

*Pastor's Papers* | Ronald H. Gann  
Bible/Apologetics

### ***Paul's Third Missionary Journey***

A Survey Of The Life & Ministry Of The Apostle Paul (Part 6)  
(Extracted From *A Hebrew Of Hebrews*; Ronald H. Gann [Aventine Press, 2008])

182 Rockingham Road  
Londonderry, NH 03053  
(603) 759-7120 | office@bridgewaychristianchurch.org



[www.bridgewaychristianchurch.org](http://www.bridgewaychristianchurch.org)

The turning point in World War II occurred on June 6, 1944, when Allied forces invaded German-occupied France. In an epic contest to dismantle Hitler's *Atlantic Wall*—an extensive train of fortifications along the western coast of Europe—Supreme Allied Commander General Dwight D. Eisenhower wagered the destiny of the western hemisphere on the untested amphibious training of the British, Canadian, and American militaries. Formally titled Operation Overlord, the advancement of the Allied armies onto the beachheads of Normandy in France set in motion the Allied offensive known as D-Day.

The framework for Operation Overlord was built in November of 1943 at the tripartite talks in Tehran, Iran, between President Franklin Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and Premier Joseph Stalin. Worried that Germany would defeat the Red Army on the eastern front if unhindered by the west, Stalin was adamant that Great Britain and the United States distract the Axis powers by opening a second front in western Europe. The Premier was convinced that Germany's foundational pillars—its military munitions, manpower, and material goods—would buckle under the economic weight of dual-battlefronts. With a preoccupied German military in the Eastern Bloc, the three leaders instructed General Eisenhower to launch a second theater of combat in western France by early summer.

Eisenhower was the chief architect behind Operation Overlord. His strategy to liberate France involved the amphibious landings of Allied forces onto five Nazi-fortified beaches—codenamed Sword, Juno, Gold, Omaha, and Utah. Located west of the Orne River, the five beaches spanned more than thirty miles of French coastline.

The deployment of Allied forces onto Normandy proved to be mammoth in scope. It consisted of twelve thousand planes, 2,727 warships, 156,215 infantrymen, and upwards of five thousand landing craft. As the first invading force to cross the treacherous English Channel since 1688, the D-Day naval assault was the largest and most powerful military armada ever to sail in warfare. Eisenhower later recalled, “No amphibious attack in history had approached this one in size. Along miles of coastline there were hundreds of vessels and small boats afloat and the ant-like files of advancing troops ashore.”<sup>1</sup>

The overall line of attack on D-Day was fairly rudimentary. Canada was assigned Juno, and Great Britain the beaches of Gold and Sword. Flanking them on the eastern side of the Cotentin Peninsula was the U.S. Fourth Infantry Division on Utah Beach, together with an American amphibious attack on Omaha. Each contingent was tasked

with subjugating their respective beachfront and to eliminate obtrusive debris, eradicate machinegun nests, and establish a security parameter.

At approximately 6:30 AM, on June 6, 1944, D-Day was officially launched from the shores of the English Channel. While British troops enjoyed comparatively easy successes, as did American forces on Utah beach, the U.S. First and Twenty-Ninth Infantry Divisions on Omaha met determined resistance.

An unassuming but deadly cape located between the beaches of Omaha and Utah threatened to curb Allied success. Riddled with minefields, barbed-wire entanglements, and machinegun emplacements, the peninsula was called Pointe du Hoc. European historian Robert Wilde described Pointe du Hoc as a Nazi stronghold festooned “[w]ith its vertical slopes, tiny shingle beach and views of the surrounding coast.” It featured “thick concrete casements and underground bunkers, protected cable runs, an equally protected spotting post on the cliff and a network of trenches, [making] the position ... the strongest ever built by the Nazis in the west.”<sup>2</sup>

Allied air reconnaissance over Pointe du Hoc detected six 155mm guns manned by over two hundred Nazis perched clandestinely on the coastal cliffs. The sentries enjoyed a panoramic view of the entire Normandy seaboard, and were capable of making surgical strikes with their cannons from several miles away. These formidable weapons served as a deterrent to the invading forces below and provided hilltop support to German barricades at Omaha and Utah. If not neutralized, the armaments all but guaranteed the defeat of Allied forces who dared to storm the beaches of Normandy.

In order to prevent massive casualties, it was imperative that the guns be decommissioned. Although Allied bombing on the Pointe was impressive,<sup>3</sup> only manual reconnaissance proved viable to reach the reinforced concrete bunkers that encased the gun batteries. Most challenging were the imposing 100-meter cliffs that had to be climbed in order to destroy the ordinances effectively. It required a specially-trained corps of Army Rangers who were capable of not only negotiating the stubborn Channel—as each man would be weighed down by heavy packs filled with rations, ropes soaked with sea-water, grappling hooks, ammunition, and ladders—but who, once ashore, were also capable of rigging the cliffs for climbing.

Many of Eisenhower’s subordinates privately feared that the assignment of Pointe du Hoc was nothing more than a suicide mission. It seemed implausible that any force, no matter how well trained, could withstand the barrage of enemy fire, let alone scale the Pointe’s impregnable cliffs and still have enough stamina left to fight the enemy at the top. Even if they survived the initial landing and managed to mount the sea cliff successfully, fifty entrenched German infantry divisions supported by ten Panzer tank divisions supposedly sat in wait for the exhausted Rangers atop the coastline. At best, the most optimistic estimates put the Allied casualty rate at more than fifty percent, with the total annihilation of the battalion as the likely worst-case scenario.

The task of carrying out the operation fell on Lieutenant Colonel James Earl Rudder and his team of Army Rangers. His squad trained extensively under British commandos for months on the Isle of Wight in preparation for the looming challenge. As Commander of the U.S. Army’s Second Ranger Battalion, Rudder knew that in order for the mission to succeed it was imperative that he surround himself with proven combatants. Rudder recruited Lieutenants George Kerchner and James Eikner, and Sergeants Frank Rupinski, Leonard Lomell, and Jack Kuhn for the seemingly

insurmountable task. Although the Lieutenant Colonel would command a total of three Ranger companies on the mission, these five men would prove pivotal in the conquest of Pointe du Hoc.

What transpired at the Pointe on June 6, 1944, is both exhilarating and heartrending. Two hundred and twenty-five men were unloaded from Allied landing craft, setting foot on the Normandy sea bank with rifles in hand and climbing supports in tow. By June 8, with no reinforcements yet available, 135 Rangers lay dead. Hitler's notorious 'Fortress Europe' confronted the Allied invaders with an imposing spray of machinegun fire from the cliff top, reducing the robust Allied force to only ninety able fighting men.

