

## CHAPTER III

---

# LITERARY FORM AND COMPOSITION

---

If the Second Letter to the Thessalonians is to be understood as a pseudepigraphon, then it is not enough to discuss and debate the circumstances of its origin. Its form must also be closely scrutinized. Yet here we will take only a fleeting look at the style and mode of expression of this document.

In any event, we are only very imperfectly familiar with Paul's language. Thus one is not able to gain and assess anything definite and uncontested from the unique linguistic features that we encounter here. On the other hand, one should not be able to find any positive characteristic of authenticity in the apparent Pauline style and mode of expression. Jülicher's view<sup>1</sup> is that one must marvel at the forger who has so skillfully copied the Pauline style.

I do not agree with this. Since a good part of the plagiarism has been taken from the first letter, one first has to first collect the borrowings and forged material in a definite copy. Once that is accomplished, then the specific Pauline material itself is substantially reduced. What remains after that contains enough expressions and evidence that make the impression of Pauline origin and character uncertain, and at first impression directly appears to thwart them.<sup>2</sup> I seriously doubt that anyone will be able to better

1. Jülicher, *Einleitung*, 47.

2. Bornemann, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, 462. He finds evidence for a very strong, Old Testament coloring and quality of the language.

demonstrate more definite aspects of Pauline style in both of the independent sections of the letter—2 Thess 1:5–10; 2:1–12—than in the First Letter of Peter.

If for other reasons the inauthenticity of the letter might be asserted, no one will thus be able to arrive at the conclusion that someone other than Paul speaks here, even when at least a considerable part of the linguistic characteristics have been derived from this material.

It is certainly no coincidence that the writer writes κύριος where Paul always tends to use θεός. For it is most certainly possible that God and not Christ has been meant with the appellation of κύριος in 2 Thess 3:16 because the original text of 1 Thess 5:23 even speaks of God (ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης). Then too from the verses of 2 Thess 2:13; 3:3; cf. 3:5 one will likewise arrive at the same conclusion when one compares the parallels 1 Thess 1:4 (ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) and 1 Thess 5:24 (πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν). Considering the content of these statements it is very improbable the writer used Christ for God in these verses. Similarly with many contemporary Christians it was really much more common for him to say “the Lord” with many phrases.<sup>3</sup> In conclusion, it would be much the same if one preferred the view that the writer understood and loved to translate the statements that Paul made about God as a reference to Christ.

Also the twofold expression εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν from 2 Thess 1:3; 2:13 rather than the εὐχαριστοῦμεν of 1 Thess 1:2; 2:13 is hardly a coincidence.<sup>4</sup> The rewriting of ὀφείλομεν (ὀφείλετε etc.) is used very often in the Letter to Barnabas.<sup>5</sup> Cf. Bar 1:7; 2:1, 10; 4:6; 6:18; 7:11; 13:3; see also I Clem 40:1. In the light of these parallels one will not want to make too much of the expression, εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν, and thus from the “Feeling of Responsibility” that Paul should have here for emphatic reasons. Should

3. Holtzmann, “Zum zweiten Thessalonicherbrief,” 101–2; Spitta, *Zur Geschichte*, 128; Zahn, *Einleitung*, 182. According to Zahn “it is clear that a forger would not have replaced one of Paul’s commonly used expressions such as ‘God of Peace’ with such an unheard of title as ‘the Lord of Peace.’” Is not everything so obvious! As if with our writer a thorough familiarity with our critical choice of words were to be presumed!

4. Holtzmann, “Zum zweiten Thessalonicherbrief,” 98; Zahn, *Einleitung*, 175. Zahn considers it not believable that a forger “could have placed such an unheard of sentence in the mouth of Paul, and not once but twice in the authentic and inauthentic letters of Paul: ‘we are obligated to thank God for you at all times.’” Then too from the interwoven time periods reflected with 2 Thess 1:10–12 and 2 Thess 2:3–9 that others find so suspicious, Zahn knows how to forge the “Mark of Authenticity.” See Holtzmann for all the periods of 2 Thess 1:3–12.

