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Summary

Robert Jewett, in his 1997 article on Paul’s second journey, explored the geographical dimensions of Paul’s travel in north-west Asia Minor as described in Acts 16:6-8.1 His focus was to investigate thoroughly the road ‘down to Troas’ mentioned in verse 8. This study will not only renew that investigation from Dorylaeum where Jewett began it,2 but will also look at the earlier stages of the journey that began at Antioch on the Orontes. In so doing, it will examine the textual and material evidence that provides knowledge of the region’s road system. Regarding this route, Johnson observes: ‘Although endless scholarly discussion has been devoted to determining the precise route Paul took … it is in fact unsolvable.’3 Despite such a pessimistic perspective, hodological research in north-west Asia Minor in recent decades has provided fresh data to aid in evaluating alternative proposals for Paul’s


2 In a later article Jewett, ‘Investigating the Route of Paul’s “Second Missionary Journey” from Pisidian Antioch to Troas’, in Acts du Ier Congres International sur Antioche de Pisidie, eds. Thomas Drew-Bear, Mehmet Taşlıalan, and Christine M. Thomas (Paris: Diffusion de Boccard, 2002), 93-96, esp. 96, articulated this need: ‘Investigating the system of roads from Galatia through the Troad would allow a more solid basis for Biblical scholars to construct up-to-date maps of Paul’s missionary travels.’

route. To this end, milestones and inscriptions will be noted especially. Relevant finds from archaeological excavations in the area of the journey will also be mentioned. Lastly, we will review publications since 1997 that have interacted with Jewett’s important study and then suggest other alternatives to his thesis. The authors wish to thank Professor Jewett for his innovative work on this subject. His model of doing on-site investigation has inspired us to take up this study, which owes much to his pioneering spirit and example.

1. Introduction

Tomasch describes geography as ‘the writing of the world’, hence it becomes ‘the reciprocal interaction of two associated processes — the textualization of territories and the territorialization of texts…. Through these processes land is re-presented as territory, and works are surveyed, explored, located, and bounded; they become as it were, texts.’ Tomasch’s words have been a motivation to attempt systematically to localise the routes related to Paul’s journeys in Asia Minor and to elucidate them as geographical ‘texts’. In 2010 the authors together with a small student group localised a number of sites related to Paul’s first journey along the Via Sebaste and the King’s Highway in south central Turkey. In 2013 we conducted a similar investigation in west central and north-western Turkey for Paul’s second journey. Our guiding methodology centred on the principles outlined by David French as well as his terminology related to the definition of roads. His base maps of

---

4 We would like to thank the British Institute in Ankara for its invitation to present a poster entitled ‘Localizing the Route of Paul’s Second Journey in Anatolia’ at the symposium ‘Roads and Routes in Anatolia: Pathways of Communication from Prehistory to Seljuk Times’ held in Ankara during 20–22 March 2014. This article is based on research for that poster and the article by Mark Wilson, ‘The Role of the Holy Spirit in Paul’s Ministry Journeys’, *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 87 (2005), 76-95, esp. 82-85.


6 The investigation was based on the article by Mark Wilson, ‘The Route of Paul’s First Journey to Pisidian Antioch’, *NTS* 55 (2009), 1-13.

7 These research trips were conducted under the auspices of Wisconsin Lutheran College, Milwaukee, and the Asia Lutheran Seminary, Hong Kong, and supported by Jerry and Kay Fischer and the Fischer Family Foundation. We thank them heartily for their support as well as the students who participated.

8 David H. French, ‘A Study of Roman Roads in Anatolia: Principles and Methods’, *AnSt* 24 (1974), 143-49, esp. 143-44. French himself adapted these five principles from
the road system in Asia Minor were utilised for reconstructing the route of the second journey, and his map of Asia provided the alphanumerical references to the road segments.9

Bekker-Nielsen likewise provided methodological guidelines related to his fieldwork, textual studies, and contextual approach on roads in nearby Cyprus.10 The Barrington Atlas of the Classical World11 depicting ancient routes around AD 100 also proved a useful tool. A number of Bible atlases were examined, since their maps are often referenced for discussions of Paul’s journeys in the classroom and local church.12 The article will interact with all of these resources where appropriate. However, the maps in Bible atlases were not particularly helpful because they often displayed limited knowledge of the topography, road system, and provincial boundaries in Asia Minor in the mid-first century AD. For example, the map of the second journey in The IVP Atlas of Bible History ignores the geographic and political

F. Frederick Starr: 1) a study of pertinent information in ancient sources; 2) narrowing of the search area for a particular road to a band 1–5 miles wide; 3) area search; 4) questioning of local inhabitants; and 5) re-examining ancient writers in light of newly discovered data. The terminology includes: road, route, highway/roadway, track, path, and course.

9 Fig. 1 is based on David H. French, ‘Asia’, Roman Roads & Milestones of Asia Minor, vol. 3, fasc. 3.5 (Ankara: British Institute at Ankara, 2014), 25-26, which provides two Conspectus Maps of Asia, West and East (CM 5.1.1–5.1.2). Cüneyt Oral of Tutku Tours combined the maps digitally, which are reproduced here with the permission of French and the BIAA.


Fig. 1. Composite of French’s maps of Asia’s ancient road system
realities of Paul’s day and shows ‘a vague line as if he traveled over mountain ranges in a helicopter’, quoting Jewett’s words (Fig. 2).13

2. Leg 1: Syrian Antioch to Antioch near Pisidia

Several aspects of the first stage of Paul’s second journey continue to generate discussion. After leaving Antioch on the Orontes, Paul and Silas delivered the letter from the Jerusalem council to the churches in coastal Syria and Smooth Cilicia (Acts 15:41). He and Silas then visited Derbe, Lystra, where Timothy joined them, and Iconium (Acts 16:1-5).