Naval fire support from nearby Allied destroyers eventually yielded a reprieve for the Rangers. The cover fire forced the Nazi gunmen to retreat, opening an extended window of opportunity for the surviving Rangers to mount the ropes and ladders. "It wasn't necessary to tell this man to do this or that man to do that," Lieutenant Kerchner later remembered. "They had been trained, they had the order in which they were supposed to climb the ropes and the men were all moving right in and starting to climb the cliff."<sup>4</sup>

Rudder's team incurred extensive losses in their attempt to scale the ridge. The Nazis had managed to cut some of the ropes, while others pitched grenades over the ledge. In desperation, they fired down from the cliffs, killing dangling infantrymen at random. But suppressive fire from the Allied destroyers in the Channel held the German infantry at bay, enabling a handful of Rangers to complete the initial climb.

The frustrating part of the battle, however, came after the cliff assault. Because reinforcements from Omaha beach failed to materialize according to plan, those who managed to reach Pointe du Hoc's cliff top were left isolated in their attempt to hold the vital ground. For two days the diminished squad of Rangers fought against waves of German counterattacks with minimal fortification or back-up.

As the Army Rangers fended off the swarm of Nazi attackers, Rudder was blindsided at the base of the cliff by a British naval shell that fell short near his makeshift command post. He suffered from shellshock and was also shot in the leg by a German sniper. Despite profuse bleeding and a concussion, he cogently commanded his troops by radio and directed them, according to intelligence reports, to the location of the Nazi 155mm guns.

The Rangers, exhausted and wounded, regrouped at the top of the cliff where a small patrol went out in search of the guns. Sergeants Lomell and Kuhn discovered what appeared to be suspicious armament tracks in the dirt and set out like bloodhounds on the trail. The tracks steered them inland to a dirt road where they stumbled upon their objective—six 155mm cannons hidden beneath a swathe of camouflage netting and positioned strategically toward Utah Beach. Off in the distance sat a squad of Nazi gunners taking part in a platoon meeting.

Sergeants Lomell and Kuhn decided to make their move. Armed with only two thermite grenades (an incendiary device that produces intense heat without an explosive charge and with a reasonable amount of stealth), Lomell approached the guns cautiously. He placed the grenades in the traversing mechanism and ignited them, melting the gears in an instant. Lomell recalls, "We ran back to the road ... and got all the other thermites from the remainder of my guys ... and rushed back and put the

grenades in the traversing mechanisms, elevation mechanisms, and banged the sights”<sup>5</sup> The six 155mm guns were immobilized.

Meanwhile, the wounded Lieutenant Colonel Rudder spotted a machinegun on the western wall of the Pointe with its sights set on Allied forces scrambling onto the beachhead. He instructed Lieutenant Eikner to eliminate it by any means necessary.

Eikner had brought with him an outmoded signal lamp, leftover from the First World War, as a precaution in case the Ranger artillery spotters were injured (which they were). Trained extensively in international Morse code, he mounted the signal lamp upon a decrepit tripod in the command post and relayed coordinate signals to the USS Saterlee offshore. Naval gunfire obliterated the machinegun within seconds of receiving the signal.

In the meantime, platoon Sergeant Frank Rupinski, who had successfully ascended the sea cliff with his squadron, ordered his crew to secure the forward area on the Pointe. Patrolling the German-made back roads, the security patrol unexpectedly discovered a German ammunition dump stashed south of the battery (which Lomell and Kuhn had already neutralized with thermite). Rupinski and his squadron quickly booby-trapped the munitions pile with high explosives and detonated it, creating a rain of debris.

For all intents and purposes, the Allied conquest of Pointe du Hoc was an astounding exhibition of heroism pitted against seemingly insurmountable odds. Although costly in casualties—in the end, seventy percent of Rudder’s Rangers were killed or wounded while fending off five German counterattacks—the objective had been accomplished. The six 155mm cannons, together with multiple machinegun nests, had been destroyed by Lomell and Kuhn, in partnership with Eikner and Rudder. Rupinski and his platoon obliterated the enemy ammunition depot. And most importantly, the Germans were uprooted from their entrenchments and forced to retreat from the cliff top, allowing safe entry for the remaining Allied invasion on the neighboring beaches.

The Allied victory on D-Day is owed to the valor and sacrifices made by the U.S. Army’s Second Ranger Battalion on Pointe Du Hoc. Eikner reminisced years later, “Had we not been there we felt quite sure that those guns would have been put into operation and they would have brought much death and destruction down on our men on the beaches and our ships at sea ... The Rangers at Pointe du Hoc were the first American forces on D-Day to accomplish their mission and we are proud of that.”<sup>6</sup>

Given the brevity of the operation, Presidential Unit Citations were certainly in order. Not surprisingly, Lieutenant Colonel Rudder, who had received a massive concussion and had been wounded while leading his men, was presented with the Distinguished Service Cross. For their individual work in disabling the massive cannons, Sergeants Leonard Lomell and Jack Kuhn were awarded the Silver Star. And although Lieutenant Eikner and Sergeant Rupinski were never officially cited, Eikner’s use of Morse code in eliminating a machinegun nest and the detonation of the ammunition dump by Rupinski is forever immortalized in the annals of World War II.

On June 6, 1984, President Ronald Reagan delivered a speech at a ceremony commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the Normandy invasion. From the cliffs of Pointe du Hoc, he saluted the valor of the two hundred and twenty-five men who mounted the very slopes on which he stood. On stage with the President were the last surviving Rangers who had conquered the jagged rock face, their bodies aged by the

rigors of time and the fickle memories of later generations. With presidential poise, the Great Communicator said the following:

“We stand on a lonely, windswept point on the northern shore of France. The air is soft, but forty years ago at this moment, the air was dense with smoke and the cries of men, and the air was filled with the crack of rifle fire and the roar of cannon. At dawn, on the morning of the 6<sup>th</sup> of June, 1944, two hundred and twenty-five Rangers jumped off the British landing craft and ran to the bottom of these cliffs. Their mission was one of the most difficult and daring of the invasion: to climb these sheer and desolate cliffs and take out the enemy guns. The Allies had been told that some of the mightiest of these guns were here, and they would be trained on the beaches to stop the Allied advance.

The Rangers looked up and saw the enemy soldiers—at the edge of the cliffs shooting down at them with machine guns and throwing grenades. And the American Rangers began to climb. They shot rope ladders over the face of these cliffs and began to pull themselves up. When one Ranger fell, another would take his place. When one rope was cut, a Ranger would grab another and begin his climb again. They climbed, shot back, and held their footing. Soon, one by one, the Rangers pulled themselves over the top, and in seizing the firm land at the top of these cliffs, they began to seize back the continent of Europe. Two hundred and twenty-five came here. After two days of fighting, only ninety could still bear arms.

