabus, and the Difference Between a Prophecy and a Command

> **Acts 21:10-11** *And as we tarried there many days, there came down from Judaea a certain prophet, named Agabus. And when he was come unto us, he took Paul's girdle, and bound his own hands and feet, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles.*

This is the most formal "Thus saith the Holy Ghost" statement in the entire episode — and it contains no command at all. It is a prediction stated as fact: this is what will happen. Not "the Holy Ghost saith, go not up."

The command appears only in the next verses, and Luke is careful about whose words they are:

> **Acts 21:13-14** *Then Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not only to be bound, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done.*

Paul's answer treats the distinction as already obvious to him. He does not argue that the Spirit was wrong or Agabus false; he accepts the prediction and states his readiness to go through exactly what it foretold, "for the name of the Lord Jesus" — language echoing the commission at Acts 9:16.

Weighing it: strong inference. That the most formal prophetic utterance in the episode contains a prediction and no imperative is a **direct statement** about the text and is, with §C, the backbone of this chapter. The opposing reading answers that a prophecy of chains *functions* as a warning and that God does not announce bondage to a man He is sending into it without explanation. That is an appeal to what God would do, which Chapter 8 takes up; it is not an appeal to what Luke wrote.

E. Acts 21:14 — What It Does and Does Not Concede

The previous version of this study titled this section "Even Those Who Pled With Him Conceded It" and read the companions' closing words — "The will of the Lord be done" — as a concession that Paul was right.

That reading is withdrawn as overstated. The sentence will bear it, but it will equally bear the opposite: that having seen Paul would not be moved, they left the matter with God. It is what people say when persuasion has failed, and it does not disclose what they concluded.

What can be said is narrower and still worth something: **they did not walk away saying he was in sin.** Luke, who records their entreaty in detail, records no verdict from them at all.

Weighing it: neutral. Downgraded from the previous version, where it was called "the most telling detail in the whole episode." It is not. It tells us the argument ended; it does not tell us who was right.

F. Peter's Girdle: The One Prophecy of a Bound Apostle That Scripture Interprets

Agabus's sign-act is a prophecy that a leading apostle will be bound and handed over. Scripture contains exactly one other such prophecy — and in that case it tells us plainly how to read it.

> **John 21:18-19** *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God. And when he had spoken this, he saith unto him, Follow me.*

Set the two side by side. Agabus takes Paul's **girdle** and says the Jews will bind him and deliver him to the Gentiles. Christ tells Peter that "another shall **gird** thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not."

Both are prophecies of an apostle bound and taken where he would not choose to go. In the one case where scripture supplies its own interpretation, the verdict is not error or warning. It is **glory** — "signifying by what death he should glorify God" — and the instruction attached to it is **"Follow me."**

This does not prove that Paul's binding was of the same character as Peter's. It establishes something narrower and important: **a divinely announced prophecy that an apostle will be bound is not, in scripture's own usage, self-evidently a warning to avoid it.** The opposing reading's strongest intuition — that God would not announce chains to a man He was sending — has a direct counter-example in the Lord's own words to the chief apostle.

Weighing it: strong inference. John 21:19's interpretation of the binding is a **direct statement**. That it governs how to read Agabus is a **reasonable inference** — the opposing reading can answer that Peter's binding came with an explicit divine interpretation and Paul's did not, which is exactly the asymmetry it relies on elsewhere. That answer has force. But it can no longer be said that scripture never frames an apostle's chains as God's will, because here it does.

G. Companions Pleading Against a Foretold Jerusalem Suffering

There is one more scene in scripture with the same shape as Tyre and Caesarea, and it is the closest structural parallel the episode has.

> **Matthew 16:21-23** *From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day. Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee. But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.*

Every element of the Tyre episode is present. A journey to Jerusalem announced as a **must** (*dei*, verse 21 — Luke's word). Suffering foretold as part of it. A loving companion, out of genuine care, urging avoidance. And a verdict — delivered not on the traveller but on the companion.

This does not settle Acts 21; Paul is not Christ, and his journey is not the atonement. But it does answer one recurring argument: that when people who love a man plead with him not to go into foretold suffering at Jerusalem, their plea carries the authority of God. Scripture has staged that exact scene once before, and it did not rule for the companions.

Weighing it: reasonable inference. The parallel is a **direct statement** of what Matthew records. Its application to Acts 21 is a **reasonable inference** and must be held at that level — the opposing reading can fairly answer that Christ's journey was uniquely necessary and that the parallel proves only that companions can be wrong, not that these companions were.

In Short

Acts 21:4 favours the opposing reading on its surface, and this study grants that. What tells against it is the grammar and Luke's own usage: the imperfect ἔλεγον is a sustained human urging; the phrase διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος is Luke's own idiom for the Spirit supplying information, as Acts 11:28 shows with the same prophet; Luke's second report at 21:12 puts the imperative in the companions' own mouths; and Agabus's formally introduced prophecy contains a prediction and no command at all. Two scenes elsewhere in scripture bear on it: Christ's own interpretation of a bound apostle as glory (John 21:18-19), and the one other episode where loving companions urged avoidance of a foretold Jerusalem suffering (Matthew 16:21-23). Acts 21:14's "the will of the Lord be done" is neutral and the previous version overread it.

Chapter 5 — Warning, Verdict, and What Came After

A. "So Must Thou Bear Witness Also at Rome"

> **Acts 23:11** *And the night following the Lord stood by him, and said, Be of good cheer, Paul: for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.*

This is not Paul's own resolve, and not a report filtered through anxious companions. It is the Lord Himself, appearing to Paul directly, twelve verses after the arrest — and the Lord does not rebuke him. He commends what Paul has just done there ("thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem") and extends the commission forward in the same word Paul used of himself at Acts 19:21.

Weighing it: direct statement, with a live objection. What the Lord says is a **direct statement**. That it vindicates the decision to go is a **reasonable inference**, because §E's objection is available: God may stand by a servant who has already erred and repented. What makes that answer harder here than at Acts 27:24 is that no repentance is recorded between Acts 21:14 and 23:11 — but that is an argument from silence, and §D explains why this particular silence is worth more than most.

B. A Bookend Repetition

This library's *Research-Method* already names this pattern: a bookend or framing repetition, the same word recurring at the start and close of a unit to mark its boundaries and theme (Nessle's *Sumplēxis*, extending Bullinger's catalogue). "I must also see Rome" (19:21) and "so must thou bear witness also at Rome" (23:11) frame the entire disputed episode — Tyre, Agabus, the arrest, the riot, the Sanhedrin — with the identical word at both ends, spoken first by Paul and then, after everything between, spoken back to him by the Lord.