5. Rauch, Untitled Entry, *Zeitschrift*, 458.

these expressions have been especially familiar to the writer precisely as a kind of formula of the liturgical language? With the mere intent to “elevate” the argument I can see no real reason for the choice of the expression. The *ὀφείλομεν* is also found with *εὐχαριστεῖν* (*ὑπερευχαριστεῖν*, *εὐχαριστοῦντες αἰνεῖν*) in I Clem 38:4 and Bar 5:3;7:1.

Moreover with the use of *κλήσις* in 2 Thess 1:11 that is certainly to be understood as an imminent call and that in this sense has no other equivalent in Paul’s letters, and with *εἴλατο* of 2 Thess 2:13 instead of *ἐξέλεξατο*, and several other expressions a trace of non-Pauline usage can be documented with greater or less probability. Biblical criticism has assuredly gone much too far with such assessments and opinions since it has often overrated the significance of the linguistic arguments.

Yet it is not my intent to take much time for these matters that have been dealt with many times. It is enough to conclude that the language of this letter gives evidence of a great similarity to Pauline usage that is known to us. At the same time, there is much departure from that usage as it is appropriate and suitable for a writer who so very closely follows a Pauline original but was also familiar with more than one Pauline letter.

The entire atmosphere of the letter does not to any less degree justify or verify the assumption of its inauthenticity, for it actually gives definite support for such a view. How much less fresh and direct, how much drier, official, and impersonal is its tone in comparison with that of the first letter, as for example both Spitta and Bornemann have so very well described.<sup>6</sup> This stance is most appropriate for an imitator.

We understand this even better when we remember an earlier observation.<sup>7</sup> That element of the personable, individual, and cordial warmth of the first letter that so readily marks it as an original, non-contrived<sup>8</sup> literary

6. Bornemann, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, 465ff.; Spitta, *Zur Geschichte*, 116ff.; Cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, 174. Bornemann wants to explain from the aspects and character of the impersonable, neutral etc. that Paul out of a sense of pedagogical wisdom has omitted names and all other people from the text of his letters to protect them (467, 481). That is nonetheless a contrived and subjective disposition of the matter.

7. See 33 above.

8. The judgment and assessment of the Tübingen School continues to exercise a consequential influence over the Pauline letters forasmuch as the authenticity of the four primary letters tends to appear one level more certain than that of the First Letter to the Thessalonians or the Letter to the Philippians. I do not doubt the authenticity of the Letter to the Romans. But if I were to assess the various, different levels, so then my doubt about this letter would be always more understandable than with regard to the two other letters.

composition lies for the most part in its second and third chapters ending with 1 Thess 3:10. We have already seen that the writer has completely skipped over these sections. Then too of course all of the realistic characteristics of the actual communal situation have been omitted that the first letter recorded.

Irrespective of this a perceptible difference lies behind the commanding tone and character of certain sentences that the first letter does not give any evidence of. The passage of 2 Thess 3:6–15 is especially important here.<sup>9</sup>

“But we command you, brothers, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to withdraw yourselves from every brother who walks slovenly and not according to the instruction (*παράδοσις*) that they have received from us.”<sup>10</sup> (2 Thess 3:6)

“Whenever one of you does not obey my written word, mark this one out so that you do not associate with him . . .” (2 Thess 3:14)

An explanation for this can be easily given. Hopefully everyone will discover here with regard to this matter that the pseudo-apostle is of the opinion that he should take up an apostolic tone, whereas the real apostle does not.

Several comments have been made concerning the actual literary technique of the writer. We have to expand on these, as we peruse through the entire letter from this point of view.

