

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

in Psalm lxix. which would suggest *πρηνῆς γενόμενος ἐλάκησεν μέσος καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ.*

It appears, then, as the result of this investigation, that while the narrative of the First Gospel was composed with the idea of prophetic fulfilments in the writer's mind, and while the narrative of the Acts was overlaid in the next generation with details borrowed from folk-lore literature, we have no right to say either that Matthew xxvii. 1-9 was evolved out of Old Testament prophecies or that Acts i. 18, 19, is a mere piece of folk-lore. The two narratives have in common the death of Judas within a few days after Gethsemane and the field Aceldamach that was bought with the wages of his treachery. They differ as to whether his death was self-inflicted or not, and as to whether it were he or the priests who purchased the field. We cannot reconcile these divergences; our knowledge is insufficient for the purpose, even supposing that a reconciliation were possible. But it may be maintained—and I should myself be disposed to maintain—that the vivid and striking narrative of Matthew xxvii. 1-9 is more likely to present us with a true version of the facts than the short explanatory note (for it is no more) inserted in the middle of St. Peter's speech by the author of the Acts.

J. H. BERNARD.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

IN discussing the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians I must ask to be allowed to take for granted two points, both of which will probably be readily conceded.

1. That what we know as 1 Thessalonians is an authentic work of the Apostle Paul.

2. That it was written before 2 Thessalonians, and not after it, as has sometimes been held.

Nor need the external evidence on behalf of 2 Thessalonians detain us. Though not very extensive, it is sufficiently clear so far as it goes, even more so perhaps than is the case with the corresponding evidence on behalf of the First Epistle.

Thus, while we find at least possible reminiscences of its language in the Epistles of Barnabas¹ and 1 Clement,² and again in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*,³ the *Didaché* in its eschatological section shows what appear to be unmistakable signs of acquaintance with it,⁴ and Dr. Lock has recently drawn attention to the interesting parallels afforded by the *Epistle Vienne and Lyons* preserved by Eusebius.⁵ Apart moreover from such indirect testimonies the Epistle is definitely attributed to St. Paul by Polycarp, who quotes 2 Thess. i. 4 as the words of the "Beatus Paulus," though he wrongly thinks of them as addressed to the Philippians,⁶ perhaps, as Zahn suggests,⁷ because he looked upon the neighbouring Churches of Philippi and Thessalonica as forming in reality one community.

Of still greater importance is the presence of the Epistle in the Canon of the Muratorian Fragment, in Marcion's Canon, and in the Old Latin and Syriac versions.

It is unnecessary to carry the evidence further down, for there can be little or no doubt that from this time onwards the Epistle's claims to full Apostolic authority were

¹ *Barnab.* c. 15. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 8, 12.

² *1 Clem.* c. 38. 4; 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13.

³ *Dial.* c. 32. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4, 7: c. 110. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.

⁴ *Didaché*, c. 16. 3-6; 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. Comp. also *Did.* c. 12. 3; 2 Thess. iii. 10, 12.

⁵ *Hist. Ecc.* v. 1: ἐνέσκηψεν ὁ ἀντικείμενος, προοιμαζόμενος ἤδη τὴν μέλλουσαν ἔσεσθαι παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ . . . Χριστὸς . . . καταργῶν τὸν ἀντικείμενον . . . οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπωλείας (see Lock, *Art. Thessalonians, Second Epistle to the*, in *Hastings' Dict. of the Bible*, iv. p. 747).

⁶ Polycarp. c. 11. 3: "de vobis etenim *gloriatur* in omnibus ecclesiis." Compare also c. 11. 20: "Sobrii ergo estote et vos in hoc; *et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis*," with 2 Thess. iii. 15, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἠγάγεθε.

⁷ *Geschichte des N. T. Kanons*, i. p. 815.

generally recognized in the Early Church, nor, so far as we can discover, were they ever seriously called in question until the beginning of last century.

The first to do so was Christian Schmidt (1798), who based his objections on purely internal grounds, which were assented to by de Wette in the earlier editions of his *Einleitung*, but afterwards abandoned in the fourth edition (1842), and in his Commentary on the New Testament, where the Epistle's authenticity is fully admitted.

The attack was however renewed by Kern, who was closely followed by Baur, both writers seeing in the Epistle a fictitious writing dependent on the Apocalypse, and containing features borrowed from the person and history of Nero; while Hilgenfeld went further, carrying its composition as far down as Trajan's time, a position with which in the main Bahnsen agreed.