Weighing it: corroboration only. A framing repetition marks a literary unit and names its theme. It does not adjudicate the conduct inside the unit — the same frame would exist if the episode recorded a recovered mistake.

C. Paul's Own Testimony: "I Was Not Disobedient"

> **Acts 26:19-20** *Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judaea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance.*

The previous version read this as a sworn life-audit — "given precisely at the point where a man who believed he had defied the Spirit would have every reason to say so." **That framing is withdrawn.** Paul is recounting his obedience to the Damascus vision specifically, not issuing a general statement that he had never erred. The objection is correct.

What survives is narrower and still worth stating: verse 20 names Jerusalem inside the vision's own scope — "at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judaea" — as part of what Paul understood himself to have been sent to do.

Weighing it: reasonable inference, materially reduced. Verse 20's inclusion of Jerusalem in the commission's scope is a **direct statement** of what Paul said. Reading verse 19 as bearing on the Acts 21 journey is a **reasonable inference** at best, and the opposing reading's answer — that Paul is describing the Damascus vision, not auditing his career — is the more natural reading of the immediate context.

D. What Scripture Does When a Servant of God Errs

This is the argument the previous version was reaching for and did not state correctly. It framed it as "Paul never admits fault," which is easily answered: a man need not confess every error, and Paul's silence proves little.

The stronger form is about **Luke and scripture, not about Paul's candour.**

Consider what Luke does inside this very episode. Six verses before the Lord stands by Paul and commends him, Paul misjudges, is rebuked, and corrects himself:

> **Acts 23:1-5** *And Paul, earnestly beholding the council, said, Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God until this day. And the high priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him to smite him on the mouth. Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law? And they that stood by said, Revilest thou God's high priest? Then said Paul, I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.*

And a few chapters later Luke lets Paul assign blame to others in plain terms: "Sirs, ye should have hearkened unto me, and not have loosed from Crete" (Acts 27:21).

So Luke is not protecting Paul. He records Paul's misstep and retraction in the same chapter as the Lord's commendation, and he records Paul apportioning fault freely. The narrative is perfectly willing to show error here — and it shows none about the journey.

Widen the frame and the pattern holds everywhere. **Where a servant of God errs, scripture says so:**

- **David** — "the thing that David had done displeased the LORD" (2 Samuel 11:27); "Thou art the man" (12:7); "wherefore hast thou despised the commandment of the LORD?" (12:9).

- **Samson** — his violations stated as they occur (Judges 14:3; 16:1).

- **Peter** — "I withstood him to the face, **because he was to be blamed**" (Galatians 2:11).

- **Paul himself** — Acts 23:5 above, and "I am not meet to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God" (1 Corinthians 15:9).

- **Israel's demand for a king** — treated in §E below.

And it should be said plainly, because the previous version's argument could be misread as claiming otherwise: **Paul was entirely capable of error.** He rebuked Peter to his face; Luke records his sharp contention with Barnabas over Mark without issuing any verdict (Acts 15:37-39). Nothing in this study depends on Paul's general reliability.

The distinction that matters is between a warning and a verdict. Acts 21:4 and the prophecies at Tyre and Caesarea are *prospective warnings* — they tell what is coming. In every case above, scripture

supplies a *retrospective assessment*, in narrative or divine voice, after the fact. Here no such assessment ever comes: not in Acts 22-28, not in the letters written from that custody, not in 2 Timothy at the end of Paul's life.

Weighing it: strong inference. The asymmetry is a **direct statement** about what scripture contains and omits, and it is, in this study's judgement, the strongest argument available on this side. The opposing reading's answer is that the verdict *is* given, in the form of the diminished fruit of Acts 20-28 — which is a coherent move, but an argument from outcome, and Chapter 6 §F holds it to the rule that governs both directions.

E. The Plan B Objection: Israel's King

The most serious objection to Chapter 2 §E and to §A above deserves its own section, stated at full strength before it is answered, because it is a real biblical pattern and not a debating move.

The objection. God's ratification of a course does not prove the course was His original will. Israel demanded a king; God told Samuel they had rejected Him; and then God gave them a king, chose him, and worked through him. Once Saul reigned there was no returning to the judges. Applied here: even granting that the Lord spoke at Acts 23:11 and the angel at Acts 27:24, that is God meeting a servant where he now is, not endorsing how he got there. The original road was closed; this was the road that remained.

This is a genuine scriptural shape and it must be granted as such. 1 Samuel 8:7 — "they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them" — and yet 1 Samuel 12:13, "behold, the LORD hath set a king over you." God does work through what He did not want.

The answer is in the same passage, and it is the same answer as David and Samson. In the paradigm case of a divine Plan B, scripture says plainly that the original was refused — three times, in three voices:

> **1 Samuel 12:17** *Is it not wheat harvest to day? I will call unto the LORD, and he shall send thunder and rain; that ye may perceive and see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of the LORD, in asking you a king.*
>
> **1 Samuel 12:19** *And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto the LORD thy God, that we die not: for we have added unto all our sins this evil, to ask us a king.*
>
> **1 Samuel 12:20** *And Samuel said unto the people, Fear not: ye have done all this wickedness: yet turn not aside from following the LORD, but serve the LORD with all your heart.*

Verse 20 is the exact sentence the Plan B reading of Acts needs and does not have — the acknowledgement of the error placed directly alongside the accommodation. *Ye have done all this wickedness: yet turn not aside.* God accommodates, and the text says what was refused.

So the analogy holds in form and fails in evidence. Every example the Plan B reading can offer — Saul, David, Samson — supplies the verdict alongside the accommodation. Acts supplies the accommodation and no verdict at all.

Weighing it: strong inference, against a strong objection. That every scriptural Plan B carries an explicit verdict is a **direct statement** about those passages, and this is the hinge on which Chapter 2 §E and §A above ultimately rest. The opposing reading has two available answers, and both should be stated: that an argument from what scripture *omits* is weaker than one from what it contains; and that a verdict may be implied by the changed fruit rather than stated. This study finds neither answer as strong as the pattern, but does not pretend they are unavailable.

In Short

The Lord's own words after the arrest commend rather than correct what Paul had done, and echo his "must" from Acts 19:21. Paul's "I was not disobedient" is about the Damascus vision and has been narrowed accordingly. The weight of this chapter is in what scripture does and does not say afterward: Luke records Paul's misstep and retraction six verses before the commendation, and lets Paul assign blame freely elsewhere, so the narrative is plainly willing to show fault — and it shows none here. In every scriptural case of a servant erring, including every case the Plan B objection relies on, the verdict is stated. Here it never is.