Behind me is a memorial that symbolizes the Ranger daggers that were thrust into the top of these cliffs. And before me are the men who put them there.

These are the boys of Pointe du Hoc. These are the men who took the cliffs. These are the champions who helped free a continent. These are the heroes who helped end a war.”<sup>7</sup>

Metaphors depicting divine truth abound in the Scriptures. Indeed, the apostle Paul often compared the Christian’s vocation with that of an athlete. To his protégé, Timothy, he charged, “... train yourself to be godly. For physical training is of some value, but godliness has value for all things” (1 Tim. 4:7–8), and “if anyone competes as an athlete, he does not receive the victor’s crown unless he competes according to the rules” (2 Tim. 2:5). Moreover, with his certain death pending in Rome, the apostle used the athletics metaphor in his most solemn moments, summarizing his tour of duty with the statement, “I have fought the good fight, *I have finished the race*, I have kept the faith” (2 Tim. 4:7, emphasis added).

The penmen of Holy Scripture often illustrated divine truth by comparing it with aspects from everyday society. The parables of Jesus, for example, drew upon fishing, agriculture, servitude, and vineyards as familiar anecdotes that Palestinian audiences

could relate to. Moreover, the Old Testament prophets compared invading armies and an unfaithful Israel to locusts and an adulteress wife (Joel 1:2–12 cf. Hos. 1:2).

Perhaps the most notable of Paul’s use of metaphors, however, is his allusion to military warfare. Certainly Paul considered his missionary endeavors to be a matter of spiritual combat, more forceful in nature than the obstacles encountered by Lieutenant Colonel Rudder at Pointe du Hoc. But like Rudder, who conquered the Pointe with only a small band of men against mightier Nazi strongholds, the apostle—with a select group of handpicked men—waged war “against the rulers, against the authorities, against the powers of this dark world and against the spiritual forces of evil in the heavenly realms” (Eph. 6:12).

The Savior made it clear that “the kingdom of heaven has been forcefully advancing, and forceful men lay hold of it” (Matt. 11:12). With the Lord’s words in view, Paul charged Timothy to powerfully “Fight the good fight of the faith” (1 Tim. 6:12). Similarly, the apostle girded himself as a soldier under command “not [with] the weapons of the world” but with “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God ... sharper than any double-edged sword” (2 Cor. 10:4; Eph. 6:17; Heb. 4:12). He wrote to the Corinthians, “For though we live in the world, we do not wage war as the world does. The weapons we fight with are not the weapons of the world. On the contrary, they have divine power to demolish strongholds” (2 Cor. 10:3–4).

## Compelled To Preach

It is not known with certainty how long the apostle Paul enjoyed his convalescence at Syrian Antioch before undertaking his next missionary journey, but the scholarly consensus is that he probably settled there from the summer of 52 AD through to the spring of 53 AD.<sup>8</sup> Although richly deserved, his sabbatical was short-lived. Overcome by “the terror of the Lord” and his impulse to “persuade men” (2 Cor. 5:11, NKJV), plans for a third tour were likely in full swing by autumn. It is presumable that, given his calculated approach to missions, his yearning to preach abroad fermented in his mind almost immediately after his homecoming at Antioch. The apostle Paul was never truly at rest unless he was feverishly toiling for the gospel. “I am compelled to preach,” he later admitted to the Corinthians, reminiscent of the prophet Jeremiah. “Woe to me if I do not preach the gospel” (1 Cor. 9:16 cf. Jer. 20:9).

A rejuvenated Paul decided that the consummation of his eastern missionary labors should take place in Rome, the western hub of the ruling empire. Because of its cultural and political weight, the apostle had long romanticized about ministering in the celebrated city. However, for reasons not disclosed, he had been “prevented ... from doing so until now” (Rom. 1:13).

Paul intended to incorporate strategic stopovers in his travel plans to Rome. On route, he would visit Phrygia, Galatia, Macedonia, and Achaia to collect from the churches a monetary dowry for impoverished Christians in Caesarea (Rom. 15:25–32; 1 Cor. 16:1–4; 2 Cor. 8–9). A severe famine had ravaged the land of Israel (Acts 11:28), compounding the plight of Christian Jews who were suffering religious persecution.

Paul had vowed years earlier to remember the poor in his ministry (Gal. 2:10) and was therefore compelled by his conscience to petition the Gentile churches for aid.

The collection was meant to be an expression of benevolence—reminiscent of the collection undertaken by the church at Syrian Antioch years earlier (Acts 11:27–30). More than that, Paul viewed the financial offering as a symbol of brotherhood that would remind his converts of their debt to the Jerusalem church while giving Jewish Christians an appreciation for the vitality of faith among Gentiles overseas. By soliciting their financial support, Paul hoped to soften cultural tensions between Jews and Gentiles and cement the bond of unity.

The apostle presumed that his eventual return to Jerusalem afterward with the endowment would cap his adventures in the east. With this plan in view, Paul had hoped to then launch a fourth crusade throughout the Latin areas of the western empire, specifically in Spain (Rom. 15:23–24). With the Mediterranean part of the empire sufficiently evangelized (Col. 1:23; Rom. 16:25, 26), he was eager to preach the gospel “where Christ was not known, so that [he] would not be building on someone else’s foundation” (Rom. 15:20). His strategy was to use the Roman congregation<sup>9</sup> as his base of operations in the west just as the church at Antioch was his base for evangelizing the eastern part of the empire (vv. 24–29). Confident that his plans were well-formulated, his third tour of duty on the mission field promised to broaden the scope of the gospel.

The number of assistants accompanying Paul grew exponentially. No longer partnering with just one or two individuals, his advancing age (and possibly his declining health) required a sizeable entourage. His platoon was drafted from a pool of churches situated throughout the Roman provinces. Representing Macedonia, Galatia, and Asia Minor were Sopater of Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica, Gaius of Derbe, and Tychicus and Trophimus of Ephesus (Acts 20:4). Also enlisted were the prophet Silas, the evangelist Timothy of Lystra, and Paul’s biographer, Luke—along with newcomer Titus (Acts 19:22 cf. 2 Cor. 2:13; 7:6, 13–14).

Traversing from “place to place ... strengthening the disciples” (Acts 18:23), Paul was dogged and determined on his third journey just as he had been years earlier on his first. His sacrificial love for the churches and boldness in preaching set the example for those who accompanied him.