According to Jewett, at Iconium the apostolic party was ‘prevented from traveling on the main highway west into Asia’, so they continued into North Galatia where they ‘apparently missionized for a considerable period of time while being detained by illness (Gal. 4:13-14)’.14

---


reading the apostolic party did not visit Antioch near Pisidia on the second journey. Such an interpretation is difficult to accept when viewed as part of the larger narrative. For Paul had already declared to Barnabas his motivation for the journey: ἐπιστρέψαντες δὴ ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς κατὰ πόλιν πάσαν ἐν αἷς κατηγείλαμεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου πῶς ἔχουσιν (Acts 15:36). The visit to Antioch near Pisidia encompassed the longest description on the first journey and included Paul’s first recorded speech (Acts 13:14-51). Thus Theophilus and the implied audience would assume that Antioch near Pisidia, although unmentioned, would be among τὰς πόλεις visited (Acts 16:4) and among the ἐκκλησίαι strengthened (Acts 16:5). The Christians there would have comprised one of the primary audiences for Paul’s letter to the Galatians as well as the letter from the Jerusalem council. Such an interpretation harmonizes well with the route of Paul’s third journey (Acts 18:23) wherein he revisited the four South Galatian churches while travelling along the Southern Highway to Ephesus. We agree with the conclusion of Wallace and Williams that on the second journey Paul ‘presumably visited Antioch as well as Iconium’.

15 Strabo (12.8.14) calls it Antiochea πρὸς Pisidia. Both the Oxford Atlas, 167, and ESV Atlas, 241, state that Antioch was ‘in Pisidia’. This anachronistic misnomer, often made in scholarly literature, is inappropriate for the New Testament period. Antioch only became the capital of the new province of Pisidia under Diocletian in the early 290s AD. Bruce Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the New Testament (London: United Bible Societies, 1975), 404-405, observes that the genitive reading τῆς Πισίδιας in the Codex Bezae has also contributed to this confusion. William M. Calder, Monuments from Eastern Phrygia, MAMA VII (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1956), xi, suggests that ‘Phrygian Antioch’ would also be correct geographically.

16 So Rainer Riesner, Paul’s Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 282: ‘Luke can be thinking only of the cities evangelized on the first missionary journey, namely, Iconium and Pisidian Antioch.’ A similar abbreviated narrative occurs for the Macedonian portion of Paul’s third journey. During the second journey Paul’s ministry activity in each Macedonian city is carefully detailed (Acts 16:11–17:15). However, on his return the itinerary, which would have included Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea, is condensed into one sentence (Acts 20:2).

17 This assumes an early date and a South Galatian audience; see Ben Witherington, Grace in Galatia (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 2-20. A fuller discussion of the North versus South Galatian debate is beyond the scope of this article.

18 Cilliers Breytenbach, ‘Probable Reasons for Paul’s Unfruitful Missionary Attempts in Asia Minor (a Note on Acts 16:6-7)’, in Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung, eds. Cilliers Breytenbach and Jens Schröter (Eckhard Pliimacher Festschrift; Leiden 2004), 157-69, esp. 157, 59, 62, mentions three times that the apostles passed through Pisidia on this journey. But on his second and third journeys Paul never passed through Pisidia; he was always north of this geographic region. It was only on the first journey that he passed through Pisidia (Acts 14:25).

THOMPSON & WILSON: The Route of Paul’s Second Journey

The brevity of Luke’s description of the route between Antioch near Pisidia and Troas might suggest an unfamiliarity with the terrain in north-west Asia Minor. This contrasts with his more detailed description of the first journey (Acts 13–14), a knowledge implicit in Luke’s description of the second journey to this point. Why is this portion of the journey summarised in just three verses? Lüdemann suggests that the itinerary is fragmented and convoluted and that ‘Luke has suppressed material and only reported bits and pieces.’20 However, Haenchen had previously argued that this section is a ‘condensation of a more exact report’ and that the author has probably ‘shortened a more detailed account for his purpose’.21 Since Luke was chronicling the spread of the Gospel, he had no reason to describe places and events where preaching was not permitted. Additionally, his narrative is hurrying toward describing the transformational event ahead at Troas.

3. Leg 2: Antioch near Pisidia to Apamea

Debate continues regarding the meaning of the ‘notorious phrase’ in 16:6:22 Διῆλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν23 κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ. Two translations have been suggested: ‘they travelled through the Phrygian and Galatian region’ or ‘they travelled through the region of Phrygian Galatia’.24 Mitchell points out that ‘the phrase is naturally understood as denoting the country of Phrygia Paroreius, on either side of Sultan Dağ, an area

---

20 Gerd Lüdemann, Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 178.
22 Colin J. Hemer, The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 202. He takes this ‘as an informal allusion to a definite entity’, and the resumptive phrase in 18:23 ‘is probably to be taken as partly repeating the allusion’.
23 For a similar construction see Luke 3:1: τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχονίτιδος χώρας where Iturea may also function adjectively. Perhaps Luke is using Trachonitis as a synecdoche like Philo (Gaius 326) to denote the entire kingdom. The word χώρα perhaps recalls Paul’s ministry success around Antioch during the first journey (Acts 13:49).
that was ethnically Phrygian, but which lay partly in the province of Galatia and partly in Asia’. Based on the first translation, some interpreters have projected a journey north-eastward to Philomelium where the travellers would have entered Phrygian Asia before turning north-westward toward Bithynia. The second translation suggests a journey westward along the Via Sebaste through the Phrygian region of south-western provincial Galatia. Writing about τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν in 18:23 and the related phrase in 16:6, Mitchell states that ‘there is no reason to look beyond the natural geographical interpretation of this journey, from Syria through the Cilician Gates on to the plateau, across Lycaonia to the communities of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch.’

Related is the question: When and where did the first prohibition take place? The answer depends on how κωλυθέντες is understood grammatically. Is its action antecedent or subsequent to the main verb διέρχομαι? Breytenbach reviews the translation options and opts for the former: ‘They went through the Phrygian and Galatian region, because they had been hindered to preach the word in Asia.’ He believes that the other reading is not the natural grammatical sense. However, Luke in Acts 1:16 and 25:13 does use the more unusual literary construction of an aorist participle indicating subsequent action. Campbell writes: ‘These examples thus demonstrate the possibility of the aorist participle

---

25 Mitchell, Anatolia, 2.3. Yet he further observes: ‘It is hardly conceivable that the Γαλατικὴ χώρα mentioned here is the region of north Galatia.’

26 Calder Monuments from Eastern Phrygia, vii n6, believes the probation occurred in Lystra. (However, its situation in Lycaonia, not Phrygia, and the interruption of the narrative sequence undercut such an interpretation.) Based on his view, Calder suggests that Paul travelled north across the Sultan Dağ on A6. He then proposed three possible routes by which the apostles reached Dorylaeum. Because we believe the prohibition occurred near Apamea, the two eastern routes through Nacolia are not considered in our discussion. The HarperCollins Atlas, 167, and ESV Atlas, 242, depict this route with Paul entering Asia presumably through Philomelium.