First of all, the writer copied the address of the first letter word by word. By all means it is clear that he joined the words *ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ* with the preceding, since otherwise he would not have been able to add and place *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς κτλ* with the *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*.<sup>11</sup> Whether or not he has really arrived at the meaning that Paul intended is rather doubtful. Despite the obvious placement of words, the analogy of the other Pauline addresses—in which *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη* never occurs without an addition (*ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς κτλ*)—suggests that the words *ἐν θεῷ κτλ* are to be combined with *χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη*. However that might be, we most certainly recognize the strange and thoughtless addition of the

9. Cf. Spitta, *Zur Geschichte*, 117–18. He refers to 2 Thess 2:15; 3:4 among other verses.

10. Παρελάβοσαν. The LA [Western reading] *παρελάβετε* is the correction.

11. When the redactors as a rule strongly punctuate the text before *χάρις* in 1 Thess 1:1 (see 4 above), so then they will have been guided by the analogy of 2 Thess 1:1–2. But this is not conclusive (also opposed to Bornemann for 1 Thess 1:1).

second phrase of ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς κτλ as that of a copyist. He expanded the stark and bare χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη with this phrase because they lingered still in his ear from the headings of Paul's other letters.

The writer freely copied the heading of his letter from that of the first letter. But then after the mention of διωγμοί and θλίψεις (2 Thess 1:4), he proceeds with a small digression of 2 Thess 1:5–12 his own way and gives expression to his own sentiment. That has been previously discussed.<sup>12</sup> Here verses 11 and 12 refer once more back to the characteristic statements of greeting at the beginning. One can well and clearly imagine the train of thought. The actual digression has been ended. The writer knows now that at the beginning he spoke of thanksgiving but that he did mention and speak of petition and prayer for his readers that the first letter presented. So he proceeds to make that up, whereby at the same time he admittedly continues the last train of thought. It appears to me that when at this point the very peculiar expression ἔργον πίστεως<sup>13</sup> arises that stands at the beginning of the thanksgiving in the first letter, so that provides a definite verification for the use of the first letter.

After this introduction, which itself contains eschatological elements, the very extensive eschatological passage immediately follows. That is assuredly not coincidence, even so much less than that the first letter's corresponding eschatological discourse is found at the end of that letter. Obviously the writer hurries immediately on to this topic because already at this point he wants to give expression to the matter that lies close to his heart. Thus we understand why the entire parallel structure of the two letters has been interrupted at this juncture.

The real concern of the writer has been expressed with the passage 2 Thess 2:1–12. Now he returns once more to the original. If one keeps in view that he could not begin any further elaboration of the historical and personal content of 1 Thess 2:1—3:10 and therefore has omitted it, it will thus not be difficult to understand the progressive continuation of the letter.

After the eschatological discourse his view remained fixed at first on the resumption of the thanksgiving passage of 1 Thess 2:13, particularly with the oblique ἡμεῖς<sup>14</sup> but very probably also by means of the relatedness of 2 Thess 2:14 with 1 Thess 2:12. At the same time thereby his eye returns to the thanksgiving theme of the first chapter. That is demonstrated by the

12. See 17 and 51 above.

13. Kern, "Über 2 Thess 2:1–12," 212. Cf. his comment.

14. See 20 above.

ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ and the ὅτι εἶλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός (cf. 1 Thess 1:4). Then he hurries on past the personal comments of Paul of chapters 2 and 3—the στήκετε in 2 Thess 2:15 thereby appears to him to have remained in the sense taken from 1 Thess 3:8. But then with 1 Thess 3:11–13 he encounters a general wish that he is able to appropriately make use of with his own version, 2 Thess 2:16–17.