The first stop of significance on the itinerary was Ephesus. While re-touring the Galatian and Phrygian provinces, it was brought to Paul’s attention that Apollos, the extraordinary minister of the church of Ephesus, who had succeeded the apostle as its leader (Acts 18:23ff), had unexpectedly resigned his position as pastor. The brilliant defender of the faith had exploded like a bombshell onto Corinth’s unconverted Jewish community apparently while on leave there. He powerfully countered the beliefs of the Corinthian Jews in public, demonstrating from the Scriptures that Jesus was the Christ. His tremendous performance in the public debates made a rousing impression on the Christians of Corinth, just as he had on Paul also (1 Cor. 3:6; 4:6). For that reason, the Corinthian leaders persuaded Apollos to join their ranks, leaving a significant vacancy in the Ephesian leadership.

Despite his eagerness to deliver the relief offering to Jerusalem in person—and, in turn, embark upon his trip to Rome—Paul felt it wise to fill the empty pastorate in Ephesus immediately. Making good on his earlier pledge to revisit the Ephesians (Acts 18:21), he put his plans on hold and traveled some fifteen hundred miles to Asia Minor.

It would be a decision that would alter the course of his ministry. To be sure, Rome was still the apostle's final destination but divine providence made certain that he would arrive there in a manner he could not anticipate.

## Ephesus

**E**phesus was a major commercial center and the capital of the Roman province of Asia. Its advantageous location on the western coast made it the spoke-wheel for trade in the region. Often referred to as the “First and Greatest Metropolis of Asia,”<sup>10</sup> it was distinguished for its monolithic architecture (particularly the temple of Artemis), an exhaustive library, and an open-air amphitheater. Ephesus, in contrast to Corinth, was ancient—almost one thousand years old by the time Paul arrived in the summer of 53 AD. Founded by Athens as a colony in the tenth century BC, it was a city of prominence and prosperity. Anthropologists estimate that its affluent population numbered about half a million during Paul's extended stay there, making it one of the largest cities in the empire, second only to Rome.<sup>11</sup>

Paul's presence in the city stirred the religious community. As was his custom when taking up residence in a new town, he “entered the synagogue and spoke boldly there for three months, arguing persuasively about the kingdom of God” (Acts 19:8). For weeks he reasoned from the Scriptures with those who scoffed at his preaching and he vociferously dealt with numerous objections presented to him. He conducted his homilies with poise and great bravado.

In the midst of an entire synagogue of unbelieving Jews, the apostle valiantly challenged their religious system day-in and day-out, commanding them to repent and believe in Jesus as their Messiah. Although a dominant segment in Ephesus found his message contemptible, there were some Jews of considerable clout who received him favorably (Acts 18:19). That the apostle was permitted to preach in the synagogue without hindrance was the crowning achievement of his first three months in Ephesus.

Unavoidably, however, Luke records that some of Paul's opponents were moved to indignation by his preaching. They maliciously set out to demean his public standing and “maligned the Way” (Acts 19:9). Although the writer of Acts is silent on the finer points, the outcome was that Paul eventually withdrew from the synagogue. He had come to realize that there was nothing more to be gained by ministering to such an obstinate bunch. As he had in Pisidian Antioch on his first journey (Acts 13:46) and in Corinth on his second (Acts 18:6), he turned his attention solely to the Gentiles.

Paul moved cross-town to the lecture hall of Tyrannus—a columned portico available for rent to public teachers—where he held daily discussions on the New Covenant and its fulfillment in Christ. His lectures occurred without hiatus or interruption for two years. During his ministry in the hall, the gospel radiated outward geographically through his converts, resulting in the formation of many churches in outlying villages—more notably Colosse and Hierapolis (Col. 1:7; 2:1; 4:16).

With Paul's relocation to the lecture hall also came the influx of “extraordinary miracles” (Acts 19:11). His ministry at Ephesus was marked by sporadic healings and deliverance from demons, accomplished directly through handkerchiefs and aprons that

had been in contact with his body. Diseases vanished instantly and evil spirits were exorcised when the afflicted touched the various fabrics that had been exposed to him. The miracles God performed through Paul were essential in convincing the Ephesians that he was God's messenger (cf. Heb. 2:3–4). As it had in Iconium on his first missionary journey with Barnabas (Acts 14:3), the array of miracles prepared the hearts of Gentile Ephesians for his message of salvation.

The cordial climate that initially greeted Paul in Ephesus eventually cooled as his success with the gospel increased. Toward the end of his lease at Tyrannus, the local guild of craftsmen—who specialized in idol making—became more and more embittered toward the escalating Christian movement. Fearful that Paul's unflappable denunciation of idolatry would shipwreck their economy, the rumbling of an uprising began brewing among the silversmiths.

Ephesus owed its prosperity to the pilgrim trade associated with the cult of Artemis, whose impressive temple in the heart of the city is reputed to be one of the Seven Wonders of antiquity. The cult attracted commerce from all over Asia, in particular for the silversmiths whose source of revenue was the production of metallic shrines and household idols used as votive offerings to Artemis.

Artemis of Ephesus, also referred to as the “Lady of Ephesus” or “Diana,”<sup>12</sup> was an Olympian goddess whose characteristics were derived from a permutation of Greek and Roman mythologies. Renowned for her eclectic sanctuary, she was revered as the mother of fertility. She was also believed to hold dominion over the wilderness and its wildlife and was herself a mighty huntress of wild game. Moreover, the Greeks extolled the multi-breasted idol—whose physical distinctiveness denoted her fertility—as the goddess of vegetation, chastity, and childbirth.

The mastermind behind Paul's troubles was an idol-maker named Demetrius. He detested the apostle because of the negative effect his preaching had on the sale of icons. The idol-maker's stock portfolio, as it were, was on a frightening decline with no resurgence in sight. To prevent further damage to his retail, he devised a scheme to expel the apostle from the province—namely, a civic uprising. Protesting Paul's ministry in public was sure to muzzle the apostle, if not lead to his banishment. Moreover, by stirring up a rally for Artemis, he hoped to stir up even greater profits for himself. Demetrius called an emergency meeting of his fellow silversmiths in the community:

“Men, you know we receive a good income from this business. And you see and hear how this fellow Paul has convinced and led astray large numbers of people here in Ephesus and in practically the whole province of Asia. He says that man-made gods are no gods at all. There is danger not only that our trade will lose its good name, but also that the temple of the great goddess Artemis will be discredited, and the goddess herself, who is worshipped throughout the province of Asia and the world, will be robbed of her divine majesty” (Acts 19:25b–27).

Fuelled by the greed of Demetrius and his lust for vengeance, the silversmiths left the private forum like a pack of savage wolves. Luke records that “they were furious and began shouting: ‘Great is Artemis of the Ephesians’” (v. 29). In all likelihood Demetrius led the charge into the public square as a procession of fuming tempers followed in his

wake. A stately boulevard lined with buildings and colonnades ran through the heart of the city, providing ideal acoustics for their demonstration. Into this street Demetrius and his fellow craftsmen stormed, sweeping along with them in a noisy parade all those within earshot. The cries of the bystanders sang in chorus with the mob, “Great is Artemis of the Ephesians!”