Others in more recent times who have denied the Epistle's authenticity are Weizsäcker, Pfeiderer, Holtzmann, and Schmiedel, and in part P. Schmidt and Dr. Samuel Davidson. On the other hand, it has gained the support even of such advanced critics as Jülicher and Harnack, has been vigorously defended by Zahn, and is treated as genuine by its latest commentators in Germany, Bornemann and Wohlenberg, as well as by the general consensus of New Testament scholarship both in this country and in America.

It cannot be denied however that the authenticity of the Epistle is attended with certain difficulties, which have often led to its being used with a certain amount of hesitation in works on New Testament Theology and Pauline Eschatology,¹ and it may not therefore be out of place to subject

¹ See e.g. Dr. Charles' Jowett Lectures on *Eschatology*, p. 380 ff. 2 Thesalonians is not used at all by R. Kabisch in *Die Eschatologie des Paulus* (Göttingen, 1893) or by E. Teichmann in his useful monograph on *Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht* (Freiburg in Baden, 1896).

the principal objections that have been urged against it to a fresh examination with the view of discovering what weight is to be attached to them. For this purpose they may be conveniently considered as objections based on—

1. The Language and Style of the Epistle.
2. Its Literary Relationship to 1 Thessalonians.
3. The Character of its Doctrinal Contents.

I. LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

In itself the vocabulary of the Epistle is by no means remarkable. The words peculiar to it among New Testament writings number only 9, as compared with 23 (5 ?) in 1 Thessalonians, 33 in the Epistle to the Galatians, 41 (4 ?) in the Epistle to the Philippians, and 110 (12 ?) in 1 Corinthians. And this is the more noteworthy when we remember the unique character of some of its apocalyptic passages, and the marked tendency observable in other of the New Testament writings towards diversity of language and style in dealing with similar topics.

But while the vocabulary is thus in the main genuinely Pauline, various words and phrases are often pointed to as used in a non-Pauline manner.

Thus it is said that *κλησεις* in 2 Thess. i. 11 (*ἵνα ὑμᾶς ἀξιώσῃ τῆς κλήσεως ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν*) refers to the final call to participation in future blessedness instead of, as is usual in St. Paul, to the initial act of the Christian's life. But even if this future reference be admitted, which is by no means certain, we have at least a partial parallel in Philippians iii. 14 (*διώκω εἰς τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*), and in any case we can hardly refuse to the word a latitude of application which St. Paul might so naturally have extended to it, especially at a time when his theological system was so far from being definitely formed.

Nor again surely can any one seriously urge that because

on two occasions the Apostle used the verb *ἐξελέξατο* with reference to the Divine election (1 Cor. i. 27 f., Eph. i. 4), he could not therefore have used *εἶλατο* in 2 Thess. ii. 13 (*ὅτι εἶλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἰς σωτηρίαν*), a verb which, as we know from other evidence, he was in the habit of employing (see Phil. i. 22), and which from its special reference to the destiny or vocation of the chosen was peculiarly appropriate in the present passage.

Still more idle is the objection to *ἰσχύς* in 2 Thessalonians i. 9 (*ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ*) for the more usual *δύναμις*, for not only is *ἰσχύς* vouched for by Ephesians i. 19, vi. 10, but in the Thessalonian passage it is actually a quotation from Isaiah ii. 10.

And if any importance is to be attached to the solitary appearance of *ἐγκανχᾶσθαι* (2 Thess. i. 4) instead of *καυχᾶσθαι*, which is found more than 30 times in the Pauline Epistles, or to the combination *ὄλεθρος αἰώνιος* (2 Thess. i. 9), which St. Paul does not again use, but which is in perfect keeping with the language of the Old Testament, and more particularly of Jesus, on which in the whole passage the writer shows himself so dependent, or to the admittedly difficult construction *ὅτι ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς* (2 Thess. i. 10: comp. however 1 Cor. xiii. 7, 1 Tim. iii. 16, and see Winer-Moulton, p. 326)—do not these and similar anomalies tell at least as much for as against Pauline authorship, for is it likely that any imitator would have endangered the credibility of his work by making use of them?

The same might be said of the variation that appears in certain familiar formulas or phrases between our Epistle and 1 Thessalonians, even if other explanations for the changes were not forthcoming.