Thus when the request for the intercession of the readers follows that, introduced by τὸ λοιπόν (1 Thess 4:1: λοιπόν), it already sounds in and of itself just like a closing verse. This impression is further reinforced for the προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, and περὶ ἡμῶν appear to have been taken from the closing of the first letter and also since the πιστὸς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ κύριος (2 Thess 3:3) point to him (1 Thess 5:24). Additionally it may also be added that the train of thought in 2 Thess 3:1–5 or actually beginning already with 2 Thess 2:13 becomes peculiarly erratic, agitated, and disquieting. With almost every sentence there is a new theme: 2 Thess 2:13–14 presents a thanksgiving, 2 Thess 2:15 an admonition, 2 Thess 2:16–17 a prayer-wish, 2 Thess 3:1 a request for an intercession for the Gospel and the Apostle, 2 Thess 3:3 an expression of reliance on God abruptly added on, 2 Thess 3:4 another expression of trust that refers to the behavior and conduct of the readers, and 2 Thess 3:5 once more another prayer-wish. This last sentence is almost a duplicate of 2 Thess 2:16–17 and has been taken from 1 Thess 3:11. This original verse has once more been exploited, whereby the κατευθῆναι admittedly must lose its relationship to Paul's travel plans (1 Thess 3:11 κατευθῆναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς) and become a rather drab and colorless expression (κατευθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας . . .). It is hardly mere subjective sentiment when I express the view that the writer here in this section no longer knows how to proceed and that his copious dependence on the original results not without a definite correlation to the ebbing of the flow of thought. According to this observation we will assume that originally he wanted to close the letter with 2 Thess 3:1 or rather with 2 Thess 2:16–17.<sup>15</sup> That in itself is evidence that after the completion of the eschatological discourse it became clear to him that the real purpose that motivated him to take up the pen had already been carried to its end.

Irrespective of the interpretation that for the readers the word of God is vibrant and resonates among them (καθὼς καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς), a fact that could be well explained from the previously used short verse of 1 Thess 2:1, which testifies that the Thessalonians have properly received the word of

15. Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, 212–13; von Hoffmann, *Die heilige Schrift*.

God, the content of the solicited intercession of 2 Thess 3:1, 2 has no equivalent in the original letter. That is remarkable because of the second half of the verse: *ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων*. At first this sounds like a reference to specific persons and events. Precisely because the first letter does not provide a proper explanation, it appears unusual and strange for a Pseudo-Paul and even more appropriate for the Apostle who at least with this remark would be referring to something about the contemporary situation in Corinth. Therefore some have willingly found here evidence for an allusion to the reports of Acts 18:12–17.

Nonetheless this expression is not at all specific or typical, for it appears that the writer is making use of a biblical mode of expression. Isa 25:4 taken from the LXX states: *ἀπὸ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥύσῃ αὐτούς*.<sup>16</sup> If the form of this verse is to be thus understood, then it appears that the thought would be as it emerges from very simple deliberation that the writer is aware that Paul as an Evangelist and Apostle stood over and against a world that for the most part did not believe his message and even demonstrated enmity toward him. The statement, *οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις*, leads to this general understanding. If we further assume that the writer has already sharply spoken out two times against such *ἄστοι* and *πονηροὶ ἄνθρωποι* (2 Thess 1:6–10; 2:10–12) who are the oppressors of the believers and the despisers of the truth, so one will not take offence when he names and specifies the Apostle along with the “Propagation of the Word” as the actual content for the intercession which he requests. There is no real reason to consider specific people and definite events. The *προσεύχεσθε, ἀδελφοί, περὶ ἡμῶν* occurs in the first letter without any further description.

Here the writer abandons the initial thought of ending the letter. With 2 Thess 3:6–15 he follows with another discourse of admonition where the unity, flow of thought, and liveliness of the composition is distinctly contrasted to the preceding. It is very likely that at this point his earlier comments appear too brief for him. Above all, we will assume that the words of the first letter about quiescence and work subsequently come into view, demand his attention, and appear especially important and appropriate for his audience.

As a manner of explanation he remembered that Paul had spoken about work with a second passage found in 1 Thess 2:9. He welcomed Paul's view about work because it afforded him the opportunity to present his

<sup>16</sup> Bornemann, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, 388, 533. He has made a remark about this. Cf. Rom 15:31; *Did* 5:2.

word of warning and admonition. Although for the most part he could simply copy these words of Paul, admittedly he must modify the Pauline train of thought in this relational context. It is clear that Paul had not deliberately intended to provide the Thessalonians with an exemplary paradigm for work with his manual work.<sup>17</sup> Biblical scholars have often enough taken exception<sup>18</sup> to this comment of the second letter. Yet without further engaging the discussion of this question we may conclude in this matter that biblical criticism has well understood the extent to which Paul himself could consider his work from this aspect and standpoint.