Chapter 6 — The Fruit Question

The opposing reading's most careful argument is that Acts itself changes character after 19:20, and that the change is the verdict. The previous version of this study did not engage this at all, and then, in review, overstated its answer twice. Both corrections are carried here.

A. What Genuinely Changes

Three things change, and this study grants all three.

The growth statements stop. Luke's summary statements of the church's expansion run 2:43-47, 5:14, 6:7, 9:31, 12:24, 16:5 and 19:20. The last of them is Acts 19:20: "So mightily grew the word of God and prevailed." After that, no statement in Acts uses the language of the church growing, multiplying or increasing in number. **Acts 19:20 is the last growth statement in the book, and the opposing reading is right about that.**

An earlier version of this study's review material claimed otherwise, on the grounds that the series completes at Acts 28:30-31. That depended on counting *section-closing statements* (of which 28:30-31 is the eighth) rather than *growth statements* (of which 19:20 is the seventh). Both counts are legitimate; they disagree only over what Acts 28:30-31 is. On the growth-language test, the opposing reading's count is the right one.

The prison deliverances stop. Before Acts 20 there are three: the apostles released by an angel (Acts 5:19), Peter's chains falling off (12:7-11), and the earthquake at Philippi (16:26). After Acts 20 there are none of that kind. The angel at Acts 27:23-24 announces survival, not release.

The narrative narrows to one man. From Acts 20 onward the book follows Paul's legal journey rather than the church's expansion.

Weighing it: this section is a concession. All three observations are **direct statements** about the text and this study does not contest any of them.

B. Luke's Own Structural Seam

What can be said against the inference — not the observation — begins with where the seam falls.

Under every recognised division of Acts, the boundary lies between 19:20 and 19:21, and **Acts 19:21 is the opening sentence of the book's final section** (19:21 through 28:31). The anchor verse of this study is the programmatic first line of Luke's last movement: Jerusalem, then Rome.

So the change in texture is not an unexplained drop-off. It lands exactly on a seam Luke himself made, and the verse on the far side of that seam is the verse in dispute.

But this does not settle anything, and the previous review material claimed too much for it. The opposing reading can answer — fairly — that Luke placed the seam there precisely *because* that is where the decisive choice was made, and that a structural boundary tells us where the author changed subject, not why.

Weighing it: reasonable inference, explicitly limited. The location of the seam is a **direct statement** about the structure of Acts. That it explains the change in texture innocently is a **reasonable inference** that narrows the question without answering it.

C. Two Internal Controls

What does bear on the inference is whether, inside Acts itself, diminished narrative attention or absent deliverance tracks divine disapproval. Two tests are available, and both come out the same way.

Peter. He is the vehicle of the greatest healings and deliverances in Acts 1-12 — the lame man at the gate, shadows healing the sick, an angel opening the prison. And he disappears from the book after chapter 15. By the standard the opposing reading applies to Paul, Peter's ministry collapsed. No one holds that. What it shows is that Luke's narrowing focus is a fact about Luke's subject, not a verdict on a man.

James. The sharper test, and it sits inside one chapter:

> **Acts 12:2** *And he killed James the brother of John with the sword.*
>
> **Acts 12:7** *And, behold, the angel of the Lord came upon him, and a light shined in the prison: and he smote Peter on the side, and raised him up, saying, Arise up quickly. And his chains fell off from his hands.*

Same chapter. Same persecution. Same prison. Same praying church. God let one apostle be executed and delivered the other five verses later — with **no explanation offered and no fault assigned to James anywhere in scripture.**

So deliverance from prison cannot be a reliable marker of divine approval, and its absence cannot be a marker of disapproval. If it were, Acts 12:2 would convict James of something, and nothing in scripture suggests it does.

Weighing it: strong inference. Acts 12:2 beside 12:7 is a **direct statement**, and it is the most useful thing in this chapter. The opposing reading can answer that James's death was martyrdom under persecution while Paul's chains followed a warned-against decision — which is true but assumes the point at issue. What cannot survive is the general principle that God's people are not left bound.

D. What Continues

Several of the specific claims about post-Acts-20 decline do not hold against the text.

Miracles continue, including the largest healing scene in the book's second half.

> **Acts 28:8-9** *And it came to pass, that the father of Publius lay sick of a fever and of a bloody flux: to whom Paul entered in, and prayed, and laid his hands on him, and healed him. So when this was done, others also, which had diseases in the island, came, and were healed.*

An island-wide healing, after the arrest. Add Eutychus raised from the dead (Acts 20:9-12) and the viper shaken off (28:3-6).

An angel still comes, and with God's own reason attached — Acts 27:23-24, and two hundred and seventy-six lives preserved.

Paul is not alone. Luke is with him throughout ("we"); Aristarchus sails with him (Acts 27:2); Roman brethren come out to meet him as far as Appii forum, "whom when Paul saw, he thanked God, and took courage" (28:15); and the letters from that custody name Timothy, Tychicus, Epaphras, Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, Jesus Justus and Onesimus (Colossians 4:7-14; Philemon 23-24). Onesimus is converted in that custody (Philemon 10), and there are saints in Caesar's own household (Philippians 4:22).

And the book ends on a word of freedom. Acts 28:31 closes with ἀκωλύτως — "no man forbidding him" — the last word of the book, spoken over a man in chains.

Weighing it: direct statement on the particulars; limited in scope. Each item above is what the text says, and the claims they answer are not sustainable. But correcting the particulars does not dispose of the pattern in §A, and this study does not claim it does.

E. 2 Timothy 1:15 and the Loss of Asia

The strongest form of the decline argument is not about Acts at all. It is this:

> **2 Timothy 1:15** *This thou knowest, that all they which are in Asia be turned away from me; of whom are Phygellus and Hermogenes.*

Set against Acts 19:10 — "all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks" — that is a real and troubling contrast, and no previous version of this study addressed it.

Four things bear on it.

What the verse says. "Turned away from **me**" — not from the word, not from the Lord. Paul says something similar at 2 Timothy 4:16, "no man stood with me, but all men forsook me," and immediately prays "that it may not be laid to their charge," which is not how a man describes apostasy.

The counter-example is in the next sentence.