Thus in the opening thanksgiving, where we find instead of the simple *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* of 1 Thessalonians i. 2 *εὐχαριστεῖν*

ὀφείλομεν in 2 Thessalonians i. 3 and again in ii. 13, this may be due simply to emphasis, and is in entire accord with the more formal style of the whole Second Epistle, to which reference will have to be made again. While in the closing invocation the substitution of *ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης* (2 Thess. iii. 16) for *ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης* (1 Thess. v. 23), taken along with the similar preference of *κύριος* for *θεὸς* in other passages of the Epistle (comp. 2 Thess. ii. 13 and 1 Thess. i. 4, 2 Thess. iii. 3 and 1 Thess. v. 24, 2 Thess. iii. 5 and 1 Thess. iii. 11), may well be due to the prominent place which the exalted Lord is occupying at the moment in St. Paul's thoughts in view of His glorious Return. In any case it seems evident that throughout this Epistle *ὁ κύριος* is to be referred to Christ and not to God, so that there is at least no exception here to the general Pauline practice of confining the use of *ὁ κύριος* for God to citations from the Old Testament.

Other examples of so-called inconsistencies with the language of the first Epistle hardly need to be mentioned, such as the addition of *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in the opening salutation (2 Thess. i. 2, comp. 1 Thess. i. 1), or the substitution of *ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (2 Thess. iii. 6) for *ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ* (1 Thess. iv. 1), or actually of *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο* (2 Thess. ii. 11) for *διὰ τοῦτο* (1 Thess. iii. 5) without the *καί*. When hostile criticism has to fall back on pedantries such as these, unless it is supported by other and stronger evidence than any we have yet discovered, that is in itself a confession of the insufficiency of its case. And it will, I think, be generally conceded that this Epistle, taken as a whole, so far as its language and style are concerned, leaves upon the mind of any unbiassed reader the impression of a genuinely Pauline work. For not only are there abundant traces of the Apostle's characteristic phraseology and manner, as has been clearly shown by Dr. Jowett and others, and the proof need not be

repeated,¹ but the whole Epistle reflects that indefinable original atmosphere which a great writer imparts to his work, and which in this instance we are accustomed to associate with the name of St. Paul.

II. LITERARY DEPENDENCE ON 1 THESSALONIANS.

On the other hand, the very closeness of our Epistle's resemblance to 1 Thessalonians has been made the ground of a second objection to its authenticity. For the literary dependence between the two Epistles has been declared to be of such a character that the question comes to be not, "Could one man have written both Epistles?" but, "Is it likely that one man writing to the same people at what must have been a very short interval of time would repeat himself to so large an extent? Or, even if this is conceivable under certain circumstances, is it likely in the case of a writer so richly endowed and so fertile in thought as the Apostle Paul?"

The first to raise this difficulty pointedly was Weizsäcker,² and his arguments have recently been strongly emphasized by H. Holtzmann³ and W. Wrede.⁴ And the objection is at least an interesting one, for, when taken in conjunction with other peculiarities of the Epistle, it lends itself very easily to the idea of an imitator or forger, who, in order to gain credence for certain views he wished to express, encased them, so to speak, in the framework of a generally accepted Pauline Epistle. To this supposi-

¹ Jowett, *Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, etc.*, 2nd Ed., i. p. 148 f.; Reuss, *Hist. of the New Testament*, ed. Houghton, p. 75 ("For every 'unpauline' expression the concordance shows ten Pauline").

² *Das apostolische Zeitalter*,² p. 249 f., Eng. Tr. i. p. 295 f. ("The fact that the genuineness of the epistle has been strenuously assailed is not surprising, but inevitable. The reason for this is found, above all, in its striking relation to the first letter," p. 295.)

³ *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1901, p. 97 f.

⁴ *Die Echtheit des zweiten Thessalonicherbriefs* (Texte und Untersuchungen, herausgegeben von v. Gebhardt und Harnack, N.F. ix. 2). Leipzig, 1903.

tion we shall have to return later, but in the meantime before expressing any opinion upon it, it is necessary to notice clearly how far the resemblances between the two Epistles really extend.

Both Epistles begin with a salutation in almost identical terms, and marked by a form of address which the Apostle does not employ again (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1, 2).

This is followed by the customary thanksgiving, expressed again in a way found nowhere else in St. Paul, and based on practically the same grounds as regards the Thessalonians' state (1 Thess. i. 3, 4 ff; 2 Thess. i. 3, 4).

A section follows in the main peculiar in thought to the Second Epistle (i. 5-12), though exhibiting, again, many parallels of language with the First, while the transition to the great revelation of chap. ii. is marked by a form of appeal (*ἔρωτῶμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί*, ii. 1) which is found in the Pauline Epistles outside these two Epistles only in Philippians iv. 3.