The city quickly degenerated into confusion, chaos, and disorder. Gaius and Aristarchus, Paul’s traveling companions from Derbe and Thessalonica, watched from the walkway as the procession surged. But raised tunics and lowered head coverings did little to conceal the two men’s identity. The rebel-rousers accosted the two missionaries and dragged them into the city’s amphitheater, beating and harassing them at every turn.

When he heard the news that pandemonium had seized the community, Paul was bewildered. His time at Ephesus had been mostly peaceful and the gospel warmly received. He was aghast to learn that the city had turned on him. The Ephesian coliseum, which sat over twenty-four thousand spectators, was filled to capacity with rioting townspeople. Even more worrisome for the apostle was the welfare of Gaius and Aristarchus.

It is most likely that Paul arrived at the amphitheater incognito so he could enter undisturbed. He had hoped to be able to personally negotiate the release of his comrades and put an end to the ruckus peaceably. His repeated attempts to enter, however, were thwarted by friends who feared for his safety. The local authorities also restrained him—“begging him not to venture into the theater” (v. 31b)—insisting that his presence inside would only inflame the situation and put Gaius and Aristarchus in greater peril.

Nevertheless, the composed apostle insisted that he appear before the crowd, confident that his Roman citizenship and his earlier successful appearances before government officials would enable him to placate the mob, clear his name, free his companions, and turn the whole affair to the advantage of the gospel. But Paul’s friends withstood him, in spite of his persistence.

After two hours of commotion and with shouts of “Great is Artemis of the Ephesians” waning, the city clerk took the podium. As the chief executive officer of the city and emissary to Caesar, the clerk was subject to Rome for any disorderly conduct in the city. According to Luke, his mere presence at the podium was enough to suspend the chaos.

The city clerk offered a sobering warning to the rioters: “[W]e are in danger of being charged with rioting because of today’s events. In that case we would not be able to account for this commotion, since there is no reason for it” (v. 40). He argued further that an insurrection would hardly enhance the prestige of the city in the eyes of their paranoid Roman occupier and, if continued, Ephesus would risk losing its favorable status. Even more surprising, the clerk dismissed the trumped-up allegations against Gaius and Aristarchus. Having “neither robbed temples nor blasphemed our goddess” (v. 37b), the hostages were ruled blameless.

To safeguard their municipal privileges from Roman penalty, the clerk insisted that any grievances brought against Gaius and Aristarchus, or Paul for that matter, should be formally submitted in a legal motion before the constituted authorities. As it was, the Ephesians’ public demonstration, which Rome was sure to look unfavorably

upon, was an infraction of the due process of law. The clerk was direct: “[T]he courts are open and there are proconsuls. They can press charges. If there is anything further you want to bring up, it must be settled in a legal assembly” (vv. 38b–39).

The mob was subdued, if not disappointed, and Gaius and Aristarchus were released. But the disconcerting event that endangered his team triggered an alarm in Paul. After three years of ministry in the Roman capital of Asia Minor, the apostle Paul determined that his time at Ephesus had come to a close. He relinquished pastoral responsibilities to Timothy and planned his departure from the city.

## Troas, Philippi, & Corinth

**B**idding farewell to the congregation in Ephesus after three years of ministry, Paul ventured onward toward the Greek districts of Macedonia and Achaia by way of Troas. The route took him in the opposite direction of Caesarea—his eventual goal—but the task of collecting donations from the churches took precedence.

In Troas, Paul hoped to reconnect with a young apprentice whom he had sent earlier on assignment to Corinth. Previously, the apostle had received word, while in Ephesus, that a complex situation was brewing in the Corinthian church that required apostolic intervention. Unable to accommodate the Corinthians personally, he dispatched Titus<sup>13</sup> as his delegate with the understanding that they would reunite in Troas to review his report.

Titus came to faith at some time during Paul’s first missionary journey with Barnabas.<sup>14</sup> As with Timothy, the apostle likened him to an adopted son “in our common faith” (Tit. 1:4 cf. 1 Tim. 2:3). He was not simply Paul’s understudy but was his beloved “partner and fellow coworker” (2 Cor. 8:23). An uncircumcised Greek, Titus had accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem for the Jerusalem Council where he was presented as Paul’s case study. He was living proof that *spiritually* circumcised Gentiles were equally eligible with *physically* circumcised Jews for first-class citizenship in God’s kingdom (cf. Gal 2:3). Thereafter Titus became one of Paul’s most valuable assistants, serving as the apostle’s ambassador to Corinth and Crete (cf. Tit. 1:5).

When Paul departed Corinth for Jerusalem at the close of his second missionary journey (so as to complete his Nazirite vow [Acts 18:18–21]) his worst fears were realized. Well aware that Corinth’s salacious climate posed a formidable threat to the church there, the apostle had been reticent to move on. Paganism was pervasive in the city, as was sexual debauchery; the likes of which comprised a demonic brew that undoubtedly enticed those newly converted from homosexuality, drunkenness, and prostitution (1 Cor. 6:8–10). Paul had felt an obligation to extend his stay in the city to safeguard their growth. It was eighteen months later before he was confident that the Corinthians sufficiently modeled the conduct befitting Christians living in a carnal society. Although his absence only heightened his concern for them, as was the case with all his churches (2 Cor. 11:28), he left the Corinthians in good conscience.

Nevertheless, nearly four years later and well into his third missionary journey, Paul received word that the Corinthians had relapsed. In all probability he was not surprised, but certainly disappointed. On hearing reports about divisions, adultery,

Christians suing fellow Christians, the misuse of Christian liberty, and even incest, the apostle was quick to send Titus to them, armed with a letter from the apostle.

Titus' failure to return to Troas with a progress report caused Paul much anxiety. His worry over both the Corinthians and his apprentice affected his ability to preach in the city. Distracted, he left Troas in search of Titus, foregoing any missionary work in the surrounding region (2 Cor. 2:12–13).

By way of Neapolis, the port of Macedonia, Paul sailed to Philippi.<sup>15</sup> It was there on his second missionary journey that he and Silas had been arrested, flogged, and caged for exorcising a demoniac slave girl (Acts 16:16ff). The memories of those wounds were fresh in his mind as he disembarked at the seaport. Comforted and assisted by the Philippian church, Paul blocked his past experience from his mind and focused on finding Titus.