> **2 Timothy 1:16-18** *The Lord give mercy unto the house of Onesiphorus; for he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain: But, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently, and found me. The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day: and in how many things he ministered unto me at Ephesus, thou knowest very well.*

Paul writes "all they which are in Asia" and then, without pausing, names an Ephesian who did the opposite. The same short letter sends Tychicus **to Ephesus** (4:12) and greets Priscilla, Aquila and the household of Onesiphorus (4:19). Read "all Asia" literally and Paul contradicts himself three times in one letter.

It is the same idiom as Acts 19:10. Both are sweeping epistolary statements. Reading one as rhetorical and the other as literal is what makes the argument work.

And the Asian churches were demonstrably still standing. Revelation 2-3, a generation later, addresses seven functioning churches in Asia — including Ephesus, commended for testing false apostles and not fainting (Revelation 2:2-3, quoted in Chapter 3 §C).

What this study concedes. None of that touches the causal claim underneath the objection. Paul did lose Asian support, he says so, and being a prisoner is the obvious reason. If the reply is "they abandoned him because he was in chains," that is the opposing reading's own argument, not a refutation of it. **What is contested is whether Asia was spiritually lost, not whether Paul's personal support collapsed.**

Weighing it: reasonable inference, with a real concession. That "all Asia" is personal rather than doctrinal is a **strong inference** from 1:16-18, 4:12 and 4:19. That the Asian churches survived is a **direct statement** from Revelation 2-3. That none of this dissolves the connection between Paul's chains and his lost support is conceded outright.

F. The Rule That Binds Both Directions

One discipline governs this whole chapter, and this study states it against itself first.

Good outcomes do not prove an act was obedient. Great fruit followed Paul's imprisonment; that does not establish that the journey producing it was right. God brought a kingdom out of David's house after Uriah; God delivered Israel through Esther while telling her that deliverance would arise from another place if she failed (Esther 4:14). Chapter 7 §C applies this to this study's own argument and demotes it.

And diminished outcomes do not prove an act was disobedient. The same rule, running the other way. The absence of growth statements after Acts 19:20 is real; what it means is not established by its being real. Acts 12:2 is the proof of the principle: James died, and no fault attaches.

A study cannot invoke this rule to disarm the other side's outcome argument while quietly keeping its own. The previous version did exactly that — it accepted the rule in Chapter 7 and then reached for an achieved-outcome verse later. Both sides of the rule are now enforced.

Weighing it: method, symmetrically applied. This section removes an argument from each side.

In Short

Three things genuinely change after Acts 19:20 — the growth statements stop, the prison deliverances stop, and the narrative narrows to one man — and this study concedes all three. What is contested is the inference. The seam falls exactly where Luke began his final section, with Acts 19:21 as its opening line; Peter's disappearance after Acts 15 shows that narrowed attention is a fact about Luke's subject; and James killed at Acts 12:2 five verses before Peter is delivered at 12:7 shows that deliverance cannot be a marker of approval, nor its absence of disapproval. Miracles, an angel, companions and an unhindered two years all continue. 2 Timothy 1:15 is about Paul's personal support, answered in its own next sentence — but the loss of that support is real and traceable to his chains, and this study does not pretend otherwise.

Chapter 7 — What Came Out of It

A. Philippians 1:12-14: Paul's Own Verdict From Inside It

> **Philippians 1:12-14** *But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; So that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; And many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear.*

Written from the very imprisonment that followed the arrest, not decades later softened by hindsight. Paul does not call it a setback he is enduring despite his own mistake. He calls it "the furtherance of the gospel."

Why this is a different kind of evidence from the rest of the chapter. This is not an argument from outcome. It is Paul's own characterisation of his own situation — evidence about what Paul understood himself to be doing, not about whether good things happened. The distinction is the one Chapter 6 §F turns on, and it is the reason §A and §B survive while §C is demoted.

Weighing it: strong inference. Paul's words are a **direct statement**. That his assessment is correct is a **strong inference**, and the opposing reading's answer is available: a man restored to fellowship may describe his present circumstances with faith and gratitude without thereby endorsing the road that brought him there. That answer has real force. What it cannot do is turn Philippians 1:12 into regret.

B. "The Prisoner of Jesus Christ"

> **Ephesians 3:1** *For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles.*
>
> **Ephesians 4:1** *I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.*

Paul had the plain language available to call himself a prisoner of Rome, or of the Jews who accused him, or — had he believed it — of his own disobedience. He calls himself, twice, in two letters from the same custody, the prisoner of Jesus Christ.

Weighing it: reasonable inference. The phrasing is a **direct statement**; what it implies is a **reasonable inference**. The opposing reading can answer that a believer may rightly ascribe his circumstances to Christ's ownership whatever brought them about, and that Paul's phrase is about whose he is rather than about how he got there. That is not an unreasonable answer.

C. The Revelation That Followed — Corroboration, Not Evidence

The previous version of this study argued here that Ephesians — among the last and fullest of Paul's letters, its subject the mystery "which in other ages was not made known unto the sons of men" (Ephesians 3:5) — came out of this very imprisonment, and that it would be a strange pattern for God to answer serious disobedience with one of the richest deposits of revelation in the New Testament.

That argument is demoted, and the reasoning that demotes it comes from the opposing side. God's willingness to bring great fruit out of a situation demonstrates God's faithfulness, not the servant's obedience. Solomon came from the house of David after Uriah. Esther's deliverance would have arisen from another place had she failed (Esther 4:14). And the specific form the previous version used — that letter-writing would be "a strange and uncharacteristic pattern" — is simply wrong: a prisoner writes letters because that is what a prisoner can do. "The word of God is not bound" (2 Timothy 2:9), and Paul himself frames his endurance as purposeful for others rather than as vindication (2 Timothy 2:10).

The observation is kept because it is true and worth noting. It is no longer offered as evidence.

Weighing it: corroboration only, and explicitly so. This section proves nothing and is not relied upon anywhere in this study's conclusion.

D. Returning to 1 Corinthians 1:31

This study opened under the same governing verse as the whole "Who Is Paul?" project: "he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." Nothing here is offered as praise of Paul's courage or judgement for its own sake. The claim is narrower and more testable: that scripture's own words — Christ's

commission (Acts 26:16-18; 9:15-16), the journey's stated errand (Romans 15:25-32), God's own twice-spoken necessity (Acts 23:11; 27:24), and the complete absence of any verdict where scripture normally supplies one (Chapter 5 §D) — read together as a coherent account of a called journey rather than a salvaged mistake.

Weighing it: statement of the study's own governing constraint.