The revelation referred to—the section regarding the man of lawlessness, ii. 1-12—stands so entirely by itself as regards contents, that it is frequently spoken of as constituting the *raison d'être* of the whole Epistle. But, apart from other Pauline peculiarities of language which it exhibits, it is interesting to notice in connexion with the point before us, that we find here the same reminiscences by the writer of a visit to his readers, and of what he had said when with them that we have already met in 1 Thessalonians (2 Thess. ii. 5, *οὐ μνημονεύετε ὅτι ἔτι ὦν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ταῦτα ἔλεγον ὑμῖν*: comp. 1 Thess. iii. 4, *καὶ γὰρ ὅτε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἦμεν, προελέγομεν ὑμῖν*), but which does not occur again in the Pauline Epistles.

No sooner, moreover, has the writer of the Second Epistle finished this, his main theme, than he utters a fervid thanksgiving and prayer for his readers, ii. 13, 14, after the manner of 1 Thessalonians ii. 12, 13, and in which

several of the characteristic words and phrases scattered through the First Epistle are re-echoed.

Similar resemblances may also be traced in the exhortation that follows to stand firm and to hold fast the traditions they have been taught (2 Thess. ii. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 1), and more especially in the remarkable invocation of 2 Thessalonians ii. 16, which corresponds both in form and place with 1 Thessalonians iii. 11, though there, in accordance with the usual practice, *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν* comes before *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς*: while the prayer, 2 Thessalonians iii. 5, *ὁ δὲ κύριος κατευθύναι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας*, may be compared with 1 Thessalonians iii. 11, *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς . . . κατευθύναι τὴν ὁδὸν ἡμῶν*, the only other passages in the Pauline writings where the verb *κατευθύνειν* is found, though it is to be noted that it is used in different connexions in the two passages.

The closing section of 2 Thessalonians iii. 6-15, like the closing section of 1 Thessalonians v. 1 ff., is occupied with practical exhortations, which in the main follow independent lines, though we are again struck with the recurrence here of various turns of expression and thought with which the First Epistle has already made us familiar—such as the warning against *disorderly walking* (2 Thess. iii. 6, 7, 11: 1 Thess. v. 14); the call to *imitate* the writer's mode of life (2 Thess. iii. 7, 9: 1 Thess. i. 6, 7); and the reference to the Apostles' *labouring night and day* that they might not prove themselves *burdensome* to their converts (2 Thess. iii. 8: 1 Thess. ii. 9), to which the Second Epistle adds the further thought of providing an example to the restless and idle (2 Thess. iii. 9).

Both Epistles end with an invocation to "the Lord (God, 1 Thess.) of peace," and with the customary Pauline benediction (2 Thess. iii. 18: 1 Thess. v. 18).

The resemblances between the two writings are thus very striking, and justice can hardly be said to have been

done to them as a rule by the upholders of the Pauline authorship of the Second Epistle. At the same time, care must be taken that they are not pressed too far. Even our brief review has indicated what an examination of Wrede's carefully prepared Tables makes still more evident, that at most the parallelism between the two Epistles cannot be said to extend to more than one-third of their whole contents. And from this, again, there fall to be deducted such parallels as are afforded by the salutation at the beginning, the benediction at the close, the phrases of transition from one subject to another, and similar formal expressions, where a close resemblance of language is not only natural but probable.¹

Nor must it be forgotten that even where certain sections of the Second Epistle correspond in their general contents to certain sections of the First, the actual parallelisms in language are by no means always found within these corresponding sections, but have frequently to be drawn from the two Epistles as wholes. And not only so, but they often occur in such different connexions as to suggest not so much the slavish copying by one man of another, as rather the free handling by the same writer of certain familiar words and phrases.

The same may be said of the differences of *tone*, combined with the similarities of expression between the two Epistles of which certain critics have made so much. It is quite true that in certain particulars the general tone of Second Thessalonians is more official and severe than the tone of First Thessalonians, though warm and personal passages are not wanting (e.g., i. 11, ii. 16 f.,

¹ According to Schmiedel (*Hand-Commentar zum N.T.*, II. i. 8), out of not quite 825 words in Second Thessalonians over 150 correspond literally, and over 30, with slight variations, with the vocabulary of First Thessalonians: not surely a very large number when the circumstances of the Epistle's composition are kept in view.

iii. 3-5), and that at places the writer seems in difficulties as regards both his language and his grammar.¹

But while these facts, taken by themselves, might be evidence of a later writer clumsily imitating another man's work,² may they not be equally well accounted for by a change (1) in the mood of the same writer, and (2) in the circumstances of those to whom he writes?