27 The Latin form provinciae Galaticae and its Greek equivalent Γαλατικὴ ἐπαρχεία have recently been found in other inscriptions from south Galatia; see Mustafa Adak and Mark Wilson, ‘Das Vespasiansmonument von Döseme und de Gründung der Doppelprovenz Lycia et Pamphylia’, Gephyra 9 (2012), 1-40 esp. 8-9.

28 Mitchell, Anatolia, 2.4. He also states: ‘The region around Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch was all a part of the province of Galatia in the mid-first century AD, and the expression Γαλατικὴ χώρα naturally refers to it.’


---
expressing subsequent temporal reference, in spite of those who would deny such usage.’ 30 One of those deniers was A. T. Robertson whom Breytenbach cites approvingly. 31 While there may be uncertainty about the ‘subsequent action’ making the best grammatical sense in Acts 16:6, it certainly makes the better geographical sense. And if Antioch near Pisidia were among the cities visited, which we have just concluded and which Breytenbach allows, 32 the apostles were already in the region of Phrygian Galatia. A hindrance did not bring them there but rather their charge to deliver the letter (Acts 15:30).

What was Paul’s intended destination in Asia? The consensus of scholars is that his destination was Ephesus, 33 the terminus of the Southern Highway. 34 This was the shortest and easiest route from the south Galatian cities ‘through the rest of Phrygia Paroreius to Apamea, and down the Maeander valley to the west coast’. 35 The Seleucids founded many new cities along this ‘Anatolian lieux de passage’ 36 and colonised them with Jews from Mesopotamia, so many now had Jewish populations. 37

---


34 Andreas Külzer, ‘The Network of Communication Routes in Anatolia in Late Antiquity and Medieval Times’, 7 (paper presented 15 June 2015 at Ataümc University, Ankara, Turkey; www.academia.edu/27832584/The_Network_of_Communication_Routes_in_Anatolia_in_Late_Antiquity_and_Medieval_Times, accessed 19/8/2016) calls this the koine hodos (common highway) and identifies it, following French, as one of the four main communication routes in Asia Minor during the imperial period.


36 John Ma, *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 35. At 36n37 he cites an inscription that places the Southern Highway into the distinct category of ὁδὸς βασιλική (‘royal road’).

The route of the Via Sebaste\textsuperscript{39} west from Antioch near Pisidia passed the city of Apollonia (Uluborlu). West of Apollonia the Via Sebaste continued south-westward along the ridge towards Eudoxipolis (Keçiborlu) and Lake Ascania (Burdur Lake). However, the Southern Highway towards Ephesus continued westward toward the next major junction east of Apamea. A large boundary stone dedicated to Hadrian (AD 134–35) has been found at the point where the road began its descent to the plain of Aulutrene. The stone marked not only the boundary between the cities of Apollonia and Apamea, but also the boundary between the provinces of Galatia and Asia.\textsuperscript{40} The Roman road, engineered with numerous switchbacks, still exists east of Çapalı. French labels this section of road as A9 on his road map of Asia (Fig. 1) and records three milestones (A.9:16.A-C) dating from the late second to the early fourth centuries AD that were found around Çapalı.\textsuperscript{41} Nearby at modern Eldere a Roman castellum was established near the spring source of the Meander River. This military establishment (vexillatio) may date as early as the reign of Vespasian, although the inscriptional

\textsuperscript{38} Luke Thompson is to be thanked for preparing this and the other similar maps in the article.

\textsuperscript{39} Breytenbach, ‘Probable Reasons for Paul’s Unfruitful Missionary Attempts in Asia Minor’, 161, mistakenly states that the Via Sebaste ran through Philomelium to Apamea; it ran through neither city. For a map of the route of the road, see Mitchell, Anatolia, 1: map 5.

\textsuperscript{40} William M. Ramsay, The Historical Geography of Asia Minor (London: John Murray, 1890), 172. For a discussion of the inscription with a photograph along with its reconstructed placement along the road, see Michel Christol and Thomas Drew-Bear, Un Castellum Romain Près D’Apamée de Phrygie (Wien: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1987), 14-17, plates II-III.

evidence points to the mid-second century AD. While the monument and the milestones postdate Paul’s journey, they nevertheless indicate the importance of the Southern Highway and suggest that it was the road Paul would use in his trans-Anatolian journeys.

4. The First Prohibition

After entering the province of Asia, the apostles κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ (Acts 16:6). To this point in Acts, the Spirit has directed the spread of the gospel positively (e.g., 1:8, 8:29, 39; 10:19-20; 13:2-4). But here, as Miller observes, ‘the Spirit acts “negatively” for the first time, restraining characters from proclaiming the gospel in particular regions’. Thus this first departure from the Spirit’s typical empowering role would capture the reader’s attention. Parsons and Culy postulate: ‘The traditional view that Paul turned north when the Holy Spirit would not let him enter Asia makes better sense of the syntax and the reference to Mysia (northwest of Asia) in the following verse. Paul thus went around Asia to get to Mysia.’ However, Acts never states that they were prevented from travelling in Asia. Ramsay notes incisively that Luke’s language here ‘marks clearly the distinction between the prohibition to preach in Asia, while they were actually in it, and the prohibition even to set foot in Bithynia’. For the rest of their journey until Troas the three always travelled in the province of Asia. Apamea ‘commanded the cut in the mountain range through

---

44 For a further discussion of the Spirit’s function in this passage, see the Excursus: The Pneumatology of the Second Journey.
45 Mikeal C. Parsons and Martin M. Culy, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, 308. A problem with this view is that Asia is taken as a geographical rather than a political entity. Every other reference in Acts (and in Revelation) to Asia is to the Roman province. Mysia was located in the north-eastern part of the province of Asia, thus the apostles were still in Asia; cf. David Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 455.
47 For the boundaries of provincial Asia from 27 BC to AD 72, see Christian Marek, *Geschichte Kleinasiens in der Antike* (München: Beck, 2010), maps 2-7. These six maps
which the Southern Highway climbed to the plateau of Central Anatolia, making it the commercial junction through which wealth-laden traffic passed to the East’.\textsuperscript{49} Whether they actually visited this important assize city\textsuperscript{50} is unknown because the road junction oriented toward central Asia Minor lay ten kilometres to its north-east. But a new plan with a new destination was formulated somewhere in the vicinity of Apamea.\textsuperscript{51}