It is worth mentioning that the earlier letter does not speak at all about a precept or code of work. So far as the Pauline *παράδοσις* is referred to, the text reminds us only of the personal example of the Apostle (2 Thess 3:7–9) and his verbal direction (2 Thess 3:10)—both points that the first letter readily and distinctly presented. One could be tempted<sup>19</sup> namely to relate the sentence about *ἐπιστολή* from 2 Thess 3:14 to this letter because the copied, original verse of 1 Thess 4:11 immediately precedes 2 Thess 3:12. Yet this original verse itself occurs as a present, not an earlier request or demand, and the text makes no mention at all about an earlier demand as such. Therefore it is much more likely that *διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς* is to be understood from the viewpoint of the second letter. The obedience of which 2 Thess 3:14 speaks is naturally intended and aimed at the definite command (*παραγγέλλομεν* 2 Thess 3:12). Also 2 Thess 3:11 (*ἀκούομεν γάρ τινες περιπατοῦντας ἐν ὑμῖν ἀτάκτως*) is not to be read as a report about the disheveled transformation of Christians whom the Apostle came to visit. The writer proceeds here simply as a forger and composes, to a certain extent, from the viewpoint of the first letter but not with verbatim retrospection to it. He could have done this and refer thus to the previous text of the original just as 2 Thess 2:15 gives us an example. Much less easily to the contrary could Paul ignore the fact that he had already once with a letter admonished the community about their work.

From the first letter it can be concluded that the instruction about work does not merely refer to the idle ones themselves (1 Thess 5:12) but also to the conduct of the others to them (1 Thess 5:6, 13–16).

17. Cf. 2 Thess 3:9: *ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς τύπον δώμεν ὑμῖν*. The preceding words, *οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχομεν*, remind one of a Pauline explanation and expression such as 1 Cor 9:4ff.

18. Cf. Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, 644.

19. Zahn, *Einleitung*, 165, 173. See especially 173. His proposal that the mention of *ἐάν* in the second letter could be presumed to be a conditional conjunction does not convince us.

After the completion of this explanation the writer of our letter (2 Thess 3:16) returns to the conclusion of the original letter (1 Thess 5:23). The admonitions that precede the closing remarks have been disregarded. Nevertheless one can easily see that the beginning of this passage (1 Thess 5:13 (?), 14) has already influenced the discussion about work (2 Thess 3:15). The transition from 1 Thess 4:11 to 1 Thess 5:14 and then on to 1 Thess 5:23 demonstrates here how the eye of the writer has proceeded through the text. Then when the abrasive tone of 2 Thess 3:14 is rather noticeably replaced with the milder expression of 2 Thess 3:15 (καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρόν ἡγεῖσθε, κτλ), so this exchange that is almost tantamount to a complete paradox explains best of all here that the writer was prompted by the original text itself (1 Thess 5:14, cf. 13) to modify the original verses.<sup>20</sup>

Very possibly the special reference to his own letter (2 Thess 3:14) has been elicited with regard to the relationship to 1 Thess 5:27. Both verses coincide with one another since they demand serious attention to the written letter. For that matter one will find the τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς (2 Thess 3:14) very naturally characteristic of the Pseudo-Paul. He distinctly emphasizes the letter because he knows it is a matter of authority that he claims for himself. From Paul's point of view the addendum διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς as viewed from the standpoint of the second letter would in my opinion have been unmotivated and superfluous.<sup>21</sup> The mention of ἐπιστολῆς in 1 Thess 5:27 is an entirely different matter, for here one is dealing with an oral reading of the letter.

The concluding wish of 2 Thess 3:16 is much shorter than that of 1 Thess 5:23. The phrase ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ could well be a summary of many destinations that are alluded to with this verse.