St. Paul was, we know, subject to great alternations of feeling, and when he wrote 2 Thessalonians, not only was he no longer under the same glad rebound from anxiety regarding the Thessalonians' state that he experienced when he wrote his First Epistle, but there is also evidence that at the time he was personally much harassed by "unreasonable and evil men" at Corinth (2 Thess. iii. 2: Acts xviii. 12 ff.). While, as regards the recipients of the letter, there are undoubted traces in the Second Epistle that between the time of its writing and the writing of the First St. Paul had heard of an increasing restlessness among his converts—a business which was no business (*μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους*, 2 Thess. iii. 11)—which might well justify more authoritative and severe warnings on his part, without however implying the later Church-discipline (*Kirchen-zucht*) which Schmiedel tries to discover in them.

Nor is it quite fair, as is generally done by those who lay stress on the closeness of the literary dependence between the two Thessalonian Epistles, to speak of it as without a parallel in early Christian literature. For to those who admit their authenticity we have within the circle of the Pauline Epistles themselves the kindred Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians, exhibiting an identity of thought

¹ Commenting on i. 3-10, Bornemann remarks: "Man hat das Gefühl, als sei er nicht so fort mit seinen Worten ins rechte Gleis gekommen und müsse, zum Teil mit den Worten seines früheren Briefes, zum Teil mit alttestamentlichen und liturgischen Wendungen erst den Zug seiner Gedanken rangieren und sammeln" (*Die Thessalonicherbriefe*, p. 328).

² "Künstliche oder vielmehr verkünstelte Nacharbeit," Holtzmann, p. 100.

and language, such as to make them, notwithstanding their admitted differences in aim, almost duplicates of each other. And if St. Paul could thus repeat himself in two contemporary Epistles, addressed if not to the same Church at least to the same district, why should not a like similarity run through two other Epistles, written at an interval according to the traditional view of at most a few months, and dealing with a situation which, if differing in certain particulars, was in the main unchanged?

Further efforts to explain the extent of the resemblances between the two Epistles have also been made by suggesting that St. Paul had re-read the First immediately before writing the Second Epistle, or more precisely that he had in his hands the rough draft which his amanuensis had prepared of his first letter—a clean copy having been despatched to Thessalonica—and that he drew freely from it in dictating the terms of the second letter.¹

One cannot say that this is impossible, and there would certainly be nothing according to the literary canons of the time to prevent a writer thus freely borrowing from his own previous work. But the very ingenuity of the suggestion is against it, and presupposes that the Apostle attached a greater importance to his own writings than their originally strictly occasional character warrants.

It is safer therefore to be content with such general explanations as have already been offered, or frankly to admit that the resemblances between the two Epistles constitute an interesting but, in our present state of ignorance regarding the exact circumstances of their writing, insoluble literary problem; though one which in no way militates against the Pauline authorship of the Second, unless other

¹ "Für den vielbeschäftigten und seines erregbaren Temperaments bewussten Pl. lag gerade in diesem Fall nichts näher, als das Concept des 1 Th., wenn ein solches vorhanden war, noch einmal durchzulesen, ehe er den 2 Th. diktirte." Zahn, *Einl. in das N.T.*, i. p. 179.

and more definite grounds for disputing it can be produced.

These grounds however, it is alleged, may be found in the strange character of much of the Epistle's doctrinal contents. And to this objection we must now turn.

III. DOCTRINAL CONTENTS OF 2 THESSALONIANS.

These are said, in the first place, to be inconsistent with the clear teaching of 1 Thessalonians, and, in the second place, to be in any case of such a character that it is not possible to think of St. Paul's having written them.

1. As regards the charge of inconsistency with 1 Thessalonians, that rests in the main on an alleged change of attitude with reference to the nearness of the Parousia, for that while in 1 Thessalonians the Parousia is represented as close at hand, and there is no mention of any sign by which it is to be preceded, in 2 Thessalonians we are distinctly told that it will not take place until the Man of lawlessness has been revealed.

To this it is generally replied that the two pictures are not really inconsistent, and that while there is nothing in the teaching regarding the Parousia in 1 Thessalonians to exclude the prior coming of the Man of lawlessness, there is equally nothing in his coming as depicted in the Second Epistle to delay unduly the expected Parousia of the First; all that is said is that Christ will not come just yet.¹

But while there is undoubted force in this—and parallels for the conjunction of the two views, or rather for the two

¹ Baur admitted this in his earlier and, it seems to us, correcter view of the relation of the two Epistles on this point. "It is perfectly conceivable," he says, "that one and the same writer, if he lived so much in the thought of the *parousia* as the two Epistles testify, should have looked at this mysterious subject in different circumstances and from different points of view, and so expressed himself regarding it in different ways." *Paulus*, p. 488 [Eng. Tr. ii. p. 93]. And on "how confused a maze of eschatological conceptions could co-exist often in one and the same person" see Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, Eng. Tr. i. p. 25.

