§u.] TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING. [inrropuctiox,   
   
 foree, in the: history. And besides, even if Timothy, as has some-   
 times been thonght from 1 Cor. xvi. 11, did return to Ephesus before   
 the Apostle left it, and in this sense might have been left there on his   
 departure, we must then suppose him to have almost immediately   
 deserted the charge entrusted to him; for he is again, in the autumn of   
 57, with St. Paul in Macedonia in 2 Cor. i. 1, and in Corinth in the   
 winter (Rom. xvi. 21), and returned to Asia thence with him, Acts xx.   
 4: and thus, as Wieseler remarks, the whole scope of our Episile, the   
 ruling and ordering of the Ephesian Chureh during the Apostle’s   
 absence, would he defeated. Grotius snggested, and Bertholdt adopted,   
 a theory that the Epistle might have been sent on St. Paul’s return   
 from Achaia to Asia, Acts xx. 4, and that Timothy may, instead of   
 remaining in Troas on that occasion, as related Acts xx. 5, have gone   
 direct to Ephesus, and there received the Epistle. Bnt, apart from all   
 other difficulties, how exceedingly improbable, that such an Epistle   
 should have preceded only by a few weeks the farewell discourse of Acts   
 xx. 18—85, and that he should have sent for the elders to Miletus,   
 thongh he himself had expressed, and continually alluded to in the   
 Epistle, an intention of visiting Ephesns shortly !   
 9. These difficulties have led to a hypothesis that the journey from   
 Ephesus is one unrecorded in the Acts, occurring during the long visit   
 of Acts xix. That during that time a journey to Corinth did take place,   
 we have inferred from the data furnished in the Epistles to the Corin-   
 thians: see this Introd. ch. ii. § v. During that journey, Timothy may   
 have been left there. This conjecture is at least worthy of full dis-   
 cussion: for it seems to fulfil most of the external requirements of the   
 first Epistle.   
 10. Mosheim, who was its originator, held the journey to Greece to   
 have taken place very early in the three years’ visit to Ephesus, and to   
 have lasted nine months,—thus accounting for the difference between   
 the two years and three months of Acts xix. 8, 10, and the three years   
 of Acts xx. 31. Wieseler, however, has so far regarded the phenomena   
 of the Epistle itself, as to shew that it would be very unlikely that   
 the false teachers had early in that visit assumed such consistency   
 and acquired such influence: and besides, we must assume, from the   
 intimation in 1 Tim. i. 3 ff, that the false teachers had already   
 gained some notoriety, and were busy in mischief, before the Apostle’s   
 departure.   
 11. Schrader, the next upholder of the hypothesis, makes the Apostle   
 remain in Ephesus up to Acts xix. 21, and then undertake the journey   
 there hinted at, through Macedonia to Corinth, thence to Crete (where   
 he founded the Cretan Churches, and left Titus), to Nicopolis in Cilicia   
 (see below, in the Introd. to Titus: sending from thence the first Epistle   
 to Timothy and that to Titus), Antioch, and so through Galatia back   
 lil :