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 Philippi, the first of those churches on his way from Asia. All that we   
 can say is, that the Epistle was written at one of the Macedonian   
 churches; more probably at the last which he visited than at the first.   
 The principal of those churches were at Philippi, Thessalonica, and   
 Berea. We know from 1 Thess, ii. 17, 18, how anxious the Apostle was   
 again to visit the Thessalonian church: and in the absence of all detail   
 respecting this journey in Acts xx. 1, 2, we may well believe that he   
 would have spent some time at Thessalonica. If then Philippi from its   
 situation is improbable, it would seem likely that Thessalonica was the   
 place. But all is conjecture, beyond the fact that it was written from   
 Macedonia.   
 8. The time of writing is fixed within very narrow limits. About Pen-   
 tecost, A.D. 57 (see chronological table in Introd. to Acts), St. Paul left   
 Ephesus for ‘Troas: there he stayed some little time: thence went to   
 Macedonia ; and sufficient time had elapsed for him to have ascertained   
 the mind of the Macedonian churches and to have made the collection.   
 Here falls in our Epistle: after which (Acts xx. 2) he came into Greece   
 (Corinth) and abode there three months: and then is found, after tra-   
 velling by land through Macedonia, at Philippi on his return at Easter,   
 58. So that the Epistle was written in the summer, or autumn of 57.   
 4. Two questions belong to this part of our subject, which it is not   
 very easy to answer. From 1 Cor. iv. 17, we learn that Timothy had   
 been sent to Corinth by Paul (see also Acts xix. 22, where he is said to   
 have been sent with Erastus to Macedonia) to prepare the Corinthians   
 for his own coming by reminding them of his ways and teaching. And   
 in 1 Cor. xvi. 10,11, we find directions given to them for their reception   
 of Timothy and speeding his return: “for,” adds the Apostle, “I   
 expect him with the brethren.” Here, however, some little uncertainty   
 is expressed as to his visiting them, the words being, “but if Timothy   
 should come.” Now at the time of writing this second Epistle, we find   
 Timothy with St. Paul in Macedonia (2 Cor. i. 1), without any hint given   
 of his having been at Corinth, or of any tidings respecting the church   
 there having come through him. Nay, there is an apparent presumption   
 that he had not been at Corinth: for in 2 Cor. xii. 18 where speaking of   
 those whom he had sent to Corinth he mentions Titus by name, no   
 allusion is made to Timothy. Had he been at Corinth or not ?   
 I believe, in spite of these apparent obstacles to the view, that he had   
 been there. The purpose of his mission, as stated in 1 Cor. iv. 17, is too   
 plain and precise to have been lightly given up. And the relinquishing   
 of the intended journey of Timothy, as well as that of the Apostle, would   
 have furnished to the adversaries another ground for the charge of fickle-   
 ness of purpose, which they would not fail to use against him. Had   
 therefore the journey been abandoned, some notice and apology would   
 probably have been found in this Epistle, That Timothy is not men-   
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