aspects of the same truth may be cited from our Lord's eschatological discourse (St. Matt. xxiv. 29 ff.), and from the Apocalypse of St. John (Apoc. iii. 1, vi. 1 f.)—it is better not to attempt to reconcile the two positions too literally. There are many indications that St. Paul's eschatological views were at this time in a state of flux, and that in his teaching concerning the Last Things he was determined by practical and not theological motives, without much regard as to how far that teaching presented a consistent whole. And it may well have been that in the short time that had elapsed between the writing of 1 and 2 Thessalonians he had heard of circumstances in the Thessalonians' state which led him to emphasize afresh an aspect of the Parousia on which he had dwelt when in Thessalonica (2 Thess. ii. 5), but of which the Thessalonians had apparently lost sight, and which may further have gained a new significance in his own mind.

2. Even, however, if the point be thus turned against the charge of inconsistency, the question still remains whether it is at all likely that St. Paul, supposing him to have been the writer, would have so far departed from his general mode of thought in this particular passage, ii. 1-12. In none of his other New Testament writings do we find him laying stress on the "signs" preceding the end; nor does the person of Antichrist, with whom in general his conception corresponds, though the actual name is not used, again appear in his Epistles unless it be in the incidental notice of 2 Corinthians vi. 15 (*τις δὲ συμφάνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαν*);). But this in itself is not sufficient ground for maintaining that St. Paul can never have shared what we know to have been a widely spread belief of his time (comp. 1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3; 2 John 7; Apoc. xii. 13; Gfrörer, *Jahr. des Heils*, pt. ii. p. 257). And if he did not again lay the same stress on it, that may either have been because he had outgrown the belief in this particular

form, or because he did not again find himself confronted with circumstances which made such teaching either necessary or desirable.

Of course if the historical situation lying at the background of this teaching is to be sought in the antinomian Gnostic heresies of the second century, as Hilgenfeld, Bahnsen and Pfeiderer have from various points of view maintained, or even in the popular legend of Nero redivivus which has been widely believed from Kern and Baur down to P. Schmidt and Schmiedel, the Pauline authorship of the Epistle at once falls to the ground.

But, as has already been indicated, the doctrine of Antichrist did not come into existence with Montanism, but was firmly rooted in Jewish soil even before the Christian era; while, as regards the in some respects attractive Nero-hypothesis, the recent researches of Gunkel,¹ Bousset² and Charles³ have made clear that it was at a much later date than the interests of this theory require, that those traits belonging to Antichrist were transferred to Nero, which alone could make him a fitting basis for the Pauline conception.

Nor can this conception be derived from the Johannine Apocalypse, as has again been frequently held. It is now very generally admitted by critics of all schools that the "hindrance" to the Man of lawlessness, of which the writer speaks, is to be found in the influence of the Roman Government, in perfect keeping with such later Pauline passages as Romans xiii. 1-7. But if so, it will be at once recognized how wholly different this is from the place assigned to Rome in the Apocalypse, drunk with "the blood of prophets and of saints, and of all that have been slain

¹ *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 221 ff.

² *Der Antichrist*, p. 13 f. See also Art. *Antichrist* in *Encycl. Biblica*.

³ *The Ascension of Isaiah*, p. lxi. ff. "Schmiedel's view, which regards 2 Thess. ii. 1-12 . . . as a Beliar-Neronic myth (68-70 A.D.) is at conflict with the law of development as well as with all the evidence accessible on the subject." p. lxii. note 1.

upon the earth" (Apoc. xviii. 24; comp. vi. 9-11, vii. 14, xiv. 8, xvi. 19).

The whole conception indeed, as it meets us here, is purely religious, not political, and it is in the Old Testament, in the teaching of Jesus, and, more particularly as regards form, in certain Jewish apocalyptic beliefs that its roots are to be found.

Further than this, without entering on many of the vexed questions of interpretation which the passage raises, it is impossible to go at present. But if what has just been said is correct, it will be seen that, obscure though the passage undoubtedly is, there is still nothing in it to make its Pauline authorship impossible, or even improbable; while its genuinely Pauline style, and its natural place in the argument of the Epistle, are strong evidence in favour of the traditional view.