5. Leg 3: Apamea to Dorylaeum

Near Apamea\textsuperscript{52} the apostles decided to turn northward to Bithynia to evangelise its major cities, Nicea and Nicomedia. To reach Bithynia via Dorylaeum, Asia’s north-easternmost city on its border with Bithynia, Paul had several routes from which to choose. One led north through the Phrygian Pentapolis past Agros Thermôn, Hierapolis, and Brusus to reach Cidyessus (D10). From this junction D17 ran north-west to Aezani to the junction of D20 that ran through Cotiaeum to Dorylaeum. The other road, D3, whose western terminus was Ephesus, ran north-east

\begin{itemize}
\item Paul Trebilco, \textit{Jewish Communities in Asia Minor} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 85.
\item See Dio Chrysostom, \textit{Oration} 35.15-17.
\item Eckhard Schnabel, \textit{Early Christian Mission: Paul & the Early Church}, 2 vols. (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2004), 1141-47, provides a brief description of Apamea and the other regions and cities mentioned henceforth in this article. His conclusions in ‘Notes on the travel route’ (1145) anticipate in part our own, however, without the archaeological data.
\item In his discussion of the second journey, Giovanni Uggeri, ‘Sulle strade di San Paolo in Anatolia: Il secondo e il terzo viaggio’, in \textit{Seminario di studi Paolo di Tarso: il messaggio, l’immagine, i viaggi: studi in memoria di Luigi Padovese}, eds. Stella Uggeri Patitucci and Luigi Padovese (Palermo: Officina di studi medievali, 2011), 125-73, esp. 134, brings the apostolic party to Apamea but then strangely projects the route westward to Laodicea and north-west to Philadelphia, Sardis, Thyatira, and Pergamum. Here he writes: ‘Probabilmente la decisione di raggiungere la Troade può aver consigliato a questo punto di non percorrere il più lungo itinerario costiero e di tagliare diritto alle falde del Pindasus in modo da poter raggiungere con circa 34 miglia Adramitto.’ The map of the journey included with the article (154, fig. 14), however, resembles the route in the \textit{IVP Atlas} and contradicts his text.
\item In a bathhouse here, today Hüdai Kaplıcaları, W. M. Ramsay found the two fragments of the famous Abercius inscription now in the Vatican Museum, dating to the late second century AD; see Peter Thonemann, ‘Abercius of Hierapolis: Christianization and Social Memory in Late Antique Asia Minor’, in \textit{Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World}, eds. Beate Dignas and R. R. R. Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 257-82 at 277.
\end{itemize}
through Metropolis and Synnada before reaching Prymnessus, which Syme calls the ‘strategic key of Anatolia’. Because the latter route passed through the important assize centre of Synnada and serviced the important marble quarry at Docimium, it was the more important of the two.

From Prymnessus the apostolic party would continue northward toward Dorylaeum (D24). At the road junction at Meiros, marked on the Barrington Atlas but not in French, they could travel north-east through Nacolia (D9) or north-west through Cotiaeum (D24, D20). Polhill observes trenchantly about this geographic conundrum: ‘The route of the missionaries from this point is anything but clear.’ But Acts 16:7 seems to point to a probable direction: ἐλθόντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν. Mysia was a geographic region within Asia where, as Magie correctly states, ‘there were but few routes of importance’. Luke’s use of κατὰ here is best understood as ‘along’ or ‘toward’ its boundary. Like Phrygia and Lydia, Mysia was a region whose precise borders were ‘hard to distinguish, since they merge into one another’ (Strabo 13:4:12). It consisted of several sub-areas with that closest to Bithynia being Mysia.
Abbaeitis represented by the cities of Kadi, Synaus, and Ancyra Sidera. Cotiaeum and Aezani were in the western part of Phrygia Epictetus; nevertheless, some ancient authorities assigned Kadi to Phrygia Epictetus also. Thus Cotiaeum was situated ‘toward’ Mysia in a way that Nacolia was not. So from Meiros Paul and company probably proceeded to Cotiaeum, which was at the centre of a minor knot of roads that bordered Mysia. Larkin agrees with this conclusion that Cotiaeum was where the apostolic party arrived at the border of Mysia. Along this route twenty-five arches of the Yıprak Köprüsü (Bridge) still stand south-east of modern Kütahya near Alayunt. This remarkable bridge, 150 metres long, dates from the Seljuk period but appears to be built on earlier Roman foundations.

From Cotiaeum (Kütahya) the main road (D20) to Bithynia led north-east to Dorylaeum (Eskişehir). Three milestones (085A-B, 87), measured from Dorylaeum as the caput viae of this route and dating from the Late Roman period, are displayed at the Eskişehir Archaeological Museum. The road — whose track is still observable north of Kütahya — followed the Tembris River (Porsuk) that flowed between the two cities. As Ramsay writes: ‘Dorylaion was the most important road centre in the north.’ Situated on the great trade route from the Bosphorus to the Cilician Gates, it served as a major junction of five roads. To the north-west were Prusa, Nicaea and the Bithynian capital Nicomedia, to

---

62 The only native Mysian inscription (P332) ever found came from the wooded country west of Cotiaeum between Tavşanlı and Aezani; see Barbara S. Levick et al., eds., Monuments from the Aezanitis recorded by C. W. M. Cox, A. Cameron, and J. Cullen, MAMA IX (London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies, 1988), xvii.
64 Levick et al., Monuments from the Aezanitis, xxiii.
65 Levick et al., Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, xxiii. The Peutinger Table mentions neither Cotiaeum nor Aezani. A milestone (080) found south of Altıntaş may mark this road; see French, ‘Asia’, 154-155.
66 William J. Larkin, Acts (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), 233. However, Larkin dismisses Dorylaeum as the place where the prohibition occurred because he incorrectly places Cotiaeum on the border of Bithynia.
69 Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, 168.
the east Midaeum and the Galatian capital Ancyra, to the south-east Amorium, to the south Nacolia, and to the south-west Cotiaeum. As Foss stresses: ‘Control of this site therefore ensured easy passage for armies or more peaceful traffic, or prevented the advance of an enemy from the east into the rich districts opposite the capital (Constantinople).’ Dorylaeum’s situation on the border of the Bithynian city of Nicea is attested by an inscription dating from

71 Magie, Roman Rule in Asia Minor, 1:42, 2:800-802
Hadrian’s principate. The persistency of transportation routes at Eskişehir demonstrates why Dorylaeum would be a suitable launching point into Bithynia. But the apostles now received a second prohibition: ἐπείραζον εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν πορευθῆναι, καὶ οὐκ εἶασεν αὐτοῦς τὸ πνεῦμα Ἰησοῦ (Acts 16:7). Therefore Jewett rightly argues that ‘Dorylaeum was the location where the decision not to go into Bithynia was made’.