Additionally another matter arises in this regard which especially the very proficient study of K. Dick<sup>22</sup> has recently called attention to. It is well-known that with the first letter Paul always uses the first person plural to refer to himself with the exception of verses 1 Thess 2:18; 3:5; 5:27. The interpretation of this observation does not concern us here. We ask only how the second letter responds to this usage. The writer of the second letter likewise also uses the first person plural, and only in verses 2 Thess 2:5 and 2 Thess 3:17 does the singular occur. This second verse disqualifies

20. Holtzmann, Untitled Entry, *Schenkels Bibellexikon*, 508; Holtzmann, "Zum zweiten Thessalonikerbrief," 102-3.

21. Zahn, *Einleitung*, 173. He has obviously perceived this.

22. Dick, *Der schriftstellerische Plural*, 73-74. See especially 73.

itself from any consideration because its structure allows only the use of the singular. It could perhaps well appear to be a striking coincidence that the writer shows the same fondness for the literary plural or—according to the other concept and version of the questionable occurrence—for the constant consideration of the other “co-writers” (Silvanus and Timothy) as Paul himself does in his authentic letters. Yet neither a special interest for the helpers of Paul nor the same stylistic tendency on the part of our writer can be assumed. On the other hand it is rather artificial to attribute to him an intentional replication of such a small matter, that author who hardly had the eyes to see it and who has demonstrated much freedom over and against the words of Paul. But by itself the dependence on the original does not have to have been intentional. Therefore the proposal of an involuntary and unintentional plagiarism can well be documented here. A comparison teaches that the “we” has actually been used in all of the primary verses and passages of the first letter. Thus it is only natural that the plural was retained even where there were no distinct parallels. The exception of 2 Thess 2:5 could best be explained by the observation that in this section the original did not play a role. Nonetheless nothing of this can be definitely proved or demonstrated. But it is certain that the writer would not have thought, as Dick assumes in his concept of the inauthenticity of the letter, to copy the singular or plural (*numerus*) from the first letter.

The previous comments demonstrate that the assumption of the inauthenticity of the letter is not at all a false key both for the understanding of its entire composition as well as for many of its particular characteristics. Now the question arises as to what extent the writer has pursued the original text. Has he established for himself in a rather naïve, unintentional, and convenient dependence on the framework for that which he really wants to validate and bring to fruition? Or did he have a definite awareness of the fact that the similarity of the original text would suggest the content of his letter?

One would like to suppose that a certain purpose played a role here, especially when with the closing he seeks to defend his letter with a special explanation about the possibility of a mistrustful reception of it. Far removed from what one would fear with a literary imitation, he may have if anything felt himself secured with the original. But certainly considering all of the details one cannot conceive of the complete use and imitation of Paul's letter as the result of reflection and intended style. Thus the dependence must have been at many points much more exact.

With my analysis of the letter I am rather certain that I have not repudiated this view and have imputed to the writer a fictitious technique and procedure. Yet from another point of view one may well raise an objection against the conception of the entire literary project that we have presupposed. Grimm has already given voice to this matter.<sup>23</sup> He has taken issue with Baur and asks if for every appropriate verse or passage of the second letter one is required to find several putative or actual parallels in order to substantiate copied or duplicated material taken from the first letter. With such an endeavor a whimsical manner of literary activity would be ascribed to the Pseudo-Paul, since in order to form only one sentence, he would have looked around to two or three verses of the original and out of those would have combined words and thoughts for his sentence.