In this general conclusion we are confirmed by the unsatisfactory and conflicting nature of the rival theories which are offered of the origin and intention of 2 Thessalonians by those who deny its authenticity—theories which land us in greater difficulties than any they serve to remove. Incidental notice has been taken of some of these theories already, but there are three in particular which call for further remark.¹

1. There is, in the first place, the theory of Interpolation, which has been so frequently resorted to lately to explain, or explain away, difficulties in New Testament interpretation, and which in the present instance has at least this in its favour, that we have abundant signs of its presence in the apocalyptic literature of the period. May it not then have been at work here? May not, as P. Schmidt

¹ On the necessity of the impugners of the Epistle's authenticity supplying us with an intelligible account of its origin, see Bornemann, *Komm.*, p. 478, and comp. Wrede's frank admission, "Vor allem darf es nicht bei der blossen Negation bleiben: es muss gefragt werden, wie der Brief positiv als pseudonymes Schriftstück zu begreifen ist." p. 3.

suggests, i. 1-4, ii. 1, 2^a, ii. 13-18 have formed a true Pauline Epistle, into which a later writer interpolated the two passages which have caused most difficulty, i. 5-12 and ii. 1-12? ¹

But apart altogether from the arbitrariness of any such theory, and the total absence of MS. evidence in support of it, the result is to leave a letter so shorn of all its distinctive features that it is difficult to see how St. Paul could ever have thought of writing it. And further, a careful study of the Epistle as a whole shows that these two sections are so closely related both to what immediately precedes, and to what follows, that they cannot be separated from them without violence.

2. Of greater interest is the view which Spitta develops in his study on the Epistle contained in *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums* (Band i. pp. 111 ff., Göttingen, 1893). Starting from the "inferiority" of the Second Epistle to the First, he holds that, with the exception of the authenticating paragraph at the end, iii. 17, 18, it is the work not of St. Paul, but of Timothy. And in this way he thinks that he finds an adequate explanation both of its generally Pauline character and of its peculiarities—of the former because it was written by Timothy in close correspondence with St. Paul and by his commission, of the latter because the Jewish cast of its apocalyptic passages is in thorough harmony with what we learn elsewhere regarding Timothy's Jewish upbringing (see Acts xvi. 1; 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 14 f.).

But, to take the last point first, was Timothy after all more of a Jew than St. Paul? And difficult though it may be to reconcile on paper the attitude towards the Jews which underlies the "little apocalypse" of ii. 1-12 with that afterwards elaborated in Romans xi., Dr. Moffat ² prop-

¹ *Der Erste Thessalonicherbrief*, p. 111 ff. (Berlin, 1885).

² *The Historical New Testament*, p. 626.

erly insists that "it would be psychologically false to deny the compatibility of both positions at different periods within a single personality." By the time Romans xi. came to be written, the Apostle was "more dispassionate and patriotic," or, shall we not rather say? had attained to wider views of the possibilities God had in store for His people.

It is in the want however of any satisfactory direct evidence in support of it that the real weakness of Spitta's theory may be seen. For the verse on which he relies so much will certainly not bear the strain put upon it. "Remember ye not, that, when I was yet (*ἔτι*) with you, I told you these things?" (2 Thess. ii. 5). The *ἔτι*, so Spitta argues, points to a time very shortly before that at which the writer is writing.¹ And as Timothy had been at Thessalonica more recently than St. Paul, the reference is thought to be naturally to his visit. But is there any need of applying *ἔτι* in any such restricted sense? All that it implies is the desire on the writer's part to carry his readers back with him to the time when he was with them, whenever that time may have been. And further, is it conceivable that *ἔλεγον* can be understood of any other than the leading Apostle St. Paul, more particularly in view of the admitted reference of the first person singular to him in 2 Thessalonians iii. 17 and 1 Thessalonians iii. 5, v. 27, the only other passages in the two Epistles where it is used of the writer? Had Timothy wished to distinguish himself here from his two companions, Paul and Silvanus, would he not certainly have added his name *ἐγὼ ὁ Τιμόθεος*, or some such expression, and not have trusted to the Thessalonians' recognizing his handwriting as different from that of St. Paul in the closing paragraph (iii. 17, 18), as Spitta is driven to suggest.²

¹ "Auf eine Anwesenheit in Thessalonich, welche bereits längere Zeit vergangen ist, passt der Ausdruck nicht." p. 124.

² "Ein Missverständnis war ja für die Briefempfänger nicht wohl möglich, davon zu geschweigen, dass sie des Timotheus Handschrift wer-

That Timothy may on this occasion have acted as St. Paul's amanuensis is of course possible; and it is perhaps in the thought of a change of amanuensis from (say) Silvanus in the First Epistle that some of our Epistle's linguistic peculiarities may find an explanation. But this is very different from supposing that Timothy was actually its author, or that the Apostle set his own seal to views with which he was not wholly in agreement, as Spitta's theory requires.