6. Leg 4: Dorylaeum to Hadrianuthera

With their ‘Plan B’ north into Bithynia blocked by the Spirit of Jesus, a new ‘Plan C’ was needed: παρελθόντες δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν κατέβησαν εἰς Τρῳάδα (Acts 16:8). From Dorylaeum Ramsay and Bérard

73 C. W. M. Cox and A. Cameron, eds., *Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea*, MAMA 5 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1937), 601. However, Magie, *Roman Rule*, 2:1487-88; cf. 1:626, calls the restoration questionable and doubts that the ‘territory of Nicea was so large as to be conterminous with that of Dorylaeum’, but offers no alternative suggestion. French, *Asia*, 15, also mentions two inscriptions that also provide epigraphical evidence for the boundary of Dorylaeum.

74 Regarding the appeal to persistency of routes (see note 93), Thonemann, *The Maeander Valley*, 143, cautions that routes are not always persistent: ‘... ancient Apamea-Celaenae was of little significance in the Ottoman period. No major route passed nearby.’

75 Magie, *Roman Rule*, 2:800, describes the route that ran from Dorylaeum to Nicea, the nearest Bithynian city.

76 Jewett, ‘Mapping the Route of Paul’s “Second Missionary Journey”’, 5. Here Jewett also lists other scholars who concur that Dorylaeum was the decisive junction. W. M. Ramsay seems to be the first to express this opinion in his article ‘Roads and Travel (in NT)’, in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898), 5:391.

77 The maps in the *Kregel Atlas*, 84, and *Oxford Atlas*, 169, fail to approach Bithynia whatsoever, while the *Zondervan Atlas*, 228; *Moody Atlas*, 259, Map 111; *ESV Atlas*, 242; and *HarperCollins Atlas*, 167, depict the route as entering Bithynia, despite the prohibition, and passing through Nicea and Prusa and below the Sea of Marmara before descending inland to Troas from the north-east.


---

73 C. W. M. Cox and A. Cameron, eds., *Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea*, MAMA 5 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1937), 601. However, Magie, *Roman Rule*, 2:1487-88; cf. 1:626, calls the restoration questionable and doubts that the ‘territory of Nicea was so large as to be conterminous with that of Dorylaeum’, but offers no alternative suggestion. French, *Asia*, 15, also mentions two inscriptions that also provide epigraphical evidence for the boundary of Dorylaeum.

74 Regarding the appeal to persistency of routes (see note 93), Thonemann, *The Maeander Valley*, 143, cautions that routes are not always persistent: ‘... ancient Apamea-Celaenae was of little significance in the Ottoman period. No major route passed nearby.’

75 Magie, *Roman Rule*, 2:800, describes the route that ran from Dorylaeum to Nicea, the nearest Bithynian city.

76 Jewett, ‘Mapping the Route of Paul’s “Second Missionary Journey”’, 5. Here Jewett also lists other scholars who concur that Dorylaeum was the decisive junction. W. M. Ramsay seems to be the first to express this opinion in his article ‘Roads and Travel (in NT)’, in *A Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1898), 5:391.

77 The maps in the *Kregel Atlas*, 84, and *Oxford Atlas*, 169, fail to approach Bithynia whatsoever, while the *Zondervan Atlas*, 228; *Moody Atlas*, 259, Map 111; *ESV Atlas*, 242; and *HarperCollins Atlas*, 167, depict the route as entering Bithynia, despite the prohibition, and passing through Nicea and Prusa and below the Sea of Marmara before descending inland to Troas from the north-east.


---
advocated a route to the north-west that followed the Rhyndakos valley near the borders of Mysia and Bithynia (A2). The apostles would have first reached the area around Cyzicus and then continued along the shores of the Sea of Marmara and the Hellespont (D1) before arriving at Troas. Bowers further pointed out that if Paul had gone south of the Olympus range (Uludağ), he would have passed through the heartland of un-Hellenised Abretene. While this region was not challenging topographically, it would have been an unusual route because the area lacked major roads in antiquity as well as today. Bowers therefore suggests that the apostolic party purposely passed by or through Mysia because they had already clearly settled on reaching the port of Troas in order to trans-ship to Macedonia. However, the text does not state that Troas had already been determined to be the goal.

Broughton believes that the group turned westward at Cotiaeum, not Dorylaeum, because the spurs of the Mysian Olympus extended too far south. He writes: ‘The conditions of our problem … make it almost inevitable that he started his westward journey from Kotiaeion or some point only slightly south of it.’ He argues that the few roads, either ancient or modern that cross the rough, undeveloped country of Mysia Abretene and Mysia Abbaeitis, start at Cotiaeum. Although a natural reading of the text takes the apostles first to Dorylaeum, we agree that Cotiaeum was the natural place to begin the next stage of their journey. Therefore the apostles would have had to retrace their steps south-westward from Dorylaeum to Cotiaeum along D20.

However, at Cotiaeum a further set of options arose: roads led to the north-west (D5 to its junction with C5) and to the south-west (D20 leading to D19). However, neither French nor the Barrington Atlas show either of these roads continuing all the way to the Troad. The latter shows the north-westerly road continuing to Hadriania and then stopping (Z1 is

---

80 W. P. Bowers, ‘Paul’s Route through Mysia: A Note on Acts XVI.8’, *JTS* 30 (1979), 507-511. Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 228, remarks curiously: ‘The floundering mission is finally given focus when “having arrived at Mysia they went down in Troas”.’ First, there is no evidence that the mission was floundering at this point, and second, Mysia was never a destination in the first place.
our reconstruction). French depicts no road for at least 50 kilometres to the east of Hadriania but only one continuing from there westward into Hadrianuthera (D56).\(^8\) Neither the *Barrington Atlas* nor French show the more southerly route continuing past Ancyra. Thus the two foremost authorities only agree that there was no direct route connecting Cotiaeum with Hadrianuthera in antiquity.\(^\) Today a modern highway (230) follows approximately the northern route by connecting Kütahya via Tavşanlı with Balıkesir (Hadrianuthera), while a second highway (240) follows the more southerly route.