In Short

Paul's own words from inside the imprisonment call it the furtherance of the gospel and name him twice as the prisoner of Jesus Christ — evidence about how Paul understood his own situation, which is a different and better class of claim than an argument from outcome. That the fullest revelation given to the church came out of this custody is kept as an observation and demoted to corroboration, because good fruit proves God's faithfulness rather than the servant's obedience.

Chapter 8 — The Prior Question: Can Suffering Be Inside God's Will?

Two rounds of argument over this passage produced one clear finding: nearly every disagreement resolves into a question that is not about Acts 21 at all. It is set out here plainly, with the case for each answer, because a reader who settles it one way will find most of this study unnecessary, and a reader who settles it the other way will find most of the objections dissolve.

A. The Premise Stated

The opposing reading rests, openly, on a premise about God's will for believers: **God's rule for His people is health, prosperity and freedom — not death, not sickness, not bondage.** On that premise, if God wanted Paul bound, scripture would have to say so explicitly and explain why, because bondage cuts against everything God is otherwise doing for His people.

This premise is not a debating trick and should not be treated as one. It is a serious position held by serious readers, and it does real work: grant it, and Paul's chains are evidence on their face that something went wrong.

Weighing it: the premise is the crux. Identifying it is a **strong inference** from the shape of the disagreement.

B. The Verses Offered For It

Four passages are usually brought in support. Each is quoted and weighed honestly.

Romans 12:1 — the living sacrifice. "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service." The argument: Christ died so that we need not; we are to be *living* sacrifices.

The difficulty is that Paul wrote this in the same letter in which he announces this journey and its danger (Romans 15:25-31). If Romans 12:1 forbids risking death, Paul contradicted himself within three chapters. And the word chosen is *sacrifice*, which is not a word about safety. The more natural reading is a whole life yielded, not a life protected.

2 Corinthians 5:15. "And that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them, and rose again." This says not to live unto oneself — self-subordination rather than self-preservation. Four chapters earlier the same letter says "we which live are alway delivered unto death for Jesus' sake" (2 Corinthians 4:11).

Ephesians 5:29. "For no man ever yet hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as the Lord the church." This sits inside the marriage passage and is an analogy for how husbands should love wives. It was also written from the imprisonment under dispute, by a man who in the same letter calls himself the prisoner of Jesus Christ.

3 John 2. "Beloved, I wish above all things that thou mayest prosper and be in health, even as thy soul prospereth." This is a personal greeting to Gaius, in the standard form of a first-century letter opening. It is John's wish for one man. It may well express something true about God's goodwill; it is a slender foundation for the governing rule of God's will for all believers in all circumstances.

Weighing it: these four do not establish the premise. Two say something close to the opposite (Romans 12:1, 2 Corinthians 5:15); two are being read outside their own genre and context (Ephesians 5:29, 3 John 2). That is a **strong inference** about these particular verses and not a claim that the premise is therefore false — only that it is not established from these.

C. The Verses Against It

The premise is contested, and by Paul's own preaching in Acts as much as by anything:

> **Acts 14:22** *Confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God.*

That is Paul's own teaching to new churches, and the word is *dei* — the same word this study has traced. He did not tell them tribulation was a sign of having stepped out of God's will. He told them it was the road in.

And Christ's own commission to Paul says the same thing at the outset: "I will shew him how great things he must (*dei*) suffer for my name's sake" (Acts 9:16). **Suffering is written into Paul's calling in the very sentence that states it.**

To these add:

- **Philippians 1:29** — "For unto you it is given in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer for his sake."

- **2 Timothy 3:12** — "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution."

- **John 16:33** — "In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

- **Revelation 2:10** — "Fear none of those things which thou shalt suffer: behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison… be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." Spoken by Christ, to a church in Asia, promising imprisonment and commanding faithfulness through it.

- **John 21:18-19** — a death by which Peter "should glorify God," followed by "Follow me."

The specific form of the objection — that a ministry can only be fulfilled while the minister is free and alive — is answered most directly by John 21:19 and Revelation 2:10. Christ tells the chief apostle how he will die and calls it glorifying God. Stephen's death is followed immediately by the scattering that carries the word outward (Acts 8:1-4), with no fault assigned. John the Baptist's ministry ended at his death, and scripture nowhere treats that as his error.

Weighing it: strong inference. That scripture repeatedly places suffering inside God's will for His people is a **direct statement** across many passages. What follows for Acts 21 is narrower: it establishes that Paul's chains are **not evidence on their face** of disobedience. It does not establish that these particular chains were God's will.

D. Where That Leaves Acts 21

If the premise in §A holds, the opposing reading's conclusion follows almost automatically and nothing in Chapters 1-7 will move it, because every textual argument will be read in its light.

If the premise does not hold in the strong form, then the imprisonment stops being self-interpreting, and the question returns to the text: what does scripture actually say about this journey, and what does it conspicuously not say?

This study's position is that the premise does not hold in the strong form — and that the question therefore has to be settled on Acts 21:4's grammar, Luke's usage, God's two statements of necessity, and the absence of any verdict. Which is what Chapters 2 through 6 attempt.

Weighing it: reasonable inference. A reader who holds the premise in its strong form is not being unreasonable, and this study does not treat them as such. It asks only that the premise be argued rather than assumed, since it is doing most of the work.

In Short

The dispute over Acts 21 is downstream of a prior question: whether suffering and imprisonment can lie inside God's will for a believer, or are evidence on their face that he stepped outside it. The four verses usually offered for the strong premise do not establish it — two say nearly the opposite, and two are read outside their context. Against it stand Paul's own preaching (Acts 14:22, with *dei*), his commission (Acts 9:16), Philippians 1:29, 2 Timothy 3:12, John 16:33, Revelation 2:10 and John 21:19. That does not

prove Paul's chains were God's will; it establishes that they are not self-evidently proof that they were not.

Chapter 9 — The Strongest Case Against This Study's Position

A study that has stated its own weights should also state where it is weakest. Three things belong here.

A. Where the Opposing Reading Is Strongest

Acts 21:4's surface reading. Left to itself the verse says the disciples told Paul through the Spirit not to go up, and he went up. Chapter 4 gives real reasons to read it otherwise — the imperfect verb, Luke's second report, the Acts 11:28 parallel, Agabus's command-free prophecy — but the plainest reading of the sentence in isolation is the opposing one, and that should not be glossed over.