3. If then the writer was not St. Paul, there is nothing left for us but to fall back upon the suggestion which has been urged from time to time in various forms, that the Epistle is the work of an unknown writer, who, anxious to gain currency for his own views regarding the Last Things, imbedded them in a framework skilfully drawn from St. Paul's genuine Epistle.

We have seen already the objections attending any such theory, in so far as it is connected with a definite historical situation such as the expected return of Nero. But apart altogether from such considerations, is it likely that a fictitious Epistle addressed on this showing to a Church which had already an authentic Epistle of St. Paul's, and in which many of the original recipients may well have been alive, would ever have gained currency as the Apostle's?

So strongly does Wrede, the latest exponent of the theory, feel this that he suggests that the Epistle was never intended for Thessalonica at all, but that the unknown writer simply made a general use of 1 Thessalonians, as, owing to its apocalyptic character, best serving the purpose he had in view.¹ So that it comes to this: That this

den gekannt haben im Unterschied von der des Paulus in der Schlussbemerkung, 3, 18. Somit ergibt es sich mit ziemlicher Sicherheit, dass der im Namen von Paulus, Silvanus und Timotheus ausgegangene 2. Thess.-Brief von den letzten dieser drei abgefasst und von den ersten nur mit einem eigenhändigen Schlusswort versehen ist." p. 125.

¹ pp. 38 ff., 68.

Epistle, so amply vouched for in antiquity, is nothing but a barefaced forgery¹—written in the name of St. Paul by one who was not St. Paul—invested with the authority of the Apostle, though designed to correct views currently attributed to the Apostle—and addressed to the Church of Thessalonica, though having another and a very different circle of readers in view. Surely there are more “misses” here than any “hits,” with which, according to the most charitable interpretation of it, the theory can be credited!

Nor does the view of forgery, so improbable in itself, derive any real help from two passages which are often cited in support of it, and as in themselves conclusive against the Epistle’s genuineness.

The first of these is ii. 2: “To the end that ye be not shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is now present.” But even if the difficult clause, *μήτε δι’ ἐπιστολῆς ὡς δι’ ἡμῶν*, be taken as referring to the possible existence of a pretended or forged epistle, and is not merely the exhausting by the writer of the different ways by which the Thessalonians might have been disturbed—spirit, word, letter—it represents at most just such a vague suspicion as might have crossed St. Paul’s mind (comp. 1 Thess. v. 27), but which would have been exceedingly unnatural in one who was himself engaged in passing off a spurious letter.

The same may be said of iii. 17: “The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write.” The particular form of authentication

¹ It is unfortunate to have to use the word “forgery”—round which such definite associations have now gathered—in connexion with our problem; but I know no other word that brings out so well the deliberate attempt of one man to use the name and authority of another in his writing. In view of iii. 17, 18, there can be no talk here of a harmless pseudonymous writing. Comp. Wrede, p. 86: “Stammt der zweite Thessalonicherbrief nicht von Paulus, so ist er eine Fälschung.”

used here is unique among the Pauline Epistles; and if it had been the work of a forger, he would surely have been more careful to follow St. Paul's general usage, as it meets us in 1 Corinthians xvi. 21, or Colossians iv. 18. Whereas "if Paul wrote the words, they express his intention," as Dr. Drummond has pointed out, "and this intention was satisfactorily fulfilled if he always added the benediction in his own handwriting."¹

On the whole then, without any desire to minimize the difficulties surrounding the literary character and much of the contents of this remarkable Epistle, I can find nothing in them to throw undue suspicion on its genuineness; while the failure of those who reject it to present any adequate explanation of how it arose, or of the authority it undoubtedly possessed in the Early Church, is in itself strong presumptive evidence that the traditional view is correct, and that we have here an authentic work of the Apostle Paul.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF THE EPISTLE OF
JUDE.

IF we may judge from the number of 'primitive errors' suspected by WH in this short Epistle, it would seem that the text is in a less satisfactory condition than that of any other portion of the New Testament. There are no less than four such errors in these thirty verses, the same number as are found in the eight chapters of the two Petrine Epistles, and in the forty-four chapters of the first two Gospels. In what follows I give the text of WH.

v. 1. Τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις κλητοῖς.

Here ἡγαπημένοις is supported by ABN, several cursives and ver-

¹ *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, etc.* (International Handbook to the New Testament), p. 13.