Choosing between the two routes is difficult.\(^\) Among the authorities each route includes a section without any documentation for its existence. Nevertheless, several factors point to the southerly route. The northern one is shorter, but it passed through only one major city while

---

\(^8\) Mary T. Boatwright, *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 189, in her examination of Hadrian’s foundations in Mysia, speaks of a road extending from Hadrianutherae to Hadrianeia and on to Cotiaeum, but cites no support for that statement.

\(^\) Anna-Maria Wittke, Eckhart Olshausen, and Richard Szydlak, eds., *Brill’s New Paul Historical Atlas of the Ancient World* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010), 197, show no roads running north from Dorylaeum or west from Cotiaeum on its map of the road and route network in Asia Minor. The names of the three main sites in this area — Hadriani, Hadriania, and Hadrianuthera — suggest that only in the second century AD was its infrastructure more fully developed.

\(^\) Optimal Path Analysis run from Kütahya to Balıkesir in two popular route planning programs (http://openrouteservice.org; https://www.strava.com) shows both preferring the northern route. For the methodology behind this approach, see Irmela Herzog, ‘The Potential and Limits of Optimal Path Analysis’, in *Computational Approaches to Archaeological Spaces*, eds. Andrew Bevan and Mark Lake (Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast, 2013), 1-26. However, regarding the limitations of OPA, Herzog warns ‘that GIS-based reconstructing prehistoric routes without validating the results on the basis of archaeological evidence or historic sources is mere guesswork’ (20).
the southern route passed through four. Also, there is more material
evidence along the latter. From Cotiaeum D20 ran south-west to Aezani
(Çavdarhisar). Two Late Roman milestones (084 A-B) found at Zobu
mark this route with Aezani as the caput viae. North-east of Aezani
near Hacikebir a section of preserved track runs parallel to the modern
highway. Aezani was a major Graeco-Roman city with a number of
structures dating from the first century AD. Of the four Roman bridges
that spanned the Penkalas (Kocaçay) River, two are still in use. French
shows a branch (D19) going west from Aezani to Synaus and on to
Ancyra, but the main road continued south-west to Kadi (Eski Gediz).
As Levick et al. write, ‘the Aezani-Cadi stretch of the road south-west
from Cotiaeum must be treated as a route of more than local
significance’.

Outside Kadi the road briefly followed the Hermus (Gediz) River. But
to follow it southward to Temenothyrae (Uşak) would have taken Paul
back into the heart of Asia where he had been forbidden to preach. It is
thus likely that the party turned north-westward along a branch of the
Hermus to reach Synaus (Simav). Ancyra Sidera (Boğazköy), and
Goloe/Golareanoi (Bahtılı). French does not show such a road on his
Conspectus Map; however, the Barrington Atlas, while omitting
French’s D19, does show it as a Roman road (Z2). Ironically, Levick et
al. state that ‘the Cadi-Synaus-Anncyra route was also a Roman road in
the sense that David French defines it’. Two Claudian inscriptions (ca.
AD 51/52) found in the late Roman fortress at Goloreanoi date from the

85 French, ‘Asia’, 159-60.
86 Sections of this road are illustrated in Takeko Harada and Fatih Cimok, Roads of
Ancient Anatolia, 2 vols. (Istanbul: A Turizm, 2008), 67-68, Figs. 74-78. The bridge
Yıprak Köprüsü is shown on 65, figs. 70-71, as is one of the bridges at Aezani, 66, fig. 72.
87 Vittorio Galliazzo, I ponti romani, 2 vols. (Treviso: Canova, 1994), nos. 836-839;
88 The Barrington Atlas, 62, fails to show this route nor is there a modern highway
tracing its path.
89 Levick et al., Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, xxiv. At Kadi there is an
old bridge built of spolia, and numerous archaeological artefacts are displayed in the
garden of the municipal building. On the southern end of the city the remains of an
aqueduct still stand.
90 Spolia from Synaus can be found in the walls of the Nasuh Ağa Camii standing in
central Simav. Synaus was also a bishopric in pre-Constantinian times (Tabula Imperii
Byzantini 7:396). Only the acropolis can be seen at Ancyra Sidera today.
91 Levick et al., Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, xxv.
period of Paul’s traverse. However, the earliest milestones date from the reign of Septimius Severus. Nevertheless, Levick et al. write that ‘the presence of milestones may well indicate a fresh upgrading of a long-established road that had simply not met Roman specifications, or only a restoration’. Since the foundation of these cities dates before the coming of Paul, there would undoubtedly be roads connecting them before the Severan period.

Another factor is the presence of the earliest Christian monuments in Turkey. Two, dating from 157/58 and 179/80, come from Cadi. These, along with several other epitaphs from the second to third centuries found at Synaus and Ancyra Sidera, suggest the presence of early Christian communities in this area of Phrygia. These inscriptions have their counterpart in a number of inscriptions in Lycaonia, which Mitchell dates to the same period. He suggests that the prominence of individuals named Paul on the Lycaonian inscriptions indicates the legacy of the apostle who founded the churches almost two centuries before. It might also be hypothesised that these early inscriptions in remote Phrygia appear because Paul passed through these Mysian cities on the second journey. The memory is preserved, even if he was unable to evangelise them.

While neither the Barrington Atlas nor French show a road running north-west from Ancyra toward Hadrianuthera, French has suggested it as a possible route to Hadrianuthera. However, Calder and Bean do show a track following the Macestus (Simav) River. This would be the most desolate section of their journey and a place where Paul could have

92 Thomas Drew-Bear and Metin Türktüzün, ‘Goloe’, Papers of the Third International Symposium of Archaeology, Kütahya University Dumlupınar, 8–9 March 2010, ed. A. Nejat Bilgen (Kütahya: Üçmart, 2011), 201-203, 210 fig. 11. In this rural Mysian town Diodorus is identified as serving in various civic magistracies as well as twice priest of the imperial cult which earned him the title philosebastos. He was also honoured for erecting a statue of the emperor Claudius.

93 Levick et al., Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, xxv. Two milestones from this road (082–83) are found in French, ‘Asia’, 157-158.


encountered dangers from rivers and bandits as well as hunger and thirst (2 Cor. 11:26-27). Even today the area is little populated. The conclusion of the recent study of the road system around Nicea is instructive: ‘This case study shows a high degree of continuity in the communication routes within the studied area … distribution of settlement patterns indicates routes coinciding with the Roman roads that existed as early as the EBA, remarkably, continue till today.’