The apostle's trepidation over the safety of his deputy was soon allayed. Having reunited in due course, Titus brought him reassuring news concerning the Corinthians' condition (cf. 2 Cor. 7:5–16). But his report was not entirely favorable. Titus informed Paul that while the former issues of immorality appeared to be on the mend, other polarizing matters had unexpectedly developed that required immediate attention by the apostle.

Although under the headship of Apollos, the Corinthians continued to be a vexing lot—their archetypical problem-church whose frequent spiritual lapses caused Paul endless problems.<sup>16</sup> Titus reported the unsettling news that false teachers had infiltrated the ranks of the Corinthian leadership. They were undermining the work of the gospel and calling into question Paul's claim as a legitimate servant of Christ.

In their effort to give credibility to their counterfeit gospel, the Corinthian heretics colluded together to disqualify Paul as an inspired authority. They ridiculed his rhetorical wit and defamed his skills as an orator (cf. 2 Cor. 11:5–6). He was viewed as a nonconformist whose humility and technique demeaned the reverential office of an apostle (cf. 1 Cor. 9:3–18). Lacking a commanding presence, the perception was that he was “weak,” and his teaching “contemptible” (2 Cor. 10:10, NKJV). What is more, they dismissed his résumé as over-hyped, demoting him in proverbial rank to below Peter and Apollos (cf. 1 Cor. 1:12–13). Finally, they maintained that the message he preached was simplistic, and considered too elementary for their advanced philosophical wit. Their Greek appetites demanded a multifaceted religious system rooted in complexity that would exercise their intellectual stimuli (2 Cor. 10:10 cf. 1 Cor. 1:23).

On hearing of the latest problems in Corinth, Paul was disheartened and no doubt offended. Moreover, the relief offering for the poverty-stricken saints in Jerusalem had not yet been collected by the Corinthian elders despite strict orders that it be ready for the apostle when he arrived (1 Cor. 16:1–4). This dereliction in duty was an egregious lapse of judgment that Paul did not look kindly upon, especially in light of his pressing schedule and the more pressing needs of those famine-stricken in Jerusalem.

The failure of the Corinthians' to excommunicate the false teachers or to raise donations prompted the apostle to pen a stern follow-up letter. In it, he bemoaned the likelihood of having to exercise apostolic discipline in person should their disregard for apostolic authority continue. Additionally, to those at Corinth who regarded his letters as forceful but his personal demeanor as cowardly, the apostle warned: “Such people

should realize that what we are in our letters when we are absent, we will be in our actions when we are present” (2 Cor. 10:12).

With Titus dispatched to Corinth a second time with an epistle in hand, Paul opted to remain in Macedonia for further evangelism, perhaps hoping that calmer heads would prevail in Corinth after his message was received. Meanwhile, it is not certain how long the apostle labored in Macedonia, but commentators hypothesize that he likely took advantage of his proximity to Illyricum and Dyrhachium and preached the gospel in both territories (cf. Rom. 15:19).<sup>17</sup> He presumably traveled across the Balkan Peninsula on the Via Egnatia before finally following up his correspondence to the Corinthians in person.

Paul arrived in the province of Achaia in the fall of 57 AD. What was supposed to be only a brief stopover at Corinth for disciplinary action and ecclesiastical correction slowly transitioned into a long-drawn-out ministry spanning three months. The gravity of their decline required that the apostle extend his stay longer than he originally anticipated. He ministered continuously so as to rehabilitate them—teaching, exhorting, correcting, and nursing their spiritually wounded. The impact of his second letter,<sup>18</sup> coupled with his on-site counsel, apparently facilitated a full recovery in the church. Indeed, with the paternal-like apostle living in their midst, the immature Corinthians completed their collection for the poor in due time (cf. Rom. 15:26).

After three months in Achaia, Paul decided it was time to leave Corinth and return to Jerusalem to distribute the overdue collection for the poor. His itinerary called for boarding a ship at Cenchrea—Corinth’s marina—where pilgrims were ferried regularly between Israel, Syria, and Achaia. His intent was to reach Jerusalem in time for the great pilgrim festival of Passover.

Plans for Paul’s return-voyage, however, were derailed. As he had so often in the past, the apostle faced a new threat from his countrymen (cf. 2 Cor. 11:26). On the eve of his departure for Syria, a group of Corinthian Jews conceived a plot to murder him while at sea. The Jews in Corinth were bent on settling an old score with the apostle stemming back to his second missionary journey. Still brooding over their humiliating defeat before the proconsul Gallio—including their expulsion from the courtroom (Acts 18:12–17)—the Jews saw their opportunity to exact revenge. The plan called for killing the apostle offshore so as to prevent his escape.

Though Luke does not provide the details, Paul became aware of the murderous scheme, allowing him time to coordinate a secure route home. He opted to retrace his steps through Achaia by foot, traveling north into Macedonia with an intended stopover at Troas for respite. From there he would cross the Aegean Sea by ship, and catch a connecting ferry at Ephesus headed toward Israel. The detour, which placed him safely out of harm’s way, meant a considerable delay in his schedule, and cost him his opportunity to arrive at Jerusalem in time for Passover (cf. Acts 20:16).

## **Return To Troas**

Alexandria Troas was the principal seaport on the Aegean Sea located conveniently on the northwest coast of Asia Minor. Established in the fourth century BC as a commercial viaduct, its revenue was generated from its commuter ferry service and the export of cargo between Macedonia and Asia. The ancient city of Troy was a nearby neighbor, situated eleven miles to the north, whereas Ephesus sat remotely to the south.

It was while in Troas on his second missionary journey that Paul dreamt of a Macedonian citizen petitioning him to depart Asia Minor for Macedonia (Acts 16:9ff). The apostle had stayed in Troas for only a short time then, no more than a day, before yielding to the vision and traveling to Philippi. Moreover, just recently on his current missionary trip, Paul had passed through Troas for the second time in search of Titus. Owing to his concern over Titus' whereabouts and the issues festering in the Corinthian church, he had been distracted from preaching in the community (2 Cor. 2:12–13).

Now, having outwitted the bloodthirsty Jews at Cenchrea, Paul returned to Troas for a third time, eager to preach in the district at long last. Due to the Corinthian conspiracy that blocked his original travel plans, it was evident that he would not reach Jerusalem in time for Passover. But Pentecost was still a likely possibility. He decided, therefore, to curtail his stay in Troas, apparently no longer than a week, so as to reach Jerusalem in time for the annual celebration and to deposit the sorely needed relief offering with the apostle James.

A vibrant group of believers greeted the apostle when he arrived in the city. Though Paul himself had yet to formally preach there, the gospel had actually arrived in Troas through various channels from Galatia, Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Achaia. Paul was pleased to be in their company, and to be afforded yet another occasion to make good on his desire to teach the believers.