The escalation. Whatever each individual episode says, the *sequence* is striking: the Spirit's repeated witness in every city (20:23), Tyre (21:4), Agabus (21:10-11), and then everyone present (21:12). A reader who sees in that a mounting divine effort to turn a man around is seeing something the text genuinely presents.

The fruit. Chapter 6 concedes three real changes and answers the inference, not the observation. A reader may reasonably weigh those changes more heavily than this study does.

Weighing it: these are the genuine strengths of the other reading, and this study's confidence should be read as tempered by them.

B. A Better-Located Candidate for an Actual Misstep

If one is looking within Acts 21 for something Paul did wrong, there is a better candidate than the decision to travel, and this study had never discussed it.

> **Acts 21:23-24** *Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law.*
>
> **Acts 21:26** *Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them.*

A vow-purification with an offering has no standing under grace. Paul undertakes it to manage a reputation among believing Jews who were "all zealous of the law" (21:20) — and it is precisely this that precipitates the riot and the arrest (21:27-29). It is specific, it is a concession to the law, and its consequence is immediate and traceable.

This study raises it because honesty requires it, and notes two things about it.

First, it is a candidate the opposing reading would be better served by than the one it usually argues, because the misstep and its consequence sit five verses apart.

Second — and this cuts the other way — **the purification was not Paul's idea.** "Do therefore this that we say to thee" is James and all the elders (21:18), instructing; Paul complies (21:26). So if this was an error, it was an error of the body's counsel followed, not of a man acting alone. That matters, because the objection most often paired with this one is that Paul was walking by himself. Acts 21:18-26 is the one passage in the episode where he demonstrably is not.

Weighing it: an open question this study does not resolve. That the purification was the elders' counsel and that Paul followed it are **direct statements**. Whether it was a misstep is genuinely open, and this study takes no position on it.

C. What Would Change This Study's Mind

Stating this is a discipline, not a rhetorical gesture.

A verdict anywhere in scripture. One retrospective assessment — in Acts, in the prison letters, in the Pastorals — saying or clearly implying that the Jerusalem journey was a fault. Chapter 5 §D rests entirely on the absence of one; produce one and the argument collapses.

A recorded repentance between Acts 21:14 and 23:11. The Plan B reading needs one and does not have it. If the text supplied one, Acts 23:11 would become a restoration rather than a confirmation, and Chapter 2 §E would lose most of its force.

A clear divine imperative rather than a report of one. If Luke anywhere wrote the Spirit saying "go not up" in the Spirit's own voice — as he writes "Thus saith the Holy Ghost" at 21:11 for the prediction — Chapter 4 would be untenable.

Weighing it: none of these three exists in the text as it stands. That is the state of the evidence, not a proof.

In Short

The opposing reading is strongest at Acts 21:4's surface sense, at the escalating sequence of warnings, and at the measurable change in Acts's texture after 19:20. A better candidate for an actual misstep than the journey itself is the temple purification of Acts 21:23-26 — which was, however, the Jerusalem elders' own counsel rather than Paul acting alone. Three specific findings would overturn this study's position, and none of them is present in the text.

Closing — The Considered Position, and What Remains Open

This study's considered position: Paul's journey to Jerusalem in Acts 19-21 was not a lapse from his calling but part of it. Christ's own commission to him named a Jewish audience, kings, danger and suffering (Acts 26:16-18; 9:15-16). The journey carried a stated errand to believers, announced in writing before he set out, with its danger named and an entire church enlisted in prayer over it (Romans 15:25-32; Acts 24:17). Its necessity was stated twice in God's own voice after the fact — by the Lord at Acts 23:11 and by an angel, with God's own reason attached, at Acts 27:24. And in a narrative that records Paul's faults freely, including six verses before the Lord commends him (Acts 23:5), no verdict against this journey is ever given — where every comparable case in scripture, including every case the Plan B objection relies on, supplies one.

Acts 21:4 is a real and serious verse and this study does not dissolve it by force. It reads it precisely: the imperfect ἔλεγον, Luke's own use of διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος for revealed content at Acts 11:28, Agabus's formally introduced prophecy that contains no command, and Luke's second report at 21:12 placing the imperative in the companions' own mouths.

At what weight. This position is offered as a **reasonable inference** resting on two **direct statements** and one **strong inference** — not as a conclusion no careful reader could reach differently. The Appendix sets out every argument's weight, including the ones this version demoted.

What this version withdrew. Four claims from the previous version do not survive and have been removed rather than softened: that Acts 19:21 and 20:22 share the same Greek construction; that Luke uses *dei* nowhere loosely; that the "kings" clause was fulfilled *only* because of the arrest; and that the fruit of the imprisonment demonstrates the obedience of the journey. A fifth, that Acts 9:15-16 is the sentence commissioning Paul, was simply inaccurate — it is spoken to Ananias. Two more were overstated and have been reduced: Acts 21:14's "the will of the Lord be done" as a concession, and Acts 26:19 as a sworn life-audit.

Three questions remain genuinely open, and this study does not close them.

First, the unrecorded repentance. The Plan B reading of Acts 23:11 and 27:24 requires a repentance between Acts 21:14 and 23:11 that the text does not record. This study treats that absence as telling, because Luke records a different correction of Paul inside that very span (23:5). But an argument from silence is an argument from silence, and a reader may weigh it lower.

Second, the purification. Whether Acts 21:23-26 was itself a misstep is open (Chapter 9 §B). This study takes no position, and notes only that it was the Jerusalem elders' counsel rather than Paul's solitary choice.

Third, the fruit. Acts 19:20 is the last growth statement in Acts, the prison deliverances stop, and Paul's Asian support collapses (2 Timothy 1:15). This study holds that none of this establishes disobedience, on

the same rule that forbids it from arguing obedience from good fruit — but it grants that a reader may weigh the pattern more heavily, and it does not call that reader careless.

And the prior question. Behind all of it lies Chapter 8's question, which no amount of grammar will settle: whether suffering and imprisonment can lie inside God's will for a believer. Readers who answer that differently will read this entire study differently, and they should know that is where the difference lies.

This study, like every study in this library, is offered for exactly what it is: a careful reading of what scripture itself says, with its own weights marked and its own withdrawn arguments named — not a verdict no other honest reader could reach otherwise. *He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.*

Appendix — Weight of Each Argument

Every substantive argument in this study, what it establishes, what the opposing reading can fairly answer, and how much weight it carries. Arguments the previous version relied on and this version demoted are marked.

Direct statement — scripture says it in so many words. **Strong inference** — follows closely; the alternative strains. **Reasonable inference** — more natural, but an honest reader can differ. **Corroboration only** — consistent with this position but roughly as consistent with the other. **Neutral** — settles nothing.