So it is possible that Turkish highway D585 is the latest iteration of a track whose origins trace back into antiquity.

7. Leg 5: Hadrianuthera to Troas

Both the posited routes from Cotiaeum — the north and southern — led to Hadrianuthera (also Hadrianoutherai: ‘Hadrian’s Hunts’). The Historia Augusta (20:13; cf. Cassius Dio 69:10:2) records that the city was founded by the eponymous emperor after a successful bear hunt in the area in AD 123. However, a settlement existed already in Paul’s day, although its name is not known. This is implied by the tradition that Aelius Aristides was born here around AD 117/18, six years before Hadrian’s visit. Boatwright notes that it was ‘at the crossroads of the major road between Cyzicus and Pergamum and the road running west from coastal Adramyttium into the interior of Mysia’. French’s D4 runs north to south while D55 leads westward to Adramyttium.

Jewett, however, chooses a different route, drawing attention to the language of Acts 16:8 as a factor for his decision: ‘The expression “they descended into Troas”, would accurately describe a journey down into

---

100 W. Gawantka and M. Zahrnt, ‘Eine neue Inschrift der Stadt Stratonikeia-Hadrianopoli im Lydien’, Chiron 7 (1977), 310n15, suggest that Hadrian renamed an existing city here and did not found a new one. The modern name Balikesir is surmised to be derived from that earlier name, possibly Παλαιοκάστρον, or Παλαι Καισαρεία; cf. Ramsay, Historical Geography of Asia Minor, 156.
102 Boatwright, Hadrian, 188; cf. Magie, Roman Rule, 1:617.
the coastal city from the mountainous country to the east of Troas.”103

Based on this understanding of καταβαίνω, 104 Jewett postulates a route from Hadrianuthera that ran north of Mount Ida and approached Troas from the upper Scamander valley (Fig. 6).105 The Barrington Atlas depicts several of the sites on Jewett’s map. Ergasteria and Pericharaxis106 are situated on the route connecting Pergamum and Cyzicus (D4), while Argyria and Argiza107 lay on a putative road between Adramyttium and Cyzicus.108 The modern highway D555 follows the former route. A paved highway parallels the second route and runs from Edremit through Kalkım with a branch reaching Pazarköy. The significant observation is that both the ancient and modern roads run south to north. There are no modern roads running east to west north of Mount Ida (Kaz Dağı), and neither Calder and Bean, the Barrington Atlas, or French depict such an east-west route in antiquity.

Several factors point to the route west to Adramyttium (D55) as Paul’s most viable choice.109 First, there is no persistency of a track or road along Jewett’s proposed route. 110 Second, Hadrianuthera, as Boatwright and Magie have suggested, was strategically sited at the spot where a road connected with the coast.

---

104 The verb καταβαίνω is used nineteen times in Acts, eleven in the context of travel, especially travel down from Jerusalem (e.g., 7:15; 8:15, 26; 18:22; 24:1, 22; 25:6, 7).
105 Jewett, ‘Mapping the Route of Paul’s “Second Missionary Journey”’, 10-16.
107 The village of Kalkım today identifies its ancient name as Agonia (http://kalkim.com/index.php?page=articles&op=readArticle&id=31&title=Kalkım-Tarih; accessed 18/8/2016). Argiza is located at Pazarköy (http://imperium.ahlfeldt.se/places/29499.html; accessed 18/8/2016). Jewett provides extensive documentation for the sites mentioned on his itinerary in the footnotes on pages 10-12. Unfortunately no recent survey or excavation work has been done in this area.
108 Calder and Bean, and the Barrington Atlas depict the road from Adramyttium to Cyzicus, but French shows no such road, indicating that no milestones have been found to support a paved road running along that route.
109 The Discovery House Atlas, 300, Map 11.6, does depict the route, albeit imprecisely. After leaving Bithynia, it descends southward from the Sea of Marmara and then westward into Troas.
110 Optimal Path Analysis run from Balıkesir to Dalyan in two popular route planning programs (http://openrouteservice.org; https://www.strava.com) shows both choosing the coastal route.
Fig. 6. Jewett’s hypothesis for Paul’s route from Dorylaeum to Troas\textsuperscript{111}

\textsuperscript{111} Reproduced from Jewett, ‘Mapping the Route of Paul’s “Second Missionary Journey”’, 22.
Finally, Jewett rejects this option because he implies that it ran at or near sea level most of the way. But this is not the case. The following are elevations along Jewett’s proposed route: Ergasteria (225m), Argiza (177m), Scepsis (236m), and Scamandros (114m). He situates Polichna somewhere between Orencik (290m) and Karaköy (335m). However, between these villages is the Mount Ida range reaching an elevation of 900 metres through which only forest roads exist today. On the other hand, the coastal road that climbed over the western spur of Mount Ida reached an elevation of 457m near Paleo Gargara before it descended to Scamandros. Except for passage through Mount Ida, the southern route actually reaches a higher elevation than most of Jewett’s sites, so could fit Luke’s language, κατέβησαν εἰς Τρῳάδα, as well as accord with the geography of the south-western Troad.112 Also, Liddell and Scott note that a classical meaning of καταβαίνω is ‘go down from the inland parts to the sea’. So the journey from Scamandros to Troas could fit that description as well.

Peterson writes that Troas ‘was actually in Mysia and could be approached only by passing west through Mysia’,113 However, Troas was situated in the Troad, while its neighbour Adramyttium was part of Mysia. At Adramyttium (Ören) Paul reached a seaport on the Aegean Sea as well as another assize city in Asia. However, no additional guidance was received here so they continued along the northern coast of the Gulf of Adramyttium that passed below Mount Ida and through Antandrus on D1. At New Gargara the road climbed north-west from the coast to skirt the rough terrain lying to its west.114 About the road traces here Böhlendorf-Arslan writes: ‘At the edge of the city rock of Nea Gargara a paved street turns to the east in the direction of Antandrus. There are no more road traces in the direction of Scepsis or a western

---

112 Broughton, ‘Three Notes on Saint Paul’s Journeys in Asia Minor’, 135, makes the interesting observation that ‘κατέβησαν does not certainly imply that Troas was the first point he (Paul) touched upon the coast after coming down from the interior’. Since he opts for the southern route through Adramyttium and Assos, Broughton must have these port cities in mind.