His forthcoming outreach in Troas, although belated, ultimately proved groundbreaking for the universal Church. Establishing the practice of the most celebrated ritual within Christendom, the apostle's ministry with the Troasian church set precedent for the ecclesiastical worship of God. Paul and his entourage, together with the local congregation, came together "on the first day of the week ... to break bread" (Acts 20:7).

Luke's reference to the church gathering "on the first day of the week" is the earliest, unambiguous evidence for Christians meeting together for worship on a predetermined day. From this model in Acts 20 the Christian Church adopted "the first day of the week" as its formal day of assembly, conducive with New Covenant teaching.<sup>19</sup> Thus, Christians congregate for communion and worship not on the Sabbath (Saturday), as in the Jewish custom, but on Sunday. Included in this pattern is the ceremonial observance of the sacraments, and "[devotion to] the apostles' teaching and to the fellowship, to the breaking of bread and to prayer" (Acts 2:42).

Conducting an evening service in Troas, Paul preached the gospel ardently and spoke in varying degree concerning Christian practice, conduct, and doctrinal orthodoxy. Their place of worship, according to Luke, was an upper room in the home of a local church member. The scores of Macedonian Christians who filled the room to capacity likely attended the service in anticipation that the well-known apostle would preside over the Lord's Supper.

The church in Troas listened assiduously as the apostle Paul “kept on talking to midnight,” and eventually “until daylight” (Acts 20:7, 11). Their inquisitive minds apparently took advantage of the apostle’s long-windedness. They posed many probing questions to him, which apparently demanded lengthy theological explanations, turning the service into an all-night vigil. Most likely Paul felt it important to compensate the Troasians for his having neglected to preach to them earlier (cf. Acts 18:8–10; 2 Cor. 2:12–13).

Moreover, since his departure was at hand the next day, their access to a commissioned messenger from God was limited. Paul therefore considered it necessary to field their questions as an apostolic courtesy and to make the most of his abbreviated stay. Giving no thought to his own need for rest, even though the journey ahead of him to Jerusalem would be long and difficult, he used every available minute to preach the gospel.

As Paul tirelessly lectured from the third floor of the residence, a young man named Eutychus listened from his perch on a windowsill. He had found his way to the most advantageous location in the crowded room where the evening air was the freshest and coolest. Luke implies that flickering flames produced from torch lamps dimly lit the room, setting a tranquil atmosphere. Adding to the ambiance were the fumes and aroma from the oil lamps, which soothed the otherwise stuffy atmosphere. As Paul “talked on and on” into the night (Acts 20:9), the hypnotic mood caused a drowsy Eutychus to grow fatigued.

Eutychus apparently slumped over on the perch sound asleep. With nothing to barricade his fall, he plummeted three stories from the open window. The terrible sound that emanated from his body striking the roadway no doubt ricocheted throughout the upper room, bringing a shocking and sudden halt to the church service. In only a matter of seconds, the serenity of Paul’s meeting dissolved into chaos and the crowded room was emptied. The Troasian Christians raced as one man down three flights of stairs in a panic to find their young friend lying dead from an apparent broken neck.

It is likely that when Paul arrived on the scene moments later, Luke, the only physician on site, had already pronounced him dead (v. 9b cf. Col. 4:14). The church was heartbroken, frightened, and moved to tearful silence. Yet their grief would last only in passing. The stage was set for the apostle Paul to formally introduce the Troasians to his apostolic power. Up to that time, they had only known his reputation as a message-bearer, having never heard him preach or having witnessed the activity of the Holy Spirit in his ministry. And now, by God’s providence and intervention, the apostle was on full display to unleash the miraculous, forever cementing in their minds his command as an apostle.

Reminiscent of the prophets Elijah and Elisha, who each had resuscitated the dead by lying on the corpses (1 Kings 17:21; 2 Kings 4:34), Paul lay prone on top of Eutychus’ dead body. As he stretched himself over the young man, mimicking the prophets of old, he embraced Eutychus’ shattered vertebra. Paul comforted the watching bystanders: “Don’t be alarmed,” he said. “He’s alive” (Acts 20:10b).

Eutychus was suddenly revived. Acting with the command of an apostle, Paul miraculously restored him to life. The onlookers marveled at the sight of Eutychus rising to a full stand, completely healthy and with no sign of injury. The resurrection was a spectacle to behold. Unable to rip their eyes from the miracle, they stood speechless in

marvel, terror, and bewilderment. On the heels of the horrific event and its wonderful outcome, Paul directed the church to return to the upper room for further lecture, praise, and worship, and to partake in the elements of communion.

Paul's stay in Troas was significantly beneficial for the church there. He had taught them extensively, fellowshiped together in the Lord's Supper, and they had witnessed a dramatic sign of God's presence and power. With indebted tidings for his committed (albeit brief) preaching, plus his performance of the miraculous, the Macedonian and Asian Christians in Troas bid the apostle Paul an endearing goodbye as he set off for Assos.

### **Assos, Mitylene, & Miletus**

**W**ith Timothy still presiding over the church in Ephesus in Paul's absence and Titus on extended assignment in Corinth, Paul's remaining team—Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Tychicus, Trophimus, Silas, and Luke—set sail for Assos. Paul, however, opted to travel alone by foot along the Asian coastline. Although Luke does not state Paul's reasons for doing so, it is likely that the apostle chose to be alone so as to commune with the Lord, unencumbered, in preparation for what he knew would be a hostile welcome in Jerusalem (Acts 20:22–24). The twenty-mile trek from Troas to Assos accorded the apostle a full day unto himself and his Lord.

Paul eventually rejoined Luke and his colleagues at the anchorage in Assos. He boarded ship with his co-laborers and set sail to Mitylene, the leading city of the island of Lesbos. They continued their voyage through the coastal islands of Asia Minor, stopping successively at Chios and Samos before docking on the mainland at Miletus, a city thirty miles south of Ephesus.

Paul intended to avoid a long layover in the region, but the unloading of cargo at port postponed his departure. Despite Miletus' close proximity to Ephesus, Paul opted to forego the emotional strain of having to endure yet another emotional parting with the Ephesians and chose to remain seaside. Moreover, his ultimate goal, having missed Passover, was to return to Palestine by the fiftieth day to celebrate Pentecost. Time was crucial and he could not afford to catch a later boat. Nevertheless, with his ship in harbor undergoing freight exchange, Paul summoned the overseers in Ephesus to come join him at Miletus.