On the one hand, this objection is not the worst proposal since it compels one to conceive of the literary activity of a falsifier as a concrete process. However, the point of his argument has been dethroned and eliminated if the earlier expressed observation<sup>24</sup> is really correct that for the most part the majority of the similarities distinctly relate and combine one single verse or passage of the one with just such a one from the other letter. If on the other hand as opposed to that many parallels from several related verses of the first letter actually coincide, support, and explain a verse of the second letter, that is not at all an incomprehensible occurrence. Several examples have already demonstrated this. There was nothing irrational about the fact that alongside 2 Thess 2:13 and 1 Thess 2:18, the verse from 1 Thess 1:4 is also reminiscent of them. Additionally, 2 Thess 3:8, which occurs in the middle of a passage, reminds one of 1 Thess 4:11–12 and demonstrates a clear and special dependence on 1 Thess 2:9. Other such cases can be similarly explained. It is most natural that single phrases and verses anchor themselves in one's memory with the reading of the opened letter and that they might well penetrate the text where other verses are primarily authoritative and decisive. On the other hand, if someone *during the process of writing* used an original text and easily skimmed over large sections of it, that person would have combined material that did not relate. No one can accurately assess everything in such cases, and no one can demand that one be able to accomplish such.

Irregularities and ambiguities often result in dependent writings when they have been derived from a slavish dependence on the original

23. Grimm, "Die Echtheit," *Studien*, 801.

24. See 18ff. above.

text—yet not always. We have already encountered a few such cases with our research. The non-analogous ἡμεῖς (δὲ) of 2 Thess 2:13 explains the unusual addition of ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν κτλ in the greeting, and finally the peculiar and specific relationship of 2 Thess 3:15 to 2 Thess 3:14 is to be singled out and remembered here.<sup>25</sup> Further examples of this kind have often been found. At least with two cases the judgment of critical scholars seems to be very probable.

The usage of πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἐνὸς ἐκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους of 2 Thess 1:3 is incorrect to the extent that εἰς ἀλλήλους is related to a singular form. After ἐνὸς ἐκάστου one would expect to find ὑμῶν rather than πάντων ὑμῶν. Πάντων can easily be derived from 1 Thess 1:2. But the combination of the singular with εἰς ἀλλήλους might be easily explained from the influence of the verse 1 Thess 3:12: ὑμᾶς ὁ κύριος πλεονάσαι (here it is transitive) . . . τῇ ἀγάπῃ εἰς ἀλλήλους.<sup>26</sup> But the matter is really not obvious.

The second case deals with these words that immediately follow the brief thanksgiving: ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐγκαυχᾶσθαι (2 Thess 1:4). Here that αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς distinctively presupposes an opposite. The exegetes acknowledge this for the most part but find themselves faced with a dilemma because no striking opposite can be derived from the context itself. Nevertheless an explanation for the dilemma results when one finds the opposite in the *object* of the pride and praise because the writers do not merely praise the Thessalonians but even themselves for their own sakes.<sup>27</sup> It is very likely possible that αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς is to be considered simply as an expression of the apostolic dignity and that the discreet thoughts or words are to be accepted for what is expressed. Thus they would explain the matter as follows: when we ourselves praise someone, so that means more than when others do that. It is still more likely to find a relationship in these words to 1 Thess 1:7–8 to the others who proclaim there the praise of the Thessalonians. Thus the αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς appears assuredly to have been expressed with a very special exaltation.<sup>28</sup>

25. See 79 above.

26. Holtzmann, “Zum zweiten Thessalonicherbrief,” 100; Schmiedel, Untitled Entry, *Handkommentar*. But Schmiedel just as also Holtzmann would like to derive the ἐνὸς ἐκάστου from 1 Thess. 2:11.

27. Bornemann, *Die Thessalonicherbriefe*. (According to A. Buttman and Laurent).

28. Hilgenfeld, Untitled Entry, *Zeitschrift*, 243; Holtzmann, “Zum zweiten Thessalonicherbrief,” 100; Schmiedel, Untitled Entry, *Handkommentar*, z St., 9–11. Cf. also 1 Thess 1:1b, 9 and the opposition: ἡμᾶς—αὐτοί.

## THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SECOND LETTER TO THE THESSALONIANS

The extent to which other particular words and expressions that present themselves without any difficulty and which receive a special light<sup>29</sup> of emphasis by means of a comparison with the first letter are not to be considered and examined here.

SAMPLE

29. Holtzmann, "Zum zweiten Thessalonicherbrief," 99. For example an expression such as 2 Thess 1:3: *ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν*.