#	Argument	Where	Weight	What the other reading fairly answers
1	Paul's commission named a Jewish audience, kings and suffering	1 §A	Reasonable inference	A commission naming an audience says nothing about timing or route
2	Christ's direct words to Paul name "the people" and presuppose danger	1 §B	Strong inference	Deliverance into four years of chains is a thin rescue
3	Acts 26:17's deliverance promise is kept seven times in Acts 21-28	1 §B	Strong inference	Earlier rescues took Paul *out of* danger, not through it
4	"Kings" fulfilled *only* because of the arrest	1 §A	**Withdrawn**	Reasons backward from outcome to requirement
5	Acts 22:17-21 shows order, not a permanent ban	1 §C	Reasonable inference	The vision shows Jerusalem was never his assignment
6	Luke records Paul resisting the Lord and being overruled (22:19-21)	1 §C	Corroboration only	Willingness to record one such scene does not guarantee another
7	Acts 19:21 and 20:22 share one construction "word for word"	2 §A	**Withdrawn — false**	20:22 is a bare dative with no ἐν
8	Luke's own ἐν τῷ πνεύματι at Luke 2:27, 4:1 is divine, no verb of speech	2 §A	Reasonable inference	Acts 18:25's bare dative; translators divide at 19:21
9	Acts 19:21 lacks Paul's usual provisional language	2 §C	Reasonable inference, reduced	Romans 15:32 *is* provisional language about this journey's sequel
10	Luke uses *dei* nowhere loosely	2 §D	**Withdrawn — false**	Luke 13:14; Acts 19:36; Acts 25:10
11	*Dei* concentrates at Luke's narrative hinges	2 §D	Corroboration only	A man may sincerely believe "I must" and be wrong
12	God Himself twice names Rome as necessary (23:11; 27:24)	2 §E, 5 §A	Direct statement	The Plan B reading: ratification is not original intent
13	Luke's echo of Luke 9:51	2 §F	Corroboration only	The echo fits either reading equally
14	Acts 20:23's testimony is content, not command	2 §G	Neutral	The words will bear a warning
15	Acts 20:16's motive is ordinary human haste	3 §A	**Concession**	—
16	Acts 20:24's purpose clause names a *received* ministry	3 §B	Strong inference	A right disposition can serve a wrong journey
17	The Holy Ghost, not Paul, appointed the Ephesian elders (20:28)	3 §C	Direct statement	—
18	Revelation 2:2-3 shows Paul's wolf-warning was heeded	3 §C	Reasonable inference	Revelation 2:4-5 still threatens the candlestick
19	The journey's errand was relief for believers (Rom 15:25-32; Acts 24:17)	3 §D	Direct statement	A good errand can be undertaken at the wrong time

20	Acts 21:4's surface reading favours the other side	4 §A	**Concession**	—
21	ἔλεγον is imperfect — sustained human urging	4 §B	Reasonable inference	Spirit-prompted urging is still divine urging
22	διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος introduces content at Acts 11:28, same prophet	4 §C	Strong inference	One parallel is not a rule
23	Agabus's "Thus saith the Holy Ghost" contains no command	4 §D	Strong inference	A prophecy of chains functions as a warning
24	"The will of the Lord be done" as a concession that Paul was right	4 §E	**Demoted to neutral**	It is what people say when persuasion fails
25	John 21:18-19 — a bound apostle, interpreted by Christ as glory	4 §F	Strong inference	Peter's binding came with an explicit interpretation; Paul's did not
26	Matthew 16:21-23 — companions rebuked for urging avoidance	4 §G	Reasonable inference	Christ's journey was uniquely necessary
27	Acts 26:19 as sworn testimony he never erred	5 §C	**Demoted**	He is recounting the Damascus vision, not auditing his life
28	Verse 20 places Jerusalem inside the vision's scope	5 §C	Reasonable inference	Describes past ministry, not this journey
29	Luke records Paul's fault at 23:5 and assigns blame at 27:21	5 §D	Direct statement	—
30	Scripture always supplies a verdict where a servant errs; here none	5 §D, §E	Strong inference	Argument from silence; the verdict may be the changed fruit
31	Every Plan B in scripture carries an explicit verdict (1 Sam 12:17-20)	5 §E	Strong inference	Omission is weaker evidence than statement
32	Acts 19:20 is the last growth statement	6 §A	**Concession**	—
33	Prison deliverances stop after Acts 20	6 §A	**Concession**	—
34	Acts 19:21 opens Luke's final section	6 §B	Reasonable inference	Luke put the seam there *because* of the decision
35	Peter disappears after Acts 15 without fault	6 §C	Strong inference	Luke's subject changed; so may God's dealings have
36	James killed (12:2) five verses before Peter delivered (12:7)	6 §C	Strong inference	Martyrdom under persecution differs from warned-against chains
37	Miracles, an angel and companions continue after Acts 20	6 §D	Direct statement	Correcting particulars does not dispose of the pattern
38	"All Asia turned away" is personal, not doctrinal	6 §E	Strong inference	The loss of support is still traceable to the chains

39	Great fruit shows the journey was obedient	7 §C	**Withdrawn**	God's faithfulness, not the servant's obedience (Esther 4:14)
40	Philippians 1:12 is Paul's own characterisation, not an outcome	7 §A	Strong inference	A restored man may describe his present with faith
41	"The prisoner of Jesus Christ" (Eph 3:1, 4:1)	7 §B	Reasonable inference	About whose he is, not how he got there
42	The four verses for "God's rule is health and freedom" fail	8 §B	Strong inference	The premise may hold on other grounds
43	Scripture repeatedly places suffering inside God's will	8 §C	Direct statement	Establishes only that chains are not self-interpreting
44	The temple purification (21:23-26) as a candidate misstep	9 §B	**Open — no position taken**	It was the elders' counsel, not Paul acting alone

Sources Consulted

This standalone study is built directly from scripture; the sources below were consulted only for method, cross-checking, and background corroboration, and none carries scriptural weight in the argument.

Greek. Every grammatical claim in Chapters 2 and 4 was verified element by element against biblehub.com's interlinear, including prepositions: Acts 19:21 (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι), Acts 20:22 (τῷ πνεύματι, no preposition), Acts 18:25 (ζέων τῷ πνεύματι), Mark 2:8 (τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ), Luke 2:27 and Luke 4:1 (both ἐν τῷ πνεύματι), Acts 21:4 (ἔλεγον, imperfect; διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος) and Acts 11:28 (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος). The *dei* (Strong's G1163) word study in Chapter 2 §D was checked against the concordance for ordinary as well as theological uses, which is how the previous version's overclaim was caught.

