§ 1] TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING. [inrropucrioy.   
   
   
 to be prolonged beyond expectation. The hope of returning very   
 soon (iii, 14) is faint: the provision made, is for a longer absence.   
 Had the Apostle intended to return in a few weeks to Ephesus and   
 resume the government of the Church there, we may safely say that   
 the Epistle would have presented very different features. The hope   
 expressed in ch. iii. 14, quite parenthetically, must not be set against   
 the whole character of the Epistle\*, which any unbiassed reader will see   
 provides for a lengthened superintendence on the part of Timothy as the   
 more probable contingency.   
 14. Thus we see that, independently of graver objections, indepen-   
 dently also of the connexion of the three Epistles, the hypothesis of   
 Wieseler and Davidson does not suit the requirements of this first Epistle   
 to Timothy. When those other considerations come to be brought   
 again into view,—the necessarily later age of all three Epistles, from the   
 heresies of which they treat, from the Church development implied by   
 them, from the very diction and form of thought apparent in them,—the   
 impossibility, on any probable psychological view of St. Paul’s character,   
 of placing writings, so altogether diverse from the Epistles to the Corin-   
 thians, in the same period of his life with them,—I am persuaded that   
 very few students of Scripture will be found, whose mature view will   
 approve any form of the above hypothesis. hs   
 15. It will not be necessary to enter on the various other sub-hypo-   
 theses which have been made, such as that of Paulus, that the first Epistlo   
 was written from Casarea; &e. &e. They will be found dealt with in   
 Wieseler and Davidson, and in other introductions.   
 16. Further details must be sought in the following Introductions to   
 each individual Epistle. - 1 will mention however two decisive notices in   
 2 Tim., which no advocate of the above theory, or of any of its modifica-   
 tions, has been able to reconcile with his view. According to that view,   
 the Epistle was written at the end of the first (and only) Roman im-   
 prisonment. In ch. iv. 13, we have directions to Timothy to bring a   
 cloak and books which the Apostle left at Troas. In ib. ver. 20 we   
 read “Erastus remained in Corinth, but Trophimus left I behind in   
 Miletus sick.’ To what these notices point I shall consider further   
 on: I would now only call the reader’s attention to the following facts.   
 Assuming as above, and allowing only the two years for the Roman   
 imprisonment,—the last time he was at Troas and Miletus was six years   
 before (Acts xx. 6,17); on that occasion Timothy was with him: and   
 he had repeatedly seen Timothy since: and, what is insuperable, even   
 supposing these difficulties overcome, Zrophimus did not remain there, for   
 he was at Jerusalem with St. Paul at the time of his apprehension,   
 Acts xxi. 29. It will be easily seen by reference to any of the supporters   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
   
 3 See Davidson, ib. vol. p. 14.   
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