113 Peterson, Acts, 455.

direction. After climbing over the western ridge of the Mount Ida range, the road descended into the Satnioeis River (Tuzlu Çay) where it split. One fork descended south-west to the coast at Assos (D57), while the main road continued northward. Paul could have chosen the longer route through Assos and continued via the Smintheum along the coast to Troas, but he more likely continued on D1. A multi-inscribed milestone dating to the third or fourth century AD and now standing in Ayvacık probably marked this road. D1 skirted the heights of Neandria (520m; Çğri Dağ) on the east, and at the northern bend of the Scamander River (Kücük Menderes) around Seandros (near Ezine) a spur (D58) ran south-westward down to Troas. Even this last stretch fits well the narrow meaning of καταβαίνω.

Paul’s decision to turn toward Troas undoubtedly stemmed from learning that this Roman colony was a nodal point ‘between road

---


116 There is a long, well-preserved section of this road north of Ilyasfakı Köyü paralleling the old Ayvacık-Behramkale road. It crossed the Satnioeis River north of Assos via a bridge about 100 meters west of the restored Ottoman bridge. A drawing and a photograph of the remains of this ‘Greek bridge’ made in the 1880s can be found in Joseph T. Clarke, Francis H. Bacon, and Robert Koldewey, *Investigations at Assos* (Cambridge: Archaeological Institute of America, 1902), 129-131.


121 Distance need not be a factor: Paul and Barnabas went down from Perga to Attalia (Acts 14:25), a journey of only sixteen kilometres.

systems from the east and maritime routes to the south and west’. \(^{123}\)

Alexandria Troas was larger than Assos, and its port was an established corridor with a regular ferry service linking Asia to Europe as well as a hub for ships waiting to enter the Hellespont and continue to the Black Sea region. \(^{124}\) At Troas Paul received a vision of a Macedonian man inviting them to cross over to Europe (Acts 16:9). \(^{125}\) Was the church in Troas started at this time or later? Hemer answers: ‘The provincial sense seems to exclude mission there at the time of the ban in Acts 16…. I should place the evangelization of Troas in the Ephesian period and its aftermath.’\(^ {126}\) In any case, Troas later became a pivotal city for Paul’s ministry (Acts 20:6-12; 2 Cor. 2:12; 2 Tim. 4:13).

Paul had travelled approximately 825km before the first prohibition was received near Apamea. The apostolic party continued another 260km until the second prohibition was given at Dorylaeum. From Dorylaeum to Troas they continued westward for another 500km without any guidance. The Anatolian portion of the second journey ended after a journey of almost 1600km and many weeks after it had begun in Antioch on the Orontes.

\(\text{Fig. 7. Leg 5, from Hadrianuthera to Alexandria Troas}\)

---


125 For discussions of this dream/vision, see Edmond Farahian, ‘Paul’s Vision at Troas (Acts 16:9-10)’, in *Luke and Acts*, ed. Gerald O’Collins and Gerald Marconi (New York: Paulist, 1993), 197-207, and Miller, *Convinced that God had Called Us*, 93-107. Miller’s study notably lacks any historical or geographical context for the vision at Troas and provides only a literary analysis of the event.

Jewett, at the end of his article, expressed hope that his research would lead to two outcomes: ‘By clarifying the status of the Roman road network in a portion of Asia Minor that has remained relatively untouched by recent investigations of the transportation system, this investigation would offer a resource that could be used in the creation of “The Classical Map of Greece and Rome” to be published in 1999 by Princeton University Press under the sponsorship of the American Philological Association. It also could lend precision to the next generation of maps for biblical atlases and other reference works.’\(^{127}\) However, Jewett’s proposed route was not adopted by the editors of the *Barrington Atlas* in Map 56 of the Pergamum region. Likewise, no Bible atlases have adopted his suggestion; nevertheless their depictions for various stages of the journey remain vague and imprecise.

In a later article Jewett concedes: ‘With regard to the present hypothesis, if in fact there was no road system through the Skamander Valley past Skepsis to the mining sites of Polichne, Argyria, Argiza, and Ergasteria, then Paul’s route must have followed the coastal highway through Adramytteion.’\(^{128}\) This is in fact the conclusion of our investigation. Using the data presented above, the authors suggest that Figure 8 depicts the most likely route for Paul’s second journey.

It must be emphasised that this suggestion remains provisional and subject to new discoveries in the region. Nevertheless, the flat trajectory on the map in the *IVP Atlas* (Fig. 1) has now been replaced by a zigzag path that takes seriously both the text of Acts and the hodological realities in north-west Asia Minor in the first century AD (Fig. 8).

Projecting this journey on a topographical base map is also visually helpful because it presents the land features that constrained travel in antiquity (Fig. 9).

The goal of our research has been similar to Jewett’s. We hope that the data presented in the article will result in more geographically precise discussions of the second journey as well as more accurate cartographical depictions in future editions of Bible maps and atlases.

---


Fig. 8 Suggested Route of Paul’s Second Journey from Antioch near Pisidia to Troas
Fig. 9. Suggested Route in its Topographical Context\textsuperscript{129}

\textsuperscript{129} Courtesy of Ancient World Mapping Center

Is Luke’s nomenclature in the two prohibitions — Holy Spirit and Spirit of Jesus — a point of pneumatological significance? Pervo notes rightly that the ‘Holy Spirit’ and the ‘Spirit of Jesus’ are placed in parallelismus membrorum, thus no theological distinction needs to be made between them. Wall suggests that the expression ‘probably cues the reader’s recollection of Jesus’s active role in Paul’s conversion and commission’. The voice directing him is therefore the same one that spoke to him on the road to Damascus (Acts 9:4-6). A practical question relates to how these prohibitions were received. Stählin rejects the idea that guidance came through natural events, psychic impulses, a vision, or even an inner certainty brought about by the Spirit. Instead for him the likely explanation is ‘the word of Christ spoken under inspiration by a prophet (probably Paul, or perhaps Silas)’. He draws this conclusion from Luke’s earlier identification of Paul and Silas as prophets (Acts 13:1; 15:32). Witherington, however, suggests that an internal leading by the Holy Spirit might be the way the prohibitions were discerned. However, since the wording of both prohibitions is so ambiguous, especially when compared to the clearly supernatural ‘vision in the night’ recorded just a few verses later (16:9), it is also possible that the two prohibitions were merely the result of physical obstacles that prevented the execution of the apostolic plans. Certainly any or a combination of these may have been the means by which the Spirit conveyed these prohibitions.

---