
CONTENTS

Translator's Preface | ix

Translator's Note | xi

Acknowledgments | xiii

Abbreviations for Reference Works | xiv

Notes on the Greek | xv

Preface | xvii

Preliminary Remarks | 1

Chapter I

The Literary Relationship of the Two Letters to the Thessalonians: A Comparison of the Parallels | 4

An overview of the parallels. General comments. The unique parallel structure of the two letters. The historical setting and situation. The content of the two letters. The structure and formation. The parallels occur in parallel sections of the letters. Some parallels appear in conspicuously corresponding verses and passages. The sequence of the parallels is predominately the same. Exact parallelism can be documented between 1 Thess 1:1 and 2 Thess 1:1–2; 1 Thess 2:9 and 2 Thess 3:8. The results of this comparison can only be explained on the basis of the literary use of the first letter by the writer of the second letter. Paul is not the author. The difference between the two letters. Timothy is not the author.

Chapter II

Objections to an Early Fiction: The Writer's Purpose and Situation | 35

The second letter rejects the expectation of the imminent Coming of the Parousia. The oppositional relationship between 1 Thess 5:1–4 and 2 Thess 2:1–12. The preaching of the End Time has caused great fright and concern. The influence of the prophets has yielded nothing for the present situation. The mention of persecutions has also

not had an effect. Can Paul himself refer only to a forged letter with 2 Thess 2:2? But 2 Thess 2:2 is not comprehensible as a Pauline assertion. If 2 Thess 2:2 is not of Pauline origin, then it does not refer to a forged letter. *Διὰ λόγου* and 2 Thess 2:2. The result of the exegesis. (The reason for a letter to the Thessalonians) The overall historical relationship. The authority of the Pauline letters creates difficulties. (2 Pet 3:16; Jas 2:14ff).

Chapter III

Literary Form and Composition | 70

Remarks concerning parlance and modes of expression. The mood and tone of the letter. The characteristic literary techniques of the forger. The use of “I” and “we” in the letters. The plausibility of the assumed forgery. Ambiguity as a consequence of the forgery.

Chapter IV

The Letter as Forgery | 83

The applicability and practicality of the concept of a forgery. 2 Thess 3:17 does not contradict because it is deliberately deceptive. The success of the forgery. A Possible Chronology. There is no definite *terminus a quo*. The attestation of the letter by Marcion and Polycarp. A later evaluation and use of 2 Thess 2:4 appears questionable and dubious.

Chapter V

The Significance of the Jerusalem Temple | 93

The Temple and not the Church. The content of 2 Thess 2:3–12 is not the fabrication of the author. There is perhaps a literary source for this passage. The expectation of 2 Thess 2:4 also can have been derived from an older concept. The reinterpretation of the words about the temple cannot be assumed. It is difficult to presuppose the reconstruction of the Temple. Has this usage been taken over and adopted without the thought of the destruction of the Temple? What are the possible, related analogies? (Rev 11:1, 2, 8, 13.) The result.

Bibliography | 113