Pneumatology. The reading of the gift of holy spirit operating within a believer's own purposing (Chapter 2 §A) builds on this library's settled position, worked out previously in *Save Yourselves From This Untoward Generation* (Chapter 2) and the *Holy Spirit "He or It" Pronoun Study*, rather than being re-derived here.

Structure of Acts. Chapter 6's treatment of the growth statements and the section boundary at 19:21 was checked against two independent structural analyses of Acts, and against the published list of expansion summaries (2:43-47; 5:14; 6:7; 9:31; 12:24; 16:5; 19:20). The distinction between counting growth statements and counting section-closing statements — which is what produced an error in this study's own review material — is set out in Chapter 6 §A.

History. The history of Ephesus after Paul was checked against standard reference material and is not relied upon in the argument; Chapter 3 §C and Chapter 6 §E rest on Revelation 2-3 and on 2 Timothy's own contents instead.

Peer review. This version was substantially rewritten in response to two rounds of detailed criticism from a Christian research scholar holding the opposite position. His objections are not quoted directly, but the case in Introduction §C is his, stated as he states it, and the arguments withdrawn or demoted in this version were withdrawn because he was right about them.

Positions in the literature. The framing of two readings taken seriously reflects a real and long-standing debate among careful expositors rather than a fringe question, with representatives including Ray Stedman ("Paul's Mistake") on one side and Tony Cooke ("Did Paul Miss It?") on the other; neither is quoted in the argument, which is built from the text.

Every doctrinal claim in this study has been tested directly against the text of scripture itself, in the King James Version.

Scripture Index

Judges 14:3; 16:1 Chapter 5 §D

1 Samuel 12:17 Chapter 5 §E

1 Samuel 12:19 Chapter 5 §E

1 Samuel 12:20 Chapter 5 §E

Esther 4:14 Chapter 6 §F; Chapter 7 §C

Matthew 16:21-23 Chapter 4 §G

Mark 2:8 Chapter 2 §A

Luke 2:27 Chapter 2 §A

Luke 2:49 Chapter 2 §D

Luke 4:1 Chapter 2 §A

Luke 9:22 Chapter 2 §D

Luke 9:51 Chapter 2 §F

Luke 13:14 Chapter 2 §D

Luke 22:42 Introduction §C

Luke 24:26 Chapter 2 §D

John 16:33 Chapter 8 §C

John 21:18-19 Chapter 4 §F; Chapter 8 §C

Acts 2:38 Chapter 2 §A

Acts 8:1-4 Chapter 8 §C

Acts 9:15-16 Chapter 1 §A; Chapter 8 §C

Acts 11:28 Chapter 4 §C

Acts 12:2 Chapter 6 §C

Acts 12:7 Chapter 6 §C

Acts 23:1-5 Chapter 5 §D

Acts 23:10 Chapter 1 §B

Acts 23:11 Chapter 2 §E; Chapter 5 §A-B

Acts 24:17 Chapter 3 §D

Acts 25:10 Chapter 2 §D

Acts 26:16-18 Chapter 1 §B

Acts 26:19-20 Chapter 5 §C

Acts 27:21 Chapter 5 §D

Acts 27:23-24 Chapter 2 §E; Chapter 6 §D

Acts 28:8-9 Chapter 6 §D

Acts 28:15 Chapter 6 §D

Acts 28:24 Introduction §C

Acts 28:31 Chapter 6 §D

Romans 1:13 Chapter 2 §C

Romans 8:14 Chapter 2 §A

Romans 12:1 Chapter 8 §B

Romans 15:25-28 Chapter 3 §D

Romans 15:30-31 Chapter 3 §D

Romans 15:32 Chapter 2 §C

1 Corinthians 1:31 Anchor Passage; Chapter 7 §D

1 Corinthians 15:9 Chapter 5 §D

1 Corinthians 16:7 Chapter 2 §C

2 Corinthians 1:17 Chapter 2 §C

Acts 14:22 Chapter 2 §D; Chapter 8 §C
Acts 15:26 Chapter 3 §B
Acts 15:37-39 Chapter 5 §D
Acts 18:25 Chapter 2 §B
Acts 19:10 Introduction §C; Chapter 6 §E
Acts 19:20 Introduction §C; Chapter 6 §A
Acts 19:21 Anchor Passage; Chapter 2 §A
Acts 19:36 Chapter 2 §D
Acts 20:9-12 Chapter 6 §D
Acts 20:16 Introduction §C; Chapter 3 §A
Acts 20:22-24 Introduction §C; Chapter 2 §G; Chapter 3 §B
Acts 20:25 Chapter 3 §C
Acts 20:28 Chapter 3 §C
Acts 20:29-30 Introduction §C; Chapter 3 §C
Acts 20:32 Chapter 3 §C
Acts 21:4 Chapter 4 §A-B
Acts 21:10-11 Chapter 4 §D
Acts 21:12 Chapter 4 §B
Acts 21:13-14 Chapter 4 §D-E
Acts 21:23-24, 26 Chapter 9 §B
Acts 21:31-32 Chapter 1 §B
Acts 22:17-18, 21 Chapter 1 §C
2 Corinthians 4:11 Chapter 8 §B
2 Corinthians 5:15 Chapter 8 §B
2 Corinthians 11:23 Chapter 3 §B
Galatians 2:11 Chapter 5 §D
Galatians 6:10 Introduction §C
Ephesians 3:1 Chapter 7 §B
Ephesians 3:5 Chapter 7 §C
Ephesians 4:1 Chapter 7 §B
Ephesians 5:29 Chapter 8 §B
Philippians 1:12-14 Chapter 7 §A
Philippians 1:29 Chapter 8 §C
Philippians 4:22 Chapter 6 §D
Colossians 4:7-14 Chapter 6 §D
2 Timothy 1:15 Introduction §C; Chapter 6 §E
2 Timothy 1:16-18 Chapter 6 §E
2 Timothy 2:9-10 Chapter 7 §C
2 Timothy 3:12 Chapter 8 §C
2 Timothy 4:12, 16, 19 Chapter 6 §E
Philemon 10, 23-24 Chapter 6 §D
Revelation 2:2-3 Chapter 3 §C; Chapter 6 §E
Revelation 2:10 Chapter 8 §C