When the delegation from Ephesus arrived three days later, Paul used what little time he had ashore to console them. He appealed to his blameless record and reminded them of their firsthand knowledge of his ministry, which was to serve as an example among their eldership. For three years he had nurtured and taught the Ephesians, enduring persecution from the Jews and a riot caused by Gentile idol-makers. Like a proud father, he had the privilege of watching them grow from babes in Christ into strong spiritual leaders under his tutelage. His farewell to them left them sobbing:

“And now, compelled by the Spirit, I am going to Jerusalem, not knowing what will happen to me there. I only know that in every city the Holy Spirit warns me that prison and hardships are facing me. However, I consider

my life worth nothing to me, if only I may finish the race and complete the task the Lord Jesus has given me—the task of testifying to the gospel of God’s grace.

Now I know that none of you among whom I have gone about preaching the kingdom will ever see me again. Therefore, I declare to you today that I am innocent of the blood of all men. For I have not hesitated to proclaim to you the whole will of God. Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock of which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers. Be shepherds of the church of God, which he bought with his own blood ...

... Now I commit you to God and to the word of his grace, which can build you up and give you an inheritance among all those who are sanctified” (Acts 20:22–28, 32).

Luke is quick to note the lament of the Ephesians leaders: “They all wept as they embraced him and kissed him. What grieved them most was his statement that they would never see his face again” (vv. 37–38). Bemoaning this final goodbye, Paul presumably knelt to his knees on the loading dock and laid hands on the overseers. After a deeply affectionate and sorrowful prayer accented by his own tears, the apostle boarded ship for Caesarea, the harbor of Jerusalem, never to see Ephesus or its leaders again.

To conquer Pointe du Hoc, it was crucial that Lieutenant Colonel Rudder surround himself with dependable men capable of withstanding the trauma of the task. Likewise, for Paul to assail spiritual principalities as an apostolic commander, he required a unit of men resolute in their allegiance to the Lord, to him, and the Great Commission.

Whereas Rudder was fortunate to have Lieutenants Kerchner and Eikner, and Sergeants Rupinski, Lomell, and Kuhn to climb the defying cliffs of Pointe du Hoc, Paul felt it prudent to recruit Sopater, Aristarchus, Secundus, Gaius, Tychicus, Trophimus, as well as Silas, Timothy, Luke, and Titus to scale the many hurdles on his third missionary journey. His followers carried out their orders similar to Rudder’s team; he did not have to supervise their every move but trusted them to do the job, no matter what the dangers. Together, the missionary squad successfully tackled the spiritual foothills of the Mediterranean world, taking aim at the enemy “for the destruction of fortresses” (2 Cor. 10: 4, NASB).

—*Ronald H. Gann*

<sup>1</sup> Cited at [www.normandy1944.info](http://www.normandy1944.info)

<sup>2</sup> Cited at [www.europeanhistory.about.com](http://www.europeanhistory.about.com).

<sup>3</sup> “Altogether, Pointe-Du-Hoc got hit by more than ten kilotons of high explosives, the equivalent of the explosive power of the atomic bomb used at Hiroshima” [Ambrose, Stephen E., *The Victors: Eisenhower and His Boys: The Men of World War II*; Simon & Schuster; New Ed edition (October 28, 1999)].

<sup>4</sup> Ambrose, Stephen E., *The Victors: Eisenhower and His Boys: The Men of World War II*; Simon & Schuster; New Ed edition (October 28, 1999), as cited at [www.worldwar2history.info](http://www.worldwar2history.info).

<sup>5</sup> Bowman, Martin; *Remembering D-Day, Personal Histories of Everyday Heroes*, (HarperCollins 2004), p.69.

<sup>6</sup> Ambrose, Stephen E., *The Victors: Eisenhower and His Boys: The Men of World War II*; Simon & Schuster; New Ed edition (October 28, 1999), as cited at [www.worldwar2history.info](http://www.worldwar2history.info).

<sup>7</sup> Cited at [www.reagan2020.us](http://www.reagan2020.us).

<sup>8</sup> Longnecker, Richard L. *Acts of the Apostles; The NIV Bible Commentary, vol. 2: The New Testament*, Barker, Kenneth L. and Kohlenberger III, John R. eds. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 482.

<sup>9</sup> The Roman church was one of the few churches not founded by Paul, but was probably established by his converts from Macedonia and Asia, or by Jews and proselytes converted on the day of Pentecost (cf. Acts 2:10). Because he did not regard Rome as the specific territory of another apostle (cf. Rom. 15:20), Paul was eager to go to Rome and provide the church with apostolic guidance and to introduce himself and his theology in person. He wrote Romans in ca. 57 AD while in Corinth on this third missionary journey to prepare the church in Rome for his imminent arrival.

<sup>10</sup> Easton’s Bible Dictionary, as cited at [www.sacred-texts.com](http://www.sacred-texts.com)

<sup>11</sup> Unger, Merrill. *Archaeology and the New Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1962), 316.

<sup>12</sup> The Romans identified their goddess Diana with the Greek Artemis, and at a comparatively early time they transferred to their own goddess all the peculiar features of the Greek Artemis.

<sup>13</sup> Although Acts does not mention Titus by name, scholars believe that Paul and Barnabas established a relationship with him years earlier on the mission field. Titus accompanied both men to Jerusalem for the first ecumenical council of the apostles. Titus became a trusted confidant—and the recipient of the New Testament epistle that bears his name. He was dispatched on numerous occasions to the problematic church in Corinth to report back to Paul on their circumstances.

<sup>14</sup> Depending on when one chooses to place the Jerusalem Council in New Testament chronology, some scholars maintain that Titus was converted on Paul’s second missionary journey with Silas.

<sup>15</sup> While Philippi is not specifically named as the city where Paul reunited with Titus, the studied opinions of scholars deduce it as the most likely and geographically convenient location.

<sup>16</sup> Although Luke does not record it in Acts, the apostle Paul did in fact make one earlier trip to Corinth on an emergency visit to deal with further problems in the church, according to 2 Cor. 13:1–2. This visit occurred during Paul’s three-year ministry in Ephesus. The emergency visit occurred between the time Titus was sent there with Paul’s first epistle and prior to his second visit with the follow-up letter.

<sup>17</sup> Longnecker, Richard L. *Acts of the Apostles; The NIV Bible Commentary, vol. 2: The New Testament*, Barker, Kenneth L. and Kohlenberger III, John R. eds. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 490.

<sup>18</sup> Paul’s second letter to the Corinthians—2 Corinthians—is understood, in light of 1 Cor. 5:9, as actually his third letter to the church. Likewise, his first letter—1 Corinthians—was actually his second.

<sup>19</sup> See John 20:19, 26; 1 Corinthians 16:2; Revelation 1:10 cf. Galatians 4:10–11; Romans 14:5; Acts 15; 2 Corinthians 3:6ff cf. Hebrews 8; Colossians 